

## Trafford Core Strategy Examination

### Policy SL1 Pomona Island

#### Peel's comments on TBC's Proposed Changes to Policy and Supporting Text in response to the Point 4 of the Inspector's Note re Matters Arising from Hearing Session 1.

**SL1.1.** – we support the changes proposed but suggest that that further “reconciling” amendments to the second sentence of the text are required as follows (additional text highlighted in bold)

*“It will be a new destination for **living**, business and leisure uses, combining significant **residential**, commercial and recreational **development for people living on the site and** for communities in the city centre and Old Trafford areas.”*

**SL1.2.** – we support the changes proposed. Note however that this support is subject to there also being an addition to Policy SL1 to make clear that the housing figures referred to in each Strategic Location are indicative minimum targets as per Point 3 of the Inspector's note of Matters Arising from Hearing Session 3.

SL1.4 – we support the proposed change.

SL1.5 – we do not support the proposed additional bullet point in its current form for the following reasons:

- I. We do not believe that the 800 dwellings envisaged at the site during the Plan period will generate a significant need for additional primary school places ( see comments re SL1.6 below);
- II. The wording in SL1.5 is inconsistent with that in the implementation table and the approach taken with regard to SL2 and SL5 which refer to the developments making contributions to a new school. As worded the proposed change implies the need for on-site provision of a new primary school.
- III. Because planning permission has been issued for 546 of the proposed dwellings and a S106 Agreement is already in place in respect of that permission, it is not open to the Council to seek additional financial contributions or other planning gain in respect of that consented development on a retrospective basis. Hence the provision of a new school cannot be argued to be a “development

requirement” in respect of the majority portion of the 800 total of new dwellings envisaged.

We therefore propose that the Council’s proposed new bullet point be replaced with the following wording:

*“Subject to the extent that the residential component of the mixed use development for which planning permission has yet to be granted, includes provision of accommodation suitable for occupation by families, there may be a requirement for that development to make financial contributions to the provision of additional primary school places possibly by contributing to the development of a new 1-form entry primary school to serve the new residential community on this site and in the surrounding area (including SL2 Trafford Wharfside, SL3 LCCC Quarter, and SL4 Trafford Centre Rectangle).”*

**SL1.6** – we support the deletion of the reference to the Allocations DPD and the first additional sentence of the proposed change.

We do not support the second sentence of the additional text for the following reasons:

- I. The requirement that the 65% of the residential development should be suitable for family accommodation (in line with Policy SL2) is incompatible with the requirement that the development at Pomona should be high density and high rise to reflect its Regional Centre location and, hence, the first and second sentences of the additional text conflict one with the other.
- II. The requirement that 65% of the 800 units envisaged over the plan period shall be family housing is impossible to achieve because the 546 dwellings already consented comprise only 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation that would not readily be suitable for family occupation. It would be unrealistic to require that the remaining 254 should all be family accommodation as this would not enable the scheme to comply with the density and scale requirements.

Note that it is because we do not believe that a high level of family housing within the 800 total envisaged on the site can be achieved that we do not accept that the proposed requirement in respect of primary school provision is justified.

**SL1.7** – we support the proposed change.

### **Implementation Table**

We propose that the Priority ranking for Item 1 (Bridgewater Way Scheme) should be changed to Priority 3 following the discussion during the Matter 3 session.

We support the change to Item 3 (Local highway works) subject to any further advice that we may received from Mr Townsley of TTHC who is not available to comment on this at present.

We object to the wording of Item 6 re school provision and propose that this be revised in line with our suggested rewording of Policy SL15 Bullet 6.

**Paragraph 1.7** – we consider that the last clause of 1.7 re *“including giving consideration to the creation of a new canal crossing”* should be deleted as this no longer appears in the Implementation Table.

**Paragraph 1.10:**

We propose, in view of the Council's changed position, that the first sentence and the proposed second sentence of the paragraph be deleted and replaced with the following text (to make it consistent with that in SL2:

*“Due to the potential for flooding in parts of the location which are identified as Flood Zone 3 in the SFRA Undefended Scenario it is considered that residential development (over and above that which has already been granted planning permission) would not be appropriate in those parts of the site.”*

The Council's proposed changes to the final sentence of the paragraph are supported.

**Paragraph 1.11** – we support the deletion of the paragraph in its entirety.