



Planning Development Brief

Land at Cross Street,
Sale.

Consultation Comments with
Responses

April 2007

If you need help to understand this information, please ask someone to phone 0161 912-2000 to let us know how we can best provide this information.

اذا كنت في حاجة الى مساعدة لفهم هذه المعلومة الرجاء طلب من شخص الاتصال برقم الهاتف: 0161 912-2000 لاخبارنا عن كيفية تقديم هذه المعلومة بأحسن طريقة.

ARABIC

如果您需要帮助才能看懂这份资料，可以请人致电：

0161 912-2000，告诉我们如何最好地给您 提供这些信息。

CHINESE

Si vous avez besoin d'aide pour comprendre ces informations, veuillez demander à quelqu'un de téléphoner au 0161 912-2000 pour nous informer de la meilleure façon pour fournir ces informations.

FRENCH

જો આપને આ માહિતીની શમજજા માટે મદદની જરૂર હોય તો ફુપા કરી કોઈને કહો કે, આ માહિતી અમે કેટલી સારી રીતે પૂરી પાડી શકીએ તે બાબતે અમને જણાવવા માટે, 0161 912-2000 નંબર પર ફોન કરો.

GUJARATI

Jesli potrzebujesz pomocy aby zrozumieć ta informacje, popros kogos, aby zadzwonił pod numer 0161 912-2000 aby nas poinformował, w jaki sposób najlepiej mozemy ci ja przekazac.

POLISH

ਜੇ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਹ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਸਮਝਣ ਲਈ ਸਹਾਇਤਾ ਚਾਹੀਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਾਨੂੰ 0161 912-2000 ਨੰਬਰ ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਹ ਦੱਸਣ ਲਈ ਕਰੋ ਕਿ ਅਸੀਂ ਇਹ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਸਭ ਤੋਂ ਅੱਛੇ ਢੰਗ ਨਾਲ ਕਿਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਾਂ।

PUNJABI

Haddii aad dooneeyso in lagaa taageero garashada maclumaadkaani, fadlan qof uun ka codso inuu waco telefoonka 0161 912-2000 oo noo sheego sida ugu fiican oo aanu maclumaadkaani kuugu soo gudbin karno.

SOMALI

اگر آپکو یہ معلومات سمجھنے میں مدد کی ضرورت ہے تو براہ مہربانی کسی سے کہیئے کہ وہ ہمیں 0161-912-2000 پر ٹیلیفون کرے تاکہ ہمیں معلوم ہو سکے کہ آپکو یہ معلومات فراہم کرنے کا بہترین طریقہ کیا ہے۔

URDU

This document can also be made available in alternative formats, including large print and Braille. For further details please contact the LDF Help-line on 0161 912 4475

Summary of Representations received to PDB – Land at Cross Street, Sale (Consultation Draft)

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
Simon Cook Roger Hannah & Co.	7	The scale, massing and layout of the buildings runs contrary to the objective of achieving an architecturally distinctive mixed use development.	The Planning Development Brief (PDB) aims to encourage design distinction through a quality development that does not dominate its surroundings.
		The brief is effectively requesting developers to blend in the local area rather than to create any design distinction.	Neither a tall or monolithic building would be appropriate in this specific location, due to the existing townscape and close proximity of residential properties to the boundary with the site.
	7	Whilst every attempt is made to reduce the height of the building and even a statement is made that “a fully affordable residential scheme” would be encouraged, this just ignores the practical realities of having to acquire all the land interests that form the development brief site.	The Council's adopted SPG on Housing Land Supply describes the circumstances and locations in which new housing development can take place. Reference is made to a fully affordable residential scheme being encouraged at this site, as it accords with one of the exclusions in Part 6 of the Council's SPG on Housing Land Supply. This PDB provides guidance to prospective developers and does not seek to prescribe the type of development that should be undertaken.
		The development brief makes it uneconomic for a developer to proceed with this development.	The economic feasibility of any potential development will be dealt with as part of the development process. A financial appraisal will need to be undertaken and any economic issues should be highlighted and resolved in discussions with the Council.
	Appendix 1	The development brief should include properties on the left hand side of Denmark Road, as it would improve access and facilitate a larger scale development.	The boundary of development site is clearly marked on the inset plan. Any changes to this boundary should be negotiated as part of the development process.

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
	10	The development brief on page 10 states that “vehicular access to the site should preferably not be taken directly from the A56”. This does raise the question of where does Trafford expect vehicular access to be obtained from?	Noted. New text added on page 10: “Some vehicular access to the site may be taken directly from the A56 at existing access points, but the developer must show that this will have a neutral effect on congestion.” The Local Highway Authority will not accept an additional traffic light junction to serve the site as it is considered that this would add to congestion. Any major alterations to the public highway required to accommodate the scheme should be subject to a Section 278 agreement with the Local Highway Agency. Signage should be minimised and make maximum use of existing sign poles / lighting columns to reduce street clutter and ensure the safe and efficient use of the highway.
Jeremy Banks Guest Garsden	3	Excelsior Properties support the stated aims and objectives of the draft Planning Development Brief seeking to secure development and upgrade of the overall site in an integrated manner.	Support welcomed.
	9	Excelsior Properties are supportive of the recommendation made in the Planning Development Brief for the potential to increase the Cross Street development frontage to four storeys (subject to a suitable design solution being agreed).	Support welcomed.
		Excelsior Properties support and encourage the recommendation that the adjoining properties should be fully refurbished or redeveloped to a satisfactory design and specification standard (and the potential use of CPO powers to ensure this complimentary regeneration occurs).	Support welcomed.

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
	10	Excelsior Properties propose the idea to create a potential secondary access (potentially via the CPO of additional land at the rear of the site) via Denmark Road.	This PDB provides guidance to prospective developers and does not seek to prescribe specific access arrangements. The access arrangements will be negotiated as part of the development process.
	Appendix 1	Excelsior Properties propose the idea to use the Council owned land located off Gordon Street for additional private resident's car parking.	This PDB provides guidance to prospective developers, and the land at Gordon Avenue is outside of its remit. The definitive boundary of the development site will be negotiated as part of the development process.
	9	Excelsior Properties support the recommendation to create a high quality design and the use of high quality and sustainable materials on the site.	Support welcomed.
		Excelsior Properties are committed to promoting and delivering a high quality regeneration proposal for the site in association with the preferred development partner.	Noted.
	8	Providing privacy standards can be demonstrated, the Council should not look to discourage a 2½ or 3 storey design to properties proposed for development "at the rear" of the site.	Noted. New text added on page 8: "A development which is greater than two storeys in height will need to be accompanied by robust evidence to demonstrate that privacy standards for neighbouring properties are maintained."
	7	Consideration of the whole site for a residential use, with potentially some ancillary ground floor commercial, as suggested by Excelsior, leads to a more high quality and integrated overall design solution, rather than proposals broken up by larger commercial elements.	This PDB provides guidance to prospective developers. It does not set specific ratios for particular land uses, opting rather to acknowledge that a flexible approach to land use is required to ensure the future success of any proposed scheme on the site.
		Excelsior, in conjunction with a housebuilder partner, if not constrained by external cost restrictions, will be in a position to bring forward a high quality designed and	Noted.

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
		built out development which will lift the site, the Cross Street frontage, the immediate environs and the area as a whole on this major and strategic high profile arterial route.	
Yvonne Lawrence 19 Doveston Road	10	One point that appears to have been overlooked is the protection of the flora and fauna.	<p>Noted. The protection and enhancement of flora and fauna on and around the site is outside of the remit of this document. This issue will be dealt as part of the detailed planning application submission stage.</p> <p>The developer may be required to provide a level of tree planting on site in accordance with the SPG 'Developer Contributions to the Red Rose Forest'.</p>
	3	If it is felt that there are no TPO's attached to the houses bordering on the land mentioned above, then it is requested that the Council provides Tree Preservation Orders.	<p>Noted. There are no Tree Preservation Orders on or immediately adjacent to the development site. Upon receiving an application the Council's Tree Officer will investigate any potential impact on trees and whether the imposition of TPO's is appropriate.</p> <p>New text added on page 3:</p> <p>"There are no listed buildings or tree preservation orders within or immediately adjacent to the boundary of the development site."</p>
	6	Another issue of potential interest would be the excavation of the land bordering certain properties on Doveston Road, prior to any development commencing.	<p>Noted. New text added to list of consultation bodies on page 6:</p> <p>"Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit."</p>
	3	I would be interested to find out if the building directly to the rear of 23 Doveston Roan is a listed building.	Noted. This building is not a listed building nor is it deemed to be of particular architectural or historic interest.
Paul De Festa	4	It would seem that access to the site cannot be gained	Noted. Text on page 4 changed to say:

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
and Donna Smalley 18 Gordon Avenue		from the A56 road. The brief goes on to say that 'The preferred access arrangements will be from the side roads'. Even to my untrained eye by looking at the Site Plan it would appear that visually the most accessible route to the land is through our [Gordon] Avenue.	"The preferred access arrangements will include some access from side roads in conjunction with the introduction of road safety and parking measures, and access directly from A56." The Council wishes to strike a balance between resisting proposals which will have an adverse impact on traffic flow along the A56 and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is acknowledged that the previous draft text was not clear in its approach to the use of side roads around the brief site.
	7	I am also not sure what is meant by mixed-use?	This PDB follows the principles of striving to ensure developments are as sustainable as possible and In order to achieve these objectives all new development should seek to reduce the impact of new people/vehicle trips generated by the development. Mixed use developments allow the creation of linkages between different uses and ensure the active use of sites throughout the day, for example, such as residential, retail and offices mix of uses.
		If the site in question is to be developed for light industrial use and large vehicles would need to gain access to the site I fear that our properties would feel like they were in the middle of an industrial estate which again I would think would impact negatively not only on	The PDB does not specify the particular land use ratios, light industry may be put forward as part of a development proposal and all due consideration will be given to the likely effects on neighbouring residents.

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
		our life experiences but also on the significant investments that residents of Gordon Avenue have made in our properties.	It is acknowledged that commercial traffic flow along Gordon Avenue is not desirable. New text added on Page 5: "Commercial traffic will not be able to access the site via Gordon Avenue due to the constraints of the road width."
		I would also like to take this opportunity to ask that we as residents are kept informed of the latest developments with regards to the site.	Noted – New text added on page 6: "The Council will consult with neighbouring properties that bound the development site as part of the statutory consultation process following the submission of a planning application. Residents of Denmark Road, Dovestone Road and Gordon Avenue will also be consulted as part of this consultation process."
Mark Saleh 6 Pangbourne Avenue	6	I am happy that the council do not wish to suppress architectural innovation, and acknowledges that a flexible approach to land use is required to ensure the future success of any proposed scheme for this site first.	Support welcomed.
	6	I am also glad to see that sustainable development throughout the promotion of mixed-use development is key to the Council's development strategy as oppose to monolithic housing development.	Support welcomed.
	7	I wonder if the council has considered renovation of the terrace properties along Cross Street as the brief mentions these building are of some 'architectural interest'. I believe that these building are important	Noted. The PDB does not make reference to the terraced properties being of 'architectural interest'. This does not preclude them from being retained and renovated. In order to emphasise the Councils

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
		enough to consider renovation as oppose to demolition.	<p>commitment to sustainable development and to discourage the unnecessary demolition of structurally sound buildings, the following new text has been added to page 7:</p> <p>"In line with the principle of sustainable development, the Council would encourage prospective developers to consider, where suitable, the retention and reuse of existing properties on the site. This would reduce undue building waste and retain some of the long standing built form of the urban area providing a continuum and hence longevity to any proposal."</p>
Paul Hart 16 Gordon Avenue	2	'Mixed use development' is a pretty vague and open ended description of the potential uses of this site and your letter did mention some informal propositions but no formal plan – is it possible for this information to be released to residents?	<p>Noted. This PDB follows the principles of striving to ensure developments are as sustainable as possible and In order to achieve these objectives all new development should seek to reduce the impact of new people/vehicle trips generated by the development.</p> <p>Mixed use developments allow the creation of linkages between different uses and ensure the active use of sites throughout the day, for example, such as residential, retail and offices mix of uses.</p> <p>There is no set scheme for this site, and Council discussions with developers are confidential in order to protect their commercial interest. Neighbouring residents will be notified, however, if a formal application for the site is submitted.</p>
		Some initial queries, for example if the area is to be designated as industrial (offices/workshop) then is there	The PDB does not specify ratios for particular land uses. The onus is on the developer to consider the

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
		any consideration of the economic demand for such premises in Sale?	economic demand for a particular use on the site as part of the development process.
		My other general query at this stage is timescale to the proposed development or planning bid.	<p>As stated on page 2: "There have been several informal proposals for redevelopment at this location but no planning applications have been submitted."</p> <p>The Council continues to encourage landowners/developers to come forward with proposals. No set timescale has been identified for the delivery of any proposed development at this stage.</p>
	4	Looking at the table on page 4 and the map in Appendix 1 there is an implication that access is sought through other side roads. My concern therefore is the opening up of Gordon Avenue to allow access.	<p>Noted. Text on page 4 changed to say:</p> <p>"The preferred access arrangements will include some access from side roads in conjunction with the introduction of road safety and parking measures, and access directly from A56."</p> <p>The Council wishes to strike a balance between resisting proposals which will have an adverse impact on traffic flow along the A56 and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is acknowledged that the previous draft text was not clear in its approach to the use of side roads around the brief site.</p>
	3	Crucial to the bid and any approved proposal, as stated on page 3 is "respects and makes a positive contribution to the wider locality ". I can't honestly see how providing access through Gordon Avenue will do that to the local environment and local residents.	<p>Noted. Text on page 4 changed to say:</p> <p>"The preferred access arrangements will include some access from side roads in conjunction with the introduction of road safety and parking measures, and access directly from A56."</p>

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
			<p>The Council wishes to strike a balance between resisting proposals which will have an adverse impact on traffic flow along the A56 and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is acknowledged that the previous draft text was not clear in its approach to the use of side roads around the brief site.</p> <p>The development site is currently derelict and dilapidated and prone to fly-tipping, hence the redevelopment of the site by its nature will make a positive contribution to the wider locality.</p>
		Opening access to, for example, offices or workshops at the end of the road would I believe damage property prices.	<p>The PDB does not specify the particular land use ratios, offices/workshops may be put forward as part of a development proposal and all due consideration will be given to the likely effects on neighbouring residents.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that commercial traffic flow along Gordon Avenue is not desirable. New text added on Page 5:</p> <p>“Commercial traffic will not be able to access the site via Gordon Avenue due to the constraints of the road width.”</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site and the removal of derelict properties are likely to have a positive effect on the wider area and property prices.</p>
		The development and again the opening up of Gordon	Noted. The PDB provides guidance to prospective

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
		Avenue would only increase parking issues for local residents.	<p>developers. It does not specifically refer to Gordon Avenue being made into a thoroughfare. However, the Council does acknowledge that proposals may include the use of Gordon Avenue to provide some access to the site.</p> <p>Text on page 4 changed to say:</p> <p>"The preferred access arrangements will include some access from side roads in conjunction with the introduction of road safety and parking measures, and access directly from A56."</p> <p>The Council wishes to strike a balance between resisting proposals which will have an adverse impact on traffic flow along the A56 and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is acknowledged that the previous draft text was not clear in its approach to the use of side roads around the brief site.</p>
		Clearly offices or workshop development would have an impact environmentally – for example natural lighting levels and also the potential for pollution as referred to in your document in terms of disturbing the current site.	<p>Each development proposal will be considered on its individual merits and any potential environmental consequences will be regulated and dealt with as part of the development process.</p> <p>The impact on neighbouring properties will be kept to a minimum, and within the limits prescribed by environmental legislation.</p>
		General access concerns	This PDB provides guidance to prospective developers and does not seek to prescribe specific

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
			access arrangements. The access arrangements will be negotiated as part of the development process. The PDB tries to minimise traffic generation and prevent any bottleneck of traffic.
		Could the current set of lights, located outside 'Garveys' not be shifted down?	<p>As stated on page 10:</p> <p>"The Local Highway Authority will not accept an additional traffic light junction to serve the site as it is considered that this would add to congestion...Any major alterations to the public highway required to accommodate the scheme should be subject to a Section 278 agreement with the Local Highway Agency."</p> <p>The PDB provides guidance to prospective developers. Any potential movement of traffic signals will need to be negotiated with the Local Highways Authority as part of the development process.</p>
Mr & Mrs Doris 2 Gordon Avenue		We are very pleased about the proposal of improving the look of Cross Street and surrounding areas.	Support welcomed.
		However, we are not pleased about the proposal of making Gordon Avenue into a thoroughfare; the parking is a problem now as the businesses on the opposite side of the road use Gordon Avenue as a car park during the day...	<p>Noted. The PDB provides guidance to prospective developers. It does not specifically refer to Gordon Avenue being made into a thoroughfare. However, the Council does acknowledge that proposals may include the use of Gordon Avenue to provide some access to the site.</p> <p>Text on page 4 changed to say:</p>

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
			<p>"The preferred access arrangements will include some access from side roads in conjunction with the introduction of road safety and parking measures, and access directly from A56."</p> <p>The Council wishes to strike a balance between resisting proposals which will have an adverse impact on traffic flow along the A56 and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is acknowledged that the previous draft text was not clear in its approach to the use of side roads around the brief site.</p>
Mr & Mrs Pollitt 14 Gorton Avenue		It will be good for the front of Cross Street.	Support Welcomed.
		But what does concern us is the plot of land that is adjacent to Gordon Avenue. We feel if there is some redevelopment there, would that mean opening up the Avenue for access [?] That would not be favourable, as we have a problem on Glebelands Road with heavy goods delivering wood to Howard Timber, anytime from 7:30am waiting to be unloaded.	<p>This PDB provides guidance to prospective developers, and the land at Gordon Avenue is outside of its remit. The definitive boundary of the development site will be negotiated as part of the development process.</p> <p>The PDB does not specifically refer to Gordon Avenue being made into a thoroughfare. However, the Council does acknowledge that proposals may include the use of Gordon Avenue to provide some access to the site.</p> <p>Text on page 4 changed to say:</p>

Consultee	Page No.	Comments	TMBC Response
			<p>"The preferred access arrangements will include some access from side roads in conjunction with the introduction of road safety and parking measures, and access directly from A56."</p> <p>The Council wishes to strike a balance between resisting proposals which will have an adverse impact on traffic flow along the A56 and protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is acknowledged that the previous draft text was not clear in its approach to the use of side roads around the brief site.</p>