



TRAFFORD
COUNCIL

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO MAIN
MATTERS, ISSUES AND
QUESTIONS**

MAIN MATTER 3

TOPIC PAPER

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| MAIN MATTER 3.1 | 2 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.2 | 2 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.3 | 3 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.4 | 3 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.5 | 4 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.6 | 5 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.7 | 6 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.8 | 6 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.9 | 6 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.10 | 7 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.11 | 7 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.12 | 7 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.13 | 8 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.14 | 8 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.15 | 8 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.16 | 9 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.17 | 9 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.18 | 9 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.19 | 10 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.20 | 10 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.21 | 11 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.22 | 11 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.23 | 12 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.24 | 12 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.25 | 13 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.26 | 13 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.27 | 14 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.28 | 15 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.29 | 15 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.30 | 16 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.31 | 16 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.32 | 16 |
| MAIN MATTER 3.33 | 17 |
| APPENDICES..... | 18 |
| APPENDIX 3.8A - AGREED STATEMENT TRAFFORD & THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY..... | 19 |
| APPENDIX 3.8B - AGREED STATEMENT BETWEEN TRAFFORD & THE GMPTE | 22 |
| APPENDIX 3.10 - AGREED STATEMENT BETWEEN TRAFFORD & UNITED UTILITIES | 24 |

MAIN MATTER 3.1

What is the evidence to justify the selection of the five Strategic Locations (SLs)? Which others were considered and consulted upon and what are the main reasons why those alternatives were rejected?

Council's Response

- 3.1.1 The full details of the selection process for Strategic Locations and Strategic Sites are set out in CD6.3.25. In summary, a 'long list' of potential sites and locations was developed through the Issues and Options stage and in consultation with key stakeholders which formed part of the Core Strategy Preferred Option (June 2009) (CD6.3.9). This 'long list' of 5 Strategic Sites and 13 Strategic Locations was then assessed against criteria based on guidance in PPS12 (CD 2.1.15), advice from PINS (CD2.4.1, CD2.4.2 and CD12.24) and in the light of consultation responses.
- 3.1.2 Through this assessment, the number of Strategic Locations was reduced to a 'shortlist' of 5 and it was considered that no Strategic Site allocations could be justified in the Core Strategy. However, the growth identified in the original 'long list' of sites and locations has been incorporated into the Core Strategy. The main reasons for removing a site or location were that it was not considered significant enough in scale or nature to the CS as a whole and/or that there was not enough detail about delivery of the proposals. It is considered that there is sufficient information and certainty to include the locations within the Core Strategy – establishing the principle of development, but with the detail left for progression through a document such as the Land Allocations DPD.
- 3.1.3 Suggested change 200.06, in CD 12.4 clarifies the status of the Technical Note on Strategic Locations.

Suggested Change 200.06

....More details of the process of selecting the 5 proposed Strategic Locations is set out in the ~~accompanying~~ Technical Note [on Strategic Locations and Sites Selection \(March 2010\)](#).

MAIN MATTER 3.2

To what extent does each of the SLs satisfy the requirements of paragraph 8.4 of the Core Strategy?

Council's Response

- 3.2.1 A full assessment of each of the 5 proposed Strategic Locations against the criteria in paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 of the CS is set out in

CD6.3.25. Full details of the evidence to support the identification of each Strategic Location are set out in CD12.12. It is considered that each of the 5 identified Strategic Locations meet the criteria in paragraphs 8.4 and 8.5 and to establish the principle of development for delivery through the Land Allocations DPD.

MAIN MATTER 3.3

What is the evidence that supports the detailed proposals for each of the SLs? Are they justified, effective and achievable?

Council's Response

3.3.1 CD12.12 sets out the 'what' 'why' 'who' 'how' and 'when' for each Strategic Location which together provides the justification for the proposals and a strategy for their delivery. CD8.8.25 provides an independent assessment of how housing growth can be delivered in Trafford with an emphasis on the input of development of the Strategic Locations. In response to Factual Matter 1, CD12.3 refers to a comprehensive list of evidence documents which support the inclusion of each of the Strategic Locations individually and in general. Delivery statements to support the identification of some strategic locations have been submitted by the site promoter. Together, these documents form a robust and up-to-date evidence base that shows that proposals in each of the Strategic Locations are achievable, flexible and can be monitored.

MAIN MATTER 3.4

Has the Council identified the correct SLs and quantum/phasing of development within them with specific reference to; the quantum of development at Pomona and Carrington, and the omission of land south of Partington, land south of Carrington, land at Ashton-upon-Mersey, land between Altrincham and Timperley, and land at Davenport Green?

Council's Response

3.4.1 The justification for the identification of the Strategic Locations (and why certain sites were not identified) is provided primarily in CD6.3.25 but is also informed by the various stages of Sustainability Appraisal (particularly CD6.3.3, CD6.3.12 and CD6.3.23).

3.4.2 Further refinement of the locations and their quantum/phasing is based on a wide range of evidence although particular reference is made to the following: Background Note on the Strategic Locations (CD12.12), the SHLAA and its updates (CD 8.8.5 / CD8.8.6 / CD8.2.24), the Employment Land Review and its update (CD8.3.3 / CD8.3.5), the

Manchester Salford Trafford Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (CD8.4.4), the Other Main Town Centre Uses Study (CD8.1.3), the PPS4 B1 Office Assessment (CD8.3.6).

- 3.4.3 The proposals for the release of land detailed in Table L1 are that at least 80% of housing provision is on Brownfield land. The development of existing Brownfield sites on accessible sites is the most sustainable way of meeting local housing need, without the release of green-field land or sites within the Green Belt. This is consistent with national guidance (CD2.1.3 and CD2.1.4) and Policy L4 of RSS (CD3.1.1).
- 3.4.4 Further details of the justification for the omission of land south of Partington and land south of Carrington are provided in the response to MM5.8.
- 3.4.5 Further details of the omission of land at Ashton-on-Mersey are provided in the response to MM5.7. This response is also applicable to the consideration of land between Altrincham and Timperley.
- 3.4.6 Further details of the justification for the omission of land at Davenport Green are provided in the responses to MM4.7 and MM5.1.

MAIN MATTER 3.5

Are the quanta of development of the various types specified in SL policies indicative, maxima or minima? Clarification is required for interpretation and effective implementation.

Council's Response

- 3.5.1 The policy for each Strategic Location sets out what the Council considers can be delivered in each location, over the life time of the Plan. This is based on information submitted by the location promoter (CD10.4.11 & CD12.22) and from work undertaken in CD8.2.2, CD8.2.4 and CD8.8.25, in particular.
- 3.5.2 As such, it is an indicative target for residential, employment, etc. development that is based on a realistic assessment of the potential yield of the location in order to meet the CS Vision and Objectives. The actual target for each Strategic Location will be set out in the Land Allocations Plan DPD or Carrington Area Action Plan DPD.
- 3.5.3 To make the CS position clearer, it is suggested that a paragraph is added after paragraph 8.7. This is detailed in Suggested Change 200.07 in CD12.4.

Suggested Change 200.07

[The policy for each Strategic Location sets out an indicative figure that can be delivered in each location over the plan period.](#)

MAIN MATTER 3.6

What is the evidence that supports the detailed infrastructure requirements and priorities for each of the SLs? Are they justified, effective and achievable? Has a detailed viability appraisal been carried out for each of the SLs?

Council's Response

- 3.6.1 The Background Note on the Strategic Locations (CD12.12) gives an overview of the infrastructure requirements for each SL.
- 3.6.2 The Local Infrastructure Plan (CD6.2.15) has been prepared in consultation with key utility/service providers and developers to ensure their commitment to its delivery, and that the appropriate provision of infrastructure has been identified to support development and phased and prioritised accordingly. Appendix 5.6 of the Council's response to the Inspector's Preliminary Questions (CD12.3) provides the most up to date position in terms of funding for infrastructure proposals.
- 3.6.3 The LIP is a "Living" document and will continue to be updated as new information becomes available. Specifically in relation to SL4 and SL5, a significant amount of information has been provided by developers to support their proposals. This includes the Trafford Quays Delivery Report (CD10.4.11) and the Carrington Delivery Statement (CD12.22).
- 3.6.4 The Phase 1 LDF Modelling work (CD8.6.3) identifies 5 concerns to be addressed in Trafford. The Council continues to work with the Highways Agency and GMPTE to identify the transport requirements and this will form part of the evidence to inform the Land Allocations DPD.
- 3.6.5 At this stage a detailed site specific viability appraisal has not been carried out. However, paragraph 8.20 of the Core Strategy Publication document (CD6.2.1) does acknowledge the issue of viability, and that negotiation may need to take place to identify what infrastructure is critical to the delivery of developments and to meeting the overall vision and objectives of the plan, without compromising future developments. Policy L8 sets out the process that will be followed should site specific issues of viability arise (paragraphs 17.7 and 17.8).
- 3.6.6 This issue will be dealt with in more detail through the Land Allocations DPD and the Planning Obligations SPD.

MAIN MATTER 3.7

Given that the full cost of remediation works and infrastructure are not fully known for each Strategic Location, will the identified SLs be deliverable and will they ensure the timely provision and implementation of the economic and housing requirements for the Borough, and the implementation of the objectives and vision of the Core Strategy, particularly in relation to the wider strategic priorities of the City Region?

Council's Response

3.7.1 The Strategic Locations are broad areas for change and are considered to be large and varied enough to provide sufficient flexibility to meet the overall objectives if individual sites or areas prove costlier in terms of remediation or infrastructure than initially anticipated. The known constraints for each Location have been identified in CD12.12 along with an indication as to how these constraints can be overcome. More detailed information regarding infrastructure will be provided during the development of the Land Allocations DPD.

MAIN MATTER 3.8

Are the timescales for the delivery of required infrastructure, particularly for highways, realistic? What is the evidence?

Council's Response

3.8.1 L4.1 (e) has been amended in reference to MM8.13 to provide clarity in terms of transport schemes, and what is required for each phase of development.

3.8.2 Phase 1 of the LDF Transport Modelling work (CD 8.6.3) identified a number of concerns in Trafford, which will be addressed through Phases 2a (CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.4) and 2b of this work. The Council will work with the Highways Agency and GMPTE to identify in more detail what transport schemes are required to support development and this will be used to inform the Land Allocations DPD.

3.8.3 The Council has signed up to the GM Protocol (CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.5) for co-operative working with the Highways Agency, and the Agreed Statements with the HA (Appendix 3.8a) and GMPTE (Appendix 3.8b) further state the commitment to joint working in relation to identifying and delivering the necessary highways infrastructure / public transport schemes to support the Plan.

MAIN MATTER 3.9

What is the evidence that demonstrates that the major stakeholders are committed to the delivery of the SLs, including the identified infrastructure requirements?

Council's Response

3.9.1 See response to MM3.6.

MAIN MATTER 3.10

With reference to evidence, to what extent are the strategies of utility providers aligned to the Core Strategy delivery strategy?

Council's Response

3.10.1 The Agreed Statements with the HA (Appendix 3.8a), GMPTE (Appendix 3.8b) and United Utilities (Appendix 3.10) set out the commitment of the Council and these key service providers to working together to ensure our strategies are aligned going forward.

3.10.2 The LIP (CD 6.2.15) has been prepared in consultation with key utility/service providers and developers to ensure their commitment to its delivery, and that the appropriate provision of infrastructure has been identified to support development and phased and prioritised accordingly.

MAIN MATTER 3.11

In the event that key elements of proposals for the SLs are not delivered, apart from a review of the Core Strategy, which is not considered to be a robust fall back position, what are the contingency arrangements for managing under-performance of these critical elements of the Core Strategy delivery?

Council's Response

3.11.1 The issue of contingency and flexibility in terms of the delivery of the proposals on the Strategic Locations in particular is dealt with CD12.3 in response to Factual Matter 7.

SL1 Pomona Island

MAIN MATTER 3.12

Is the approach of policy SL1 towards residential development at the Pomona Island SL overly cautious?

Council's Response

3.12.1 It is considered that the Policy follows a suitably precautionary approach to development in this Strategic Location given the information available on flood risk at the time of its preparation. Section 5 (I) of CD6.3.23 deals specifically with the challenges presented in locating more vulnerable uses such as housing at Pomona Island (SL1). Further evidence is provided in CD8.4.4 and CD12.4.

MAIN MATTER 3.13

What does the last clause of SL1.3 mean? Greater clarity is required.

Council's Response

3.13.1 The extant planning permission for 546 residential units is based on a highly modern built form of 5 individual point blocks up to 10-15 storeys high. The purpose of this clause is to ensure that if this development is not built out, any future development – be it residential or employment - fits the high-rise precedence set by the residential permission to fit with its Regional Centre location.

MAIN MATTER 3.14

Has a robust accessibility analysis of the site been carried out and has information on trip generation and distribution been provided, as requested by the Highways Agency to demonstrate the impact of the SL1 proposals on the strategic road network?

Council's Response

3.14.1 Phase 1 of the LDF Transport Modelling work (*CD8.6.3*) identified 5 concerns to be addressed in Trafford. The Council is working with the Highways Agency and GMPTE through Phase 2a (*CD12.3 – Appendix 5.4*) and 2b to refine the transport requirements to address these concerns and this will form part of the evidence to inform the Land Allocations DPD.

3.14.2 The Agreed Statement with the HA (Appendix3.8a) sets out how the Council will work with the Agency to deal with issues of accessibility and future transport provision to support SL1 and other Strategic Locations (Also see response to MM3.10).

MAIN MATTER 3.15

Has the required funding for the Bridgewater Way Scheme identified in the implementation table been secured? If not what are the implications for delivery and what will be the contingency arrangements if the funding is not forthcoming?

Council's Response

3.15.1 Appendix 5.6 of the Council's response to the Inspector's Preliminary Questions (*CD12.3*) provides the most up to date position in relation to infrastructure proposals. The costs and secured funding streams for the Bridgewater Way Scheme have been identified where known. Phase 1 is now complete and Phases 2 and 3 of the scheme are already on site with expected completion dates between December 2010 and March 2011. Phase 5 is also expected to start on site in 2011, with Phases 4 and 6 to follow. The Local Infrastructure Plan (*CD6.2.15*) September 2010, is a "Living" document that will continue to be updated as new information becomes available. In accordance with Appendix 5.6 (*CD12.3*) only Phase 6 of the scheme (Marsland Road to Broadheath) does not have any secured funding sources at present.

3.15.2 Although the Bridgewater Way Scheme will provide sustainable transport links to support development and will provide links to schools it is not considered that this will be a show stopper should funding not be forthcoming for the outstanding phase.

MAIN MATTER 3.16

Should reference be made in the implementation table to the provision of a heavy goods rail station at White City?

Council's Response

3.16.1 The Council considers that the heavy rail station is no longer a required element of infrastructure for the Strategic Locations of Pomona, Wharfside or LCCC Quarter.

3.16.2 The need for future heavy rail provision will be considered as part of Phases 2a and 2b LDF Transport Modelling work.

SL2 Trafford Wharfside

MAIN MATTER 3.17

Has the required funding for the Bridgewater Way Scheme identified in the implementation table been secured? If not what are the implications for delivery and what will be the contingency arrangements if the funding is not forthcoming?

Council's Response

3.17.1 See above response to 3.15 above

MAIN MATTER 3.18

There appear to be significant remediation and infrastructure costs associated with the delivery of development proposals at Trafford Wharfside. What evidence provides confidence that their delivery is feasible and viable?

Council's Response

3.18.1 This Strategic Location is considered to be large and varied enough to provide sufficient flexibility to meet the overall objectives if individual sites or areas prove costlier in terms of remediation or infrastructure than initially anticipated. This area was extensively remediated during the 1980s and 1990s by the Trafford Park Development Corporation, regenerating the land from its former dockland and industrial usage to meet modern employment requirements. The known constraints for each Location have been identified in CD12.12 along with an indication as to how these constraints can be overcome.

3.18.2 Appendix 5.6 of the Council's response to the Inspector's Preliminary Questions (CD12.3) provides the most up to date position in relation to

infrastructure proposals. £10m of the £27m known costs have already been delivered (Mediacity bridge). The Local Infrastructure Plan (CD6.2.15) September 2010, is a “Living” document that will continue to be updated as new information becomes available.

3.18.3 Paragraph 8.20 of the Core Strategy Publication document (CD6.2.1) does acknowledge the issue of viability, and that negotiation may need to take place to identify what infrastructure is critical to the delivery of developments and to meeting the overall vision and objectives of the plan, without compromising future developments.

3.18.4 This issue will be dealt with in more detail through the Land Allocations DPD and the draft Planning Obligations SPD.

SL3 Lancashire County Cricket Club Quarter

MAIN MATTER 3.19

Should the first bullet point to SL3.4 be amended by adding, ‘and will not adversely affect the vitality and viability of nearby centres at Stretford, Chorlton and Hulme’.

Council’s Response

3.19.1 As the Strategic Location is 'out-of-centre' further significant retail development would be subject to the PPS4 test of impact as stated in paragraph W2.12. It is considered unnecessary to repeat national policy in Policy W2.

MAIN MATTER 3.20

Is there a proven need for the strategic processional route referred to in the third bullet point of SL3.4? Instead, should this requirement be replaced by prioritising the completion of a pedestrian route between the Cricket Ground and the new superstore, adjacent to Trafford Town Hall?

Council’s Response

3.20.1 The proposed strategic processional route will help further enhance the visitor experience to this renowned location matching its status as a sporting destination of national and international significance. This will have significant economic benefits in terms of tourism and sustainability benefits in terms of providing a more attractive link to existing and proposed public transport infrastructure. The proposal is also an important link to other strategic areas such as Irwell River Park and Mediacity:UK.

3.20.2 The strategic issue is therefore to create a direct link from Old Trafford Metrolink station, past the Lancashire County Cricket Club, to Manchester United Football Club and beyond. The pedestrian route that will form part of the approved Tesco proposal, whilst improving

permeability in the area, will not provide the direct link which will meet the strategic objectives of the Processional Route. Further guidance relating to the Strategic Processional Route is contained within CD8.2.4 and CD8.2.6.

SL4 Trafford Centre Rectangle

MAIN MATTER 3.21

Clarification is required if the 15 hectares of employment land referred to in the second bullet point of SL4.2 is new employment land. If not, what gives the Council confidence that recycled employment land in this location will be sufficiently attractive to high quality B1 developers and is viable, taking into account also the required significant amount of required infrastructure?

Council's Response

3.21.1 The issue is dealt with in CD12.3 in response to Factual Matter 3 which sets out which 'new' employment land forms part of the potential supply (effectively the 23.2ha mixed use Trafford Quays site).

3.21.2 Trafford is a relatively small but intensively populated and used Borough with significant constraints in terms of the availability of new land for development. The tightly-drawn green belt in the southern and middle parts of the Borough, the extensive but well-used industrial area across the northern part and the presence of large areas of established (largely private) housing areas elsewhere mean that opportunities for new land to be brought forward for development (particularly employment development) are relatively limited. The potential for recycling existing employment land is, however, very significant and, moreover, is a sustainable approach.

3.21.3 The established Venus Buildings is a BCO Grade A office development, planning permission for c28,000sqm of BCO Grade A office space already exists within this location (H/OUT/70189) and 2 other major BCO Grade A office applications are currently being considered (74815/O/2010 & 75930/FULL/2010) proving the attractiveness of the Location as a high quality office destination.

MAIN MATTER 3.22

Does the fourth bullet point of SL4.4 and paragraph 8.66 properly reflect the tests of PPS25? Should paragraph 8.66 be amended to refer to a Flood Risk Assessment carried out at the Land Allocations DPD stage?

Council's Response

3.22.1 In formulating the policy, the Council has been informed by a Sequential Testing and Exception Testing of proposed uses within this Strategic Location (CD6.3.23 and CD6.3.24). The first sentence of the

bullet point properly reflects part (c) of the PPS25 Exception Test. The remainder of the bullet point is based on the rationale set out in the Urban Vision Sustainability Appraisal Report and the PPS25 Flood Risk Exception Test document section 5 (III) (CD: 6.3.23), which in turn was informed by the SFRA (CD: 8.4.4). These documents follow, in line with PPS25 (CD: 2.1.23), a sequential approach within the Strategic Locations such that higher vulnerability uses are recommended to be located in areas at lower probability of flooding. This approach has been followed in each of the other Strategic Locations, though in the case of SL2 (Trafford Wharfside) it appears in a separate paragraph (SL2.6). In the interests of consistency, the Council proposes to relocate that paragraph to the end of the fifth bullet point in SL2.4 and re-number the subsequent paragraphs accordingly. This Suggested Change is detailed as SC200.08 and SC200.09 in CD12.4.

3.22.2 As regards paragraph 8.66, Flood Risk Assessments are usually carried out at the planning application stage rather than DPD stage. Therefore, the Council does not consider further amendment to this paragraph to be appropriate.

Suggested Change 200.08

A Flood Risk Assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and that it will where possible reduce flood risk overall. Uses classified in PPS25 as being More Vulnerable to flooding such as residential, certain leisure uses, healthcare and educational facilities must be located outside Flood Zone 3.

Suggested Change 200.09

[Delete and re-number subsequent paragraphs accordingly.]

MAIN MATTER 3.23

For clarity and flexibility should the fourth bullet point of SL4.5 refer to 'routing' through...?

Council's Response

3.23.1 The following Suggested Change is suggested SC200.11 in CD12.4.

Suggested Change 200.11

The ~~re~~-routing, through the site, of local public transport provision;

MAIN MATTER 3.24

What is the evidence to justify the mitigation requirements to the M60? If necessary funding streams are not deliverable, what will be the impact on development delivery?

Council's Response

3.24.1 Phase 1 of the LDF Transport Modelling work (*CD 8.6.3*) identified a number of concerns in Trafford including the growth in traffic and increase in journey time along the M60. Phases 2a (*CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.4*) and 2b of this work will look at this in more detail and be used to inform the Land Allocations DPD.

3.24.2 The planning applications for WGIS, Port Salford and Phase 1a and 1b of the Trafford Quays development all include separate transport assessments. However, the cumulative impact of these sites and development proposals will be tested through Phase 2b of the LDF Transport Modelling work and be used to inform the preparation of the Land Allocations DPD.

3.24.3 Following the Comprehensive Spending Review, funding has been approved (subject to statutory procedures) for the Managed Motorway Schemes (MMS) on the M60 as set out in the LIP (*CD 6.2.15*).

3.24.4 The Council is committed to working with the Highways Agency to identify the necessary mitigation measures/requirements to the M60, as set out in the GM Protocol (*CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.5*) and the Agreed Statement (Appendix 3.8a).

MAIN MATTER 3.25

Should the supporting text to policy SL4 refer to a specific requirement for residential development at this location to provide some 'aspirational' housing?

Council's Response

3.25.1 SL4 as drafted makes it clear that Trafford Quays will be important in providing housing that meets the Borough's housing needs and that it embraces the principles of sustainability. The suggested wording would not add anything to the policy and may be misleading as 'aspirational' is not defined.

SL5 Carrington**MAIN MATTER 3.26**

Does policy SL5 meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations Assessment having regard to the Manchester Mosses SAC? Does it take the correct precautionary approach? What gives the Council confidence that appropriate mitigation for the SAC can be provided? What are the contingency plans for delivery of the Core Strategy if appropriate mitigation for the SAC cannot be provided?

Council's Response

- 3.26.1 It is considered the Policy meets the requirements. The conclusion of the HRA stated that; "Providing that the mitigating plans, policies and strategies are adopted and implemented appropriately through the development management process, it is considered that there will be sufficient safeguards in place to avoid significant harm ..." (CD 6.2.4 Table 8.1, page 20). However as a result of the comments from Natural England to the Publication version of the Plan additional text was added as a precautionary approach in Suggested Change for Submission 13 (SC13) (CD 6.1.2) to the potential need for further HRA in terms of more specific development proposals.
- 3.26.2 It is not possible at this stage to undertake more detailed HRA as more specific plans have not been produced. The justification for Policy SL5 Carrington has also been altered to make it clear that the Carrington Area Action Plan will be subject to a separate HRA assessment prior to its adoption (CD 6.1.2 SC14). The Council is confident that mitigation measures arising out of a further, more detailed HRA would be capable of resolution through the production of the Carrington AAP DPD.

MAIN MATTER 3.27

It appears that the Carrington SL is the least accessible and is subject to greater/more numerous constraints than the other SLs, including HRA, remediation and infrastructure requirements, together with multiple ownerships. What gives the Council certainty that the required development for this SL is deliverable within the specified phasing?

Council's Response

- 3.27.1 The Delivery Statement submitted by Shell (CD12.22) and Development Prospectus supplied by Shell International Ltd. (Representation 1026), detail the opportunity presented by the development opportunity at Carrington, together the identification of some of the key constraints. The prospectus identifies the need for a further masterplan to be produced to provide the detailed framework for the delivery of this large scale mixed use development at Carrington. This view is supported by Policy SL5, as Carrington is identified as a location which will be supported by an Area Action Plan, based on future detailed master plan work. The Delivery Statement (CD 12.22 pages 4 to 10 and pages 13 to 24) provides a breakdown of the development proposal including housing mix, phasing, existing tenancies, relocation of infrastructure, community infrastructure, public transport and the opportunities for place making for a new community.
- 3.27.2 Most of the land is owned by Shell, with some in their ownership since 1948. They have intimate knowledge of the uses on the land and a desktop survey of contamination has been conducted (CD 12.22 pages 25 to 30).

3.27.3 The critical mass of development proposed gives confidence that infrastructure delivery and remediation issues will be overcome to create a new community. Further details can be found in the documents as detailed above.

3.27.4 Transport requirements will be considered as part of Phase 2a (CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.4) and 2b of the LDF Transport Modelling work and will inform the preparation of the Carrington Area Action Plan.

MAIN MATTER 3.28

Taking account of the poor accessibility of this area, should the transportation requirements of SL5.4 also include requirements for improvements to sustainable transport infrastructure to be provided, in line with development delivery?

Council's Response

3.28.1 Within Policy SL5, under the Strategic Proposal SL5.2, the 4th bullet point details the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements.

3.28.2 Transport requirements will be considered as part of Phase 2a (CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.4) and 2b of the LDF Transport Modelling work and will inform the preparation of the Carrington Area Action Plan.

3.28.3 It is proposed to redraft the 2nd bullet point under SL5.4 Development Requirements to include a reference to improvements to public transport. This change is detailed as Suggested Change 200.12 in CD12.4.

Suggested Change 200.12

Contributions towards scheme(s) to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by the development on the Strategic, Primary and Local Road Networks – [these include public transport and highway infrastructure schemes](#);

MAIN MATTER 3.29

What is the evidence to justify the requirement of SL5.4 regarding the Manchester Ship Canal?

Council's Response

3.29.1 This policy position continues the policy first established by the Trafford UDP Policy T15 and is supported by Core Strategy Policy L4. Paragraph 4.10 clearly indicates the Council's intention to safeguard and promote the Manchester Ship Canal for the movement of goods.

3.29.2 The retention of the Manchester Ship Canal as a sustainable transport route is supported by the Manchester Ship Canal Company, a statutory undertaker, Port Authority and Navigation Authority (PU-1045-336).

MAIN MATTER 3.30

Should the last bullet point of SL5.4 be amended so that its requirements are applicable to all heritage assets and their settings within the SL, not only the Listed Church of St George?

Council's Response

3.30.1 The identification of a specific Listed Building within Carrington stems from when Carrington was identified as a Strategic Site and a boundary was published. Carrington is now a Strategic Location and the policy wording is proposed to be redrafted as suggested by representation PU-1051-191. This is detailed in Suggested Change 200.13 in CD12.4.

3.30.2 It is considered that Policy R1 provides an appropriate framework to protect all 'other' heritage assets.

Suggested Change 200.13

*To protect, enhance and preserve, **heritage assets and their wider settings, including the Listed Church of St George and its setting.***

MAIN MATTER 3.31

Should reference to NWDA as a funding agency for highways improvements be removed from the SL5 implementation table?

Council's Response

3.31.1 This reference has been removed following comment from the NWDA during the consultation on the Publication document CD 6.1.2 (Suggested Change to SL5). Refer to page 26 of the Proposed Minor Changes Document (CD: 6.1.2).

MAIN MATTER 3.32

How is the infrastructure requirement for the Clippers Quay Bridge justified? Is its priority 2 correct, or would a priority 3 be more appropriate?

Council's Response

3.32.1 We have assumed that this is listed under Carrington in error and refers to the Wharfside Strategic Location instead (SL2).

3.32.2 The direct link across Manchester Ship Canal at Clippers Quay will ensure all of the Quays' existing assets are effectively and economically linked together, as well as securing a route through to the Regional Centre. It will connect new development and residential opportunities across the area, and stimulate new development, both by accelerating current proposals and further increasing the attractiveness of the Quays as a place to invest. However, it is considered that the

priority should be 3 and not 2, as it is not needed to ensure sustainability of growth, but it would assist in ensuring the sustainability of planned growth. This is detailed as Suggested Change 200.10 in CD12.4.

Suggested Change 200.10

Project

Direct Link Across Manchester Ship Canal at Clippers Quay

Status

Priority ~~2~~ 3

MAIN MATTER 3.33

Should policy SL5 also seek to safeguard the disused rail track from Timperley to Glazebrook via Carrington?

Council's Response

3.33.1 CS Policy L4.9 states that the safeguarding of transport routes will be identified and included within the Land Allocations Plan. As an Area Action Plan is proposed for Carrington it is deemed appropriate for the AAP to consider this issue.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 3.8A - AGREED STATEMENT TRAFFORD & THE HIGHWAYS AGENCY

Agree Statement Between

Trafford Council and the Highways Agency

Regarding

Trafford Council's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by Trafford Council (the Council) and the Highways Agency (the Agency) to reflect the current position agreed by all parties in respect of:
- a. The Concordat/Protocol agreed for co-operative working between the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) and the Agency;
 - b. The remaining transport issues the Agency has with regard to the impact the proposals within the Publication Core Strategy will have upon the Strategic Road Network (SRN), both cumulatively and individually; and
 - c. The process and work to be undertaken, to inform the preparation of the Land Allocations DPD of the Local Development Framework (LDF), to resolve the issues raised.
- 1.2 It explains the co-operative work undertaken to date, outlines the area of agreement as well as those areas which remain outstanding and sets out a complete work programme to address those outstanding areas to be dealt with in a defined period.

2. Background

- 2.1 The SRN within the local Authority area comprises the M60 between junctions 5 and 11. The Agency through its framework Agreement with the Department for Transport (DfT), operates, maintains and improves the SRN on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The Council, as part of its duty to produce the LDF for the Borough, have consulted with the Agency regarding the impacts the proposed Core Strategy would have upon the safe and reliable operation of the SRN.
- 2.2 The SRN, by definition has roads passing through numerous areas to perform its more strategic function and is thus sensitive to the cumulative and individual impact of developments that occur, not just within an individual Borough, but also cross boundary. For this reason the Agency sought and agreed a Greater Manchester conurbation wide protocol with the Greater Manchester Planning Officers Group (GMPOG), 'The GM Protocol' (CD: 12.3 – Appendix 5.5) that sets out the approach to understanding and sustainably resolving transport issues that result from the Greater Manchester set of Core Strategies. This was brokered by Government Office for the North West. The Council, through its representation on GMPOG, was party to the discussion.

- 2.3 In order to satisfy the GM protocol commitment to understand the impacts the Core Strategies would have upon the transport networks within GM, the Agency and GMPOG as well as the GM Joint Transport Team (GMJTT) undertook a modelling exercise (*CD: 8.6.3*). From this modelling exercise, five key specific issues emerged for the Agency in the Trafford area. These are;
1. Growth in traffic and increase in journey times between Junction 5 and 11 of the M60;
 2. Carrington;
 3. CO² Emissions;
 4. Increase in traffic and journey times on key public transport corridors;
 5. Increase in overall car use and reduction in public transport use across the modelling period.
- 2.4 To fulfil the commitment within the GM Protocol to further explore and sustainably resolve the issues, it was agreed that further modelling work (Phases 2a and 2b) would be carried out, specific to Trafford. The Phase 2a work (*CD: 12.3 – Appendix 5.4*) will look in more detail at the mitigation measures needed to offset these identified concerns for the first 5 years of the Plan period (to 2016). Once this work is complete further work will be commissioned (Phase 2b) in order to address issues beyond the first 5 years to the end of the Plan period, and to support the delivery of the Land Allocations DPD.
- 2.5 It is intended that the outcomes of the Phase 2a work will be shared with developers, who will be invited to participate in Phase 2b. The Council and Agency are in the process of agreeing procedures for access to the modelling suite (via GMTU) by third parties (developers and their consultants).

3. Agreed Position at the Core Strategy Submission Stage

GM Protocol

- 3.1 The Council and the Agency agree with the GM Protocol in its attempt to co-ordinate work between the Agency and GM Authorities in preparing the necessary sustainable mitigation measures to minimise car based impact upon the SRN. It is also agreed that the thrust of the GM Protocol will form the basis for Phases 2a and 2b of the modelling work.

The five key issues to be addressed

- 3.2 The Council and the Agency agree the five key issues to be addressed as set out in Paragraph 2.3 of this Agreed/Statement of Common Ground.

Further work to address the five key issues

- 3.3 The Council and the Agency agree the Phase 2a LDF Modelling work brief contained in Appendix 5.4 (*CD 12.3*). Phases 2a and 2b of the work will be complete:
- Before the production of the Land Allocation DPD;
 - To inform the updated/detailed infrastructure plan to support the Land Allocation DPD;
 - To underpin any planning applications that may come forward.
 - Once funding of the transport modelling has been agreed between parties.

- 3.4 It is also agreed that the Council and the Agency are committed to engaging the developers of the Locations within the Core Strategy, in the Phase 2b work.

APPENDIX 3.8B - AGREED STATEMENT BETWEEN TRAFFORD & THE GMPTE

Agreed Statement/Statement of Common Ground

Between

Trafford Council and Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive

Regarding

Trafford Council's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy

2. Introduction

- 1.3 This statement has been prepared by Trafford Council (the Council) and Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive (GMPTE) to reflect the current position agreed by all parties in respect of:
- a. The Concordat/Protocol agreed for co-operative working between the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA), the Highways Agency (HA) and GMPTE;
 - b. The remaining transport issues GMPTE has with regard to the impact the proposals within the Publication Core Strategy will have upon the transport network; and
 - c. The process and work to be undertaken, to inform the preparation of the Land Allocations DPD of the Local Development Framework (LDF), to resolve the issues raised.
- 1.4 It explains the co-operative work undertaken to date, outlines the area of agreement as well as those areas which remain outstanding and sets out a complete work programme to address those outstanding areas to be dealt with in a defined period.

2. Background

- 2.6 GMPTE is the body responsible for implementing Greater Manchester Integrated Transport Authority's (GMITA) policies. GMITA is the body established to assess the public transport needs of the county and make policy decisions about public transport provision. The Council, as part of its duty to produce the LDF for the Borough, have consulted with GMPTE regarding the impacts the proposed Core Strategy would have upon the transport network.
- 2.7 The HA sought and agreed a Greater Manchester conurbation wide protocol with the Greater Manchester Planning Officers Group (GMPOG) and GMPTE. 'The GM Protocol' (*CD: 12.3 – Appendix 5.5*) sets out the approach to understanding and sustainably resolving transport issues that result from the Greater Manchester set of Core Strategies. This was brokered by Government Office for the North West. The Council, through its representation on GMPOG, was party to the discussion.

- 2.8 In order to satisfy the GM protocol commitment to understand the impacts the Core Strategies would have upon the transport networks within GM, the HA and GMPOG as well as the GM Joint Transport Team (GMJTT) and GMPTE undertook a modelling exercise (*CD: 8.6.3*). From this modelling exercise, five key specific issues emerged for the Agency in the Trafford area. These are;
6. Growth in traffic and increase in journey times between Junction 5 and 11 of the M60;
 7. Carrington;
 8. CO² Emissions;
 9. Increase in traffic and journey times on key public transport corridors;
 10. Increase in overall car use and reduction in public transport use across the modelling period.
- 2.9 To fulfil the commitment within the GM Protocol to further explore and sustainably resolve the issues, it was agreed that further modelling work (Phases 2a and 2b) would be carried out, specific to Trafford. The Phase 2a work (*CD: 12.3 – Appendix 5.4*) will look in more detail at the mitigation measures needed to offset these identified concerns for the first 5 years of the Plan period (to 2016). Once this work is complete further work will be commissioned (Phase 2b) in order to address issues beyond the first 5 years to the end of the Plan period, and to support the delivery of the Land Allocations DPD.
- 2.10 It is intended that the outcomes of the Phase 2a work will be shared with developers, who will be invited to participate in Phase 2b. The Council is in the process of agreeing procedures for access to the modelling suite (via GMTU) by third parties (developers and their consultants).

3. Agreed Position at the Core Strategy Submission Stage

GM Protocol

- 3.4 The Council and GMPTE agree with the GM Protocol in its attempt to co-ordinate work between the Highways Agency, GMPTE and GM Authorities in preparing the necessary sustainable mitigation measures to minimise car based impact upon the SRN and promote more sustainable travel patterns. It is also agreed that the thrust of the GM Protocol will form the basis for Phases 2a and 2b of the modelling work.

The five key issues to be addressed

- 3.5 The Council and GMPTE agree the five key issues to be addressed as set out in Paragraph 2.3 of this Agreed/Statement of Common Ground.

Further work to address the five key issues

- 3.6 The Council and GMPTE agree the Phase 2a LDF Modelling work brief contained in Appendix 5.4 (*CD 12.3*). Phases 2a and 2b of the work will be complete:
- Before the production of the Land Allocation DPD;
 - To inform the updated/detailed infrastructure plan to support the Land Allocation DPD;
 - To underpin any planning applications that may come forward.
- 3.4 It is also agreed that the Council and GMPTE are committed to engaging the developers of the Locations within the Core Strategy, in the Phase 2b work.

APPENDIX 3.10 - AGREED STATEMENT BETWEEN TRAFFORD & UNITED UTILITIES

Agreed Statement/Statement of Common Ground

Between

Trafford Council and United Utilities

Regarding

Trafford Council's Local Development Framework: Core Strategy

3. Introduction

- 1.5 This statement has been prepared by Trafford Council (the Council) and United Utilities (U UW) to reflect the current position agreed by all parties.
- 1.6 It explains the co-operative work undertaken to date and outlines the agreement of further work which is required prior to the Land Allocations DPD.

2. Background

- 2.11 The Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) has been prepared in consultation with U UW and other key service/utility providers and developers. This is to ensure that the appropriate provision of infrastructure will be identified to support development within the Core Strategy, it will be phased and prioritised accordingly and that service/utility providers are committed to its delivery.
- 2.12 The Council and U UW have established a liaison group in order to identify the necessary infrastructure requirements to support the sustainable delivery of the Core Strategy and LDF, whilst ensuring that customer's needs are met. These identified works will then be planned, funded and delivered to agreed timescales.

3. Agreed Position at the Core Strategy Submission Stage

- 3.7 The Council and U UW are in agreement that the utility requirements as set out in AMP 05/06 fall short of the requirements to support the Core Strategy in the early years. However, the Council and U UW will work together in order to ensure that these strategy(s) are aligned going forward in order to deliver the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy, and to support the needs of customers.

The Further Work required

- 3.8 The Council and U UW agree to continue to work together to inform the:
- Production/development of the Land Allocations DPD;
 - Update the LIP to support the Land Allocation DPD;
 - To identify any necessary improvement works to meet customers needs;
 - To underpin any planning applications that may come forward.

Agreed Statement/Statement of Common Ground