

### **Matters Arising from Hearing Session 3 - The Strategic Locations**

*Further to the discussion at Hearing session 3 the Council is requested to clarify the matters referred to in points 1, 2 and 10 below and it is invited to suggest changes to the Core Strategy in response to the other matters set out. Such changes should be prefixed (S)300 and should be consolidated in CD12.4. They should be submitted by 16.00 on Friday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2011. They will be circulated to the other participants of Hearing session 3 whose comments are invited as soon as possible before 10<sup>th</sup> March 2011. The changes and any comments on them will be discussed at a subsequent Hearing session.*

1. Briefly in bullet point form please will the Council score the suitability of the strategic locations that anticipate new residential development on flood risk zone 2 land to clarify why Pomona Island is considered to be unsuitable for this use.
2. Please will the Council clarify what additional Sustainability Appraisal it intends to carry out, list the policies that this has implications for and suggest an anticipated programme for progressing the Examination.
3. The scales of development, especially for housing, are set out very precisely in the policies for the Strategic Locations. Changes are invited that will; clarify that these are intended as being indicative minimum targets, and which will enable flexibility for some locations to deliver more/less in line with the strategy and all other policies of the CS.
4. Greater clarity to the last clause of SL1.3 is required.
5. In the absence of a specific development for the land at Trafford Wharfside adjacent to 'Clippers Quay' the requirement of policy SL2 to provide new pedestrian bridges at this precise location may be inappropriate. For flexibility, the location for this requirement should be described more generally in the policy text and the associated implementation table.
6. SL2.4 and the implementation table for that policy, as amended post publication, appear to be inconsistent with regards to provision for a new secondary school.
7. Further consideration should be given to the deletion of the first bullet point of SL3.4.
8. Paragraphs 8.47-8.49 provide confusing information. Clarification/consistency is required.
9. References in several policies to the requirement to contribute to mitigation measures on the M60 are not apparently justified by evidence that is currently available. For soundness these references should be deleted.

10. With reference to policy SL5, explanation is required of what interest features, of which protected sites may be affected by which aspects of development at Carrington, together with a brief summary of anticipated mitigation measures.
11. The Council is invited to suggest additional justification text to follow paragraph 8.79 to clarify that the reference to the Manchester Ship Canal in policy SL5 refers to freight traffic.
12. Any other changes suggested by the Council.