

## **Trafford Council response to WSP's letter for Accrue of 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022.**

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to make any further concluding comments in response to WSP's letter for Accrue of 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022. By way of preliminary observation, most of WSP's comments have already been addressed in writing or orally and we do not repeat our responses to them. It is notable that there is no response on the viability note presented by the Council by WSP or Derwent and that Derwent have not taken the opportunity to provide any further comments.

### Balconies

The Council considers that it is sound for planning policy to have an expectation that all units will have private amenity space (normally in the form of balconies). The logic and case for such provision (in response to the last minute new point raised by WSP) was addressed orally by the Council.

It is of course accepted that provision of private roof space is difficult – hence the expectation that most units will have a private balcony or winter garden.

The viability implications of balconies have been addressed. The Council's costs base includes provision of balconies; but its unit price assessment does not include the uplift in value from balconies

### Overly long frontages and appropriate spacing

The text requires judgements to be reached on these matters. What is overly long frontages and appropriate spacing will be heavily context dependent. The use of the words are necessary to ensure that these issues are positively addressed.

### Daylight and Design Code

The change to "suitable" is accepted.

### Flexibility versus Certainty

WSP assume that an acceptable and viable residential led scheme will come forward on this site. That is the Council's hope and expectation too. But in the event that it does not, a predominantly leisure use of the site would be acceptable on the site and the policy should make this clear. The text already states "and/or sport leisure".

### Implementation and windfall

No further comment – the Council explained how conservative its windfall allowance was at the hearings.

### Building heights

The Council has explained in detail why 6 storey is the appropriate maximum on the B&Q site based on the iterative work of the consultant team. The context (2 storey residential and maximum 6 storey stadium) amply justifies the 6 storey limit.

### Housing

No further comment is required.