



Trafford Core Strategy: Further Consultation on The Vision, Strategic Objectives and Delivery Strategy

**Summary of Responses
Received to the Preferred
Option (June 2009) and
Further Consultation on W1
(Nov 2009)**

March 2010

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.

إذا كنت في حاجة الى مساعدة لفهم هذه المعلومة الرجاء طلب من شخص الاتصال برقم الهاتف: 0161 912-2000 لاجبارنا 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 સમજણ માટે મદદની જરૂર હોય તો કૃપા 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 zrozumiec ta informacje, popros kogos, aby zadzwonil pod numer 0161 912-2000 aby nas poinformowal, 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 ਕਹੋ ਕਿ ਅਸੀਂ ਇਹ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਸਭ ਤੋਂ ਅੱਛੇ ਢੰਗ ਨਾਲ ਕਿਸ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਾਂ।

PUNJABI

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

SOMALI

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

URDU

Index of those who have made representations

| ID | Organisation |
|------|--|
| 1013 | Trafford Green Party |
| 1018 | Trafford Housing Trust |
| 1019 | United Utilities |
| 1026 | Shell ChemicalsUK and Shell Property Co Ltd c/o Agent |
| 1028 | Trafford Council, Community Safety, Culture & Sport |
| 1031 | Spatial Planning Team, GONW |
| 1034 | The Woodland Trust |
| 1035 | The Theatres Trust |
| 1036 | L&M Limited c/o Agent |
| 1040 | Bellway Homes Manchester |
| 1041 | GMPTE |
| 1042 | Ramblers' Association (Manchester & High Peak) |
| 1045 | Peel Holdings c/o Agent |
| 1047 | Northwest Regional Development Agency |
| 1050 | Unnamed Clients c/o Agent |
| 1051 | The National Trust |
| 1055 | Brixton Plc c/o Agent |
| 1057 | LCCC & ASK c/o Agent |
| 1064 | Manchester Airport |
| 1066 | Greater Manchester Ecology Unit |
| 1067 | Altrincham & Sale Chamber of Commerce |
| 1070 | Bowdon Conservation Group |
| 1072 | APSL c/o Agent |
| 1073 | Highways Agency |
| 1074 | English Heritage |
| 1076 | Warburton Parish Council |
| 1078 | Redrow Homes |
| 1082 | Barclays Bank c/o Agent |
| 1089 | United Utilities Property Solutions Ltd |
| 1093 | 4NW (Formerly North West Regional Assembly) |
| 1096 | Environment Agency |
| 1097 | National Grid |
| 1100 | Stevenor Investments c/o Agent |
| 1106 | Sainsbury Supermarkets Ltd c/o Agent |
| 1114 | Mr J Kennedy c/o Agent |
| 1120 | Trafford College |
| 1125 | Trafford Council, Children and Young Person Service (CYPS) |

| ID | Organisation |
|-----------|--|
| 1129 | Salford City Council, Strategic Planning |
| 1130 | Anstee, Sean |
| 1133 | Williams, Alex |
| 1135 | Young, Michael |
| 1138 | Ryan, Joe |
| 1139 | Walmsley, Sarah |
| 1140 | Wareing, Nicola |
| 1141 | Anonymous 2 |
| 1142 | Trueblood, Joan |
| 1144 | Narrainen, C |
| 1145 | Labour Group |
| 1146 | Williams, Jerry |
| 1147 | Trenchard, Stephen |
| 1148 | Fitzgerald, John |
| 1149 | Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority |
| 1150 | Thompson, Peter J |
| 1152 | Nikal Ltd c/o Agent |
| 1153 | Carter, Audrey |
| 1154 | Friends of Longford Park |
| 1155 | Moreton, Diana |
| 1156 | Carrington Business Park Limited |
| 1158 | Homestar Investments Limited c/o Agent |
| 1159 | Bowdon Downs Residents Association |
| 1160 | Green Spaces for Altrincham |
| 1165 | The Crown Estate c/o Agent |
| 1166 | Tesco Stores Ltd & Maloneview (Sale) Ltd c/o Agent |
| 1167 | Tesco Stores Ltd and LCCC c/o Agent |
| 1168 | P Fahey & Sons Ltd |
| 1169 | Special Neighbourhood Forum - Altrincham |
| 1170 | Special Neighbourhood Forum - Urmston |
| 1180 | Trafford Council, Environment Strategy |
| 1181 | Trafford Council, Location Workshop 24 Sept 09 |
| 1187 | Smith, John |
| 1189 | Orchard Barns c/o Agent |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses – Place Objectives

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1013 | A number of common themes are mentioned within the Spatial Profiles, but are not followed through in a coherent way. Opportunities associated with the Bridgewater Canal need to be reflected in each area that it runs through on its north-south axis. Similarly the A56 runs the length of the Borough and the problems associated with it should be mentioned in each area that it runs through. Also the issue of affordable housing for sale in regeneration areas such as Old Trafford and Partington is not dealt with effectively. |
| 1036 | Support objectives for Altrincham which seek to manage high levels of residential development pressure and to ensure that residents will be able to access jobs in areas such as Broadheath. |
| 1042 | The Trafford in Partnership section (2.17-2.21) should include reference to Trafford, Manchester and Salford working in partnership as a Joint Local Access Forum in relation to Rights of Way. |
| 1045 | Paragraph 2.21 should be expanded to include reference to the enhanced role and capability of inland waterways, including the Manchester Ship Canal, for freight distribution and the ensuing environmental benefits and positive implications in terms of climate change and reduced lorry miles should be considered to be of overriding benefit. |
| 1045 | Given that the Trafford Centre attracts over 30 million visitors per annum, the Trafford Park Spatial Profile should make reference to it, in addition to Manchester United and the Imperial War Museum. |
| 1045 | Support for the objective to maximise potential of visitor attractions such as the Imperial War Museum North and the Trafford Centre. |
| 1045 | The reference to the Barton Swing Bridge being a proposed World Heritage Site is inappropriate and misleading and should therefore be removed from the Trafford Park Spatial Profile. |
| 1045 | Both the Trafford Park and Carrington Key Issues and Objectives should make reference to the existence of berthage and adjoining land holdings which could provide opportunities for the sustainable and efficient movement of freight. |
| 1045 | The Urmston objective to manage the congestion associated with the Trafford Centre should be deleted. There is no evidence that the Trafford Centre is a cause of any significant or regular traffic congestion either in the immediate vicinity of the Trafford Centre or in Urmston. |
| 1045 | As recognised by Trafford's planners in relation to the WGIS planning application, Junction 10 of the M60 will be improved with the introduction of this new road proposal; generally through traffic flow changes and specifically for Urmston through the widening of the Barton Road entry. |
| 1045 | Aside from the fact the MSC were not previously aware of a proposed canal crossing in the vicinity of Carrington, any proposed bridge across the Ship Canal, would need to meet all the company's detailed requirements to ensure that there is no interference with the use of the MSC for freight and other shipping use. |
| 1050 | Support for Altrincham as a "main town centre" in Figure 2 |
| 1050 | Clarification needed as to whether references to "Altrincham" in the document encompass Bowdon, Hale and Hale Barns as these areas are included with Altrincham in terms of the Spatial Profile. |
| 1055 | Support given to the Trafford Park Key Issues and Place Objectives. |
| 1055 | Support for sustainable residential development at Wharfside and Trafford Quays. |
| 1055 | Given that the development of brownfield land is seen as a priority, peripheral sites within the Trafford Park Core area should also be considered for appropriate residential development, providing that the integrity and function of Trafford Park as a significant |

| | |
|------|--|
| | employment destination is not jeopardised. The Spatial Profile should be amended accordingly. |
| 1064 | Support the reference to joint working arrangements on airport related LDF matters at para 2.20. |
| 1066 | The Bridgewater Canal should be specifically mentioned as an “environmental asset” in the Trafford Park section, given its status as an SBI in this location. |
| 1066 | Support for the objective to maximise opportunities for green roofs and tree planting in Old Trafford. |
| 1066 | Support for Stretford objectives in relation to green roofs, tree planting and green space. |
| 1070 | Request that the Altrincham “Live” Objectives be amended to include a clause “to ensure new development reflects the characteristics of the areas, in particular the historic buildings in the town centre, the historic parks and conservation areas and the relatively low density suburban family housing neighbourhoods in the south of the area”. |
| 1073 | There is no reference to the lack of sustainable transport alternatives within the Trafford Park section. There needs to be some surety and assurances that sustainable transport measures are to be implemented to ensure the viability of this key sub-regional asset. |
| 1089 | Support for the need to determine the future land requirements of the Davyhulme Wastewater Treatment Works and to identify appropriate alternative uses for any surplus land. |
| 1145 | Support for the developments of Stretford Memorial, Trafford General and Altrincham Hospitals, but an area in need of improved healthcare provision within Urmston is Lostock. |
| 1145 | There is a need to develop improved and new youth provision in order to maintain and enhance cohesive communities. This is particularly the case in Old Trafford, Stretford, Lostock, Urmston, Flixton and Davyhulme, and Sale. |
| 1180 | It would be useful to highlight lack of appropriate (quality) public transport links and services to Trafford Park. |
| 1180 | Key issue bullet points 3 – Bus links to regional centre from Old Trafford to regional centre are relatively good. A new metrolink line is being built through Firswood. There is a need to develop better orbital links, particularly to Trafford Park. As well as public transport, other sustainable modes should be mentioned, specifically cycling e.g. To secure improvements to public transport and cycling infrastructure which are critical.... Key Issue bullet point 4 – Improvements at Old Trafford Metrolink station are to be completed mid October '09. |
| 1180 | Key issue bullet point 3 – Severance to local communities should be added, e.g. to tackle the barrier that the A56 creates to pedestrian movement between some parts of the community. |
| 1180 | Key issue bullet point 7 – the parking issue is more about management than provision. Suggest another bullet point under Live - to secure improvement to Altrincham Interchange. |
| 1180 | Suggest another bullet point – to secure improved links by sustainable modes, e.g. Trans Pennine Trail, links between Carrington and Partington. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses – Vision & Strategic Objectives

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1013 | There should be greater clarification that the vision of sustainable patterns of living applies across the Borough and is not just confined to the deprived areas in need of regeneration. Such an approach would complement the focus of the Trafford SCS. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1031 | The Vision needs to be developed further to set out a more locally distinctive vision for the Borough. The material in the “Spatial Strategy” could be incorporated into the Vision to assist with this. |
| 1045 | Strategic Objective 1 should be expanded to reflect paragraph 6.5, stating that the CS seeks to promote sufficient new housing, not only to meet the Borough’s own needs, but also to support growth and investment in the wider City Region. |
| 1045 | Strategic Objective 3 should be revised to acknowledge and give strong emphasis to the strategic role of Trafford Park as a sub-regional employment location. The objective does not match the positively expressed SCS vision which envisages Trafford being celebrated as the enterprise capital of the north west. |
| 1047 | Whilst supporting the existence of a separate Vision to that of the SCS, the new Vision does not reflect the ambition set out in 14.1 to grow and diversify the Borough’s economy. |
| 1051 | The Vision has developed in a positive way and now provides a more appropriate direction for Trafford’s future. |
| 1051 | Trafford’s distinctive landscape types, such as those associated with its important river valleys and mosses are missing from the Vision. The final paragraph should be re-worded to make specific reference to landscape: “we will protect and enhance our historic, built and natural environment and landscapes (including strategic Green Infrastructure), to improve...” |
| 1051 | The Vision should address how the Borough will ensure the prudent use of natural resources by including a paragraph relating to sustainable construction: “all new development will encompass the principles of sustainable construction, and in particular will ensure that the recycling of materials is maximised and that natural resources are used prudently”. |
| 1051 | SO2 should seek to pursue a more integrated approach to sustainable development, in particular it should embrace the benefits to disadvantaged communities of improvements to their environmental resources – not just the physical appearance but also the cultural and natural environment attributes. SO2 should make specific reference to the “physical, economic, environmental and social fabric of disadvantaged communities...” |
| 1051 | The Strategic Objectives do not make appropriate reference to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. SO8 should be broadened to realise the wider potential of the Borough’s heritage resources: “Make the most of, protect, enhance and value the Borough’s heritage...” |
| 1051 | There should be a separate Strategic Objective dealing specifically with climate change. SO7 does not go far enough as it only considers the “reducing emissions” element of climate change, not how Trafford will adapt to those impacts of climate change. |
| 1066 | Support for SO5 |
| 1072 | In order to achieve SO3, the ELS needs to consider that some forms of employment development will have specific needs which may only be met by certain sites. For example it is unlikely that many sites in Trafford, other than Davenport Green, would be able to accommodate high-end office occupiers making regionally significant scale investment. |
| 1072 | In order to achieve SO3, the ELS needs to consider that some forms of employment development will have specific needs which may only be met by certain sites. For example it is unlikely that many sites in Trafford, other than Davenport Green, would be able to accommodate high-end office occupiers making regionally significant scale investment. |
| 1096 | Although there is support for the work being undertaken jointly across AGMA districts in relation to flood risk, until such time that this work is completed it is not possible to endorse the Core Strategy Preferred Option as set out in June 2009. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1120 | The Core Strategy Vision should allow for the growth of existing community services where these are outside existing town centres, Trafford Park and Carrington to ensure that the Core Strategy does not undermine the potential for additional investment at the Trafford College campuses. |
| 1125 | Although agree with SO1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8 and strongly agree with SO3 and 5, it is necessary to consider how the Trafford Core Strategy will sit alongside those of neighbouring authorities. It is also hard to predict the needs of future communities as it is not known who they will be made up of. |
| 1140 | Strongly agree with SO7, agree with SO5, 6, and 8, neither agree nor disagree with SO2, 3, and 4 and disagree with SO1. Families should be encouraged to share houses or use flats and avoid owning too large a home or more than one home. |
| 1154 | Strongly agree with SO2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8. Agree with SO1. In particular SO2, 3, 4 and 6 which give greater priority to Stretford. A larger Tesco store would be in conflict with SO4 and SO6 is excellent, although does it relate to the airport? |
| 1167 | The SCS Vision in the Core Strategy is supported and the acknowledgement in the consultation document of the Old Trafford Cricket Ground as a world class attraction is welcomed. |
| 1031 | The 2 sets of place and strategic objectives should be integrated into a single set of objectives. This will help to demonstrate how the policies provide the delivery strategy for achieving the objectives. |
| 1047 | No comments to make about the revised set of Strategic Objectives. |
| 1074 | Support for the Vision and the Strategic Objectives. |
| 1082 | Support for maintaining the vitality and viability of Altrincham will be an important part of this process but the delivery of that aim will largely depend upon major financial investment by private sector stakeholders. It is therefore requested that the planning policies do not discourage that investment. |
| 1120 | Acknowledgement of Table 1 – the Strategic Objectives. |
| 1120 | The objectives set out at Table 1 are acknowledged 'Strategic Options' and Policy L2 (Meeting Housing Needs). The intent of the Core Strategy is supported but there is a need to be mindful of the requirements of PPS12 to ensure that the Core Strategy is sound. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses – Spatial Strategy

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | The spatial strategy could be incorporated into the vision. At present it is unclear what status it has in the Core Strategy as it is neither part of the vision, objectives or policies. |
| 1031 | The strategy splits the strategic locations into three priorities. However no mention is made of the strategic sites. Where do these fit in relation to the priorities? |
| 1031 | The first priority includes five strategic locations. It is assumed therefore that the Council wishes to see the early development of these areas. If this is the case why have they not been identified as strategic sites? |
| 1036 | The spatial strategy identifies the Woodfield Road site as falling within one of the third priority sites for development within the Borough after the Regional Centre/ Inner Area and key regeneration sites which are identified as the first and second priorities for development respectively. Support the identification of the land as a priority site for redevelopment. However steps should be taken to ensure that the Core Strategy does not preclude the potential for third priority sites to be brought forward for redevelopment in advance of first or second priority development sites, particularly in |

| | |
|------|--|
| | the instance of highly sustainable third priority sites such as the land at Woodfield Rd. |
| 1045 | Reference made to the representations and supporting information submitted in response to the previous draft document in respect of the Inner Area boundary. The key points of the earlier submission were: That adopted RSS defines the inner area in Trafford as comprising Trafford Park and North Trafford. The Trafford Centre Rectangle has always formed part of Trafford Park (the Council again confirms in its definition and description of Trafford Park as a place on p10 of the new draft CS) and accordingly any proposal to omit part of Trafford Park from the Inner Area should be supported by a clear and specific justification and evidence base. No such justification has been given by the Council. |
| 1045 | A single option with regard to the inner area boundary was presented in the 2008 draft and this has been carried forward into the new draft CS. Hence no other options have been properly considered or consulted upon. It is noted that the new draft document simply carries forward the previously proposed boundary for the Inner Area. Concern that no response has been given to the previous objection and concerns in the CS document or through any other means and the proposed boundary continues to lack any justification either within the draft document or any evidence base to support its selection. |
| 1045 | The M60 forms the natural, established and widely understood boundary of Trafford Park and is therefore the logical boundary to the Inner Area in this location. |
| 1045 | The M60 would provide the more logical boundary for the Inner Area and consider that the Trafford Quays delivery report which is being submitted to the Council in support of representations to this new draft CS provides further support for this view. More importantly in the absence of any evidence to justify the exclusion of the Trafford Centre Rectangle from the Inner Area, it is considered that the M60 boundary is the only one that would provide for consistency and compliance with the adopted RSS. |
| 1045 | Para 4.12 states that "Strategic Sites" are specifically defined sites which will "deliver significant development that is central to the achievement of the Core Strategy" and that their allocation on the proposals map will give them a high status in decision making on applications. Following on from this the allocation of land at Trafford Quays for a high quality residential led mixed use development as a strategic site clearly means that the Council considers the delivery of housing development on that site to be a key component in meeting its housing development needs and this is confirmed in the SHLAA which forms part of the evidence base. In line with the second part of para 4.12 the strategic site allocation should also provide the landowner with the comfort that the principle of the sites development for housing should not be in question if and when a planning application is brought forward by the company. |
| 1047 | Only comment on the draft Spatial Strategy relates to the first clause. This establishes the regional centre and the inner areas as the first priority for development (thus reflecting RSS). However it then says that within these areas development 'will be directed to' the five strategic locations SL1-5. It thus appears to give these locations a higher level of priority than the rest of the regional centre and the inner areas within Trafford. It may be appropriate to replace 'In particular development will be directed to....' with 'Within these areas, the Council particularly wishes to promote development and change at...' |
| 1050 | The second priority for growth is the remaining regeneration areas in Trafford and Altrincham Town Centre. The identification of Altrincham town centre as a second priority is strongly supported. |
| 1050 | It is considered that the boundary should extend beyond Altrincham town centre to Altrincham as a whole to ensure that the policy accords with RDF1 of the RSS. Policy RDF1 refers to the town of Altrincham and states that development should be focussed in and around the centres of the towns and cities. It also considers that development elsewhere within these towns and cities would be acceptable. |
| 1050 | Paragraph 2 of the Spatial Strategy policy should read "The second priority will be the |

| | |
|------|---|
| | areas in and around Altrincham Town Centre...." |
| 1050 | The wording of the third and fourth priorities is supported. In particular the fourth priority is considered to accord with Policy MCR3 of the RSS. The amendments that have been made to this approach are supported. |
| 1050 | In the case of South Manchester, except in that part of Trafford lying within or adjacent to Manchester regional centre, monitoring and managing of housing provision will be necessary to ensure that new housing development does not result in an adverse cumulative impact on local and neighbouring housing markets. Provision should focus on meeting local and affordable housing needs and any general market housing should support local regeneration strategies. Local housing needs are explained in the glossary as applying where people choose or need to live in a particular location and accommodation is available to them. |
| 1051 | Overall it appears that the preferred spatial strategy has taken appropriate account of the adopted RSS and relevant characteristics of the Borough. |
| 1055 | Paragraph 4.8 clearly sets out the potential for the Regional Centre and Inner Areas to cater for appropriate residential development, expansion of the knowledge economy and the provision of new communities. Again, this is a principle that the representor is supportive of. However there appears to be a conflict between the broad message being conveyed in this chapter, and the prescriptive nature of Chapter 6, which deals with land for new homes. |
| 1070 | Would like to see an additional sentence at the end of 4.4 to read 'Urban areas of character value in the south of the Borough would be protected from development'. |
| 1070 | To the sentence in 4.5 would like added the words 'or playing fields or open land used for formal and informal recreation purposes'. |
| 1073 | The spatial strategy as drafted does not involve the release of Green Belt land. |
| 1073 | Encouraged that economic and housing growth is to be focused within the urban area, as the urban areas within Trafford benefit from public transport provision and interchanges, as well as good access to key services via non car modes. Locating development in the Regional Centre conforms to RSS, and is encouraged, albeit with a degree of caution as parts of the Regional Centre is located close to the SRN, and as such, even though it is the preferred location for development according to RSS, there may still be significant impact at the SRN. Again this should be assessed in the LDF modelling work currently being undertaken. |
| 1073 | Locating development within Altrincham Town Centre is encouraged as it is well served by a range of public transport options, and home to key services, employment and leisure opportunities. However any large scale development aspirations in this location will have to be reviewed due to the likelihood of impacts on the A556 and M56 to the south of Altrincham. |
| 1073 | In addition no transport impact justification (as is the case for the majority of the strategy) is provided for Carrington's inclusion within the second priority of development. |
| 1073 | Previously commented on the suitability of Carrington and Partington as locations for development. If these sites can be delivered sustainably, with the appropriate transport and services infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by private car, then concerns may be addressed subject to the residual car based impact. Conversely if development at these locations results in large trip generating schemes, the representor may have to resist the development proposals at Carrington and Partington. However no individual or cumulative transport impact evidence to support these proposals has been presented as part of the Strategy. |
| 1073 | The third priority will see growth at Sale Town Centre (SL11), Stretford Town Centre (SL7), The Trafford Centre Rectangle (SL6), Woodfield Rd and Broadheath (SL12). Encouraged by such an approach on the whole as it aims to locate development in established town centre/urban areas. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1073 | Whilst there is general support for the third priority for development, which aims to locate development in established town centres and urban areas, concern is raised over promoting residential development within Air Quality Management Areas, of which the Trafford Centre Rectangle is one. |
| 1073 | The transport impact of the Trafford Centre Rectangle location (along with all of the Strategic Sites and Locations) as it is currently envisaged in the strategy will be tested as part of the LDF modelling work. |
| 1073 | Outside of these areas new growth will be focussed on meeting local needs, particularly for affordable housing, with general 'market housing' (in sustainable locations, well served by public transport) supporting local needs and regeneration priorities. Encourage Trafford's aspirations to locate additional development in sustainable locations as this will reduce the need to travel by private car. |
| 1089 | Point 4 states "Outside of these areas new growth will be focussed on meeting local needs, particularly for affordable housing, with general "market housing" (in sustainable locations, well served by public transport) supporting local needs and regeneration priorities." Request further clarification on how this will be applied to applications for new housing development. It is unclear when applications for market housing will be acceptable in these locations. It is suggested that this point is sufficiently flexible to allow the delivery of general market housing in sustainable locations so that all urban areas of the borough can contribute to the delivery of the housing required. It will be important to have this flexibility if it is demonstrated that the annual average dwelling requirement (as required by the North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021 and the growth point status of Trafford) is not being met. |
| 1093 | It is noted that the approach to be taken allows development in and around the inner areas of Trafford. In previous comments it was stated that a combination of Options 1 and 2 would be more appropriate and it is recognised that it is planned to take option 2 forward. |
| 1093 | It is noted that the justification for taking Option 2 forward is due to the sustainability appraisal recommendations and this also seems a more deliverable option. This could seem a less specific 'spatial option' as it does cover various areas of the Trafford Borough, however it is noted that the Spatial Strategy has identified key strategic sites (as identified in the RSS) and it is also noted that apart from the strategic sites, Altrincham and the Boroughs principal town will be second priority for development in line with RSS Policy RDF1 and W5. |
| 1093 | The Core Strategy also fits within the spatial priorities defined in RSS for the Manchester City Region, which states plans should support interventions to achieve significant improvement in the sub regions economic performance, secure improvements including enhancements of public transport links and accommodate housing in inner areas. |
| 1096 | The work being undertaken as part of the Level 2 SFRA is supported and it is expected that this will be completed by the final submission stage as this will inform the sustainability appraisal of the DPD and ultimately the application of the exception test (PPS25). Until this work is completed the representor is unable to endorse the preferred option at this stage as the flood risks associated with the preferred option/strategic sites are not fully understood. For information the representor will be adopting the same stance to other authorities who do not have a complete SFRA at the preferred option stage of their Core Strategy. |
| 1097 | The Energy White paper makes clear that UK energy systems will undergo a significant change over the next 20 years. To meet the goals of the white paper it will be necessary to revise and update much of the UK's energy infrastructure during this period. There will be a requirement for: - An expansion of national infrastructure (e.g. overhead powerlines, underground |

| | |
|------|---|
| | cables, extending substations, new gas pipelines and associated installations) - New forms of infrastructure (e.g. smaller scale distributed generation, gas storage sites) |
| 1097 | Request to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of Development Plan documents (DPDs) which may affect assets including policies and plans relating to the following issues; - Any policies relating to overhead transmission lines, underground cables or gas pipeline installations - Site specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites crossed by overhead lines, underground cables or gas transmission pipelines. - Land use policies/development proposed adjacent to existing high voltage electricity substation sites and gas above ground installations - Any policies relating to the diverting or undergrounding of overhead transmission lines - Other policies relating to infrastructure or utility provision - Policies relating to development in the countryside - Landscape policies - Waste and mineral plans |
| 1120 | The Council should amend the wording of the Spatial Strategy to ensure that the potential for further investment in the campuses of Trafford College are not undermined and that the College can make the best use of its assets, especially where this will allow for continued investment in education/community facilities. |
| 1130 | The Core Strategy has been well thought through and considered. Of the opinion that it is right that the areas of the Borough highlighted as Priority 1 locations for change have been selected. Pleased to see that this is not just housing led regeneration, but does include the redevelopment of Lancashire County Cricket Club, Mediacity: uk, an increased focus on employment and improved public transport. |
| 1130 | The comment (SL5) 'Improvements to public transport access are essential' is also true of priority 2 sites, Partington (SL9) and Sale West (SL10). Any efforts to regenerate communities that will allow access to jobs throughout the Borough and encourage people to live there will undoubtedly fail without effective public transport provision. |
| 1145 | It is important that all Green Belt land and Park land in the Borough is protected. |
| 1145 | It is important to continue the development of Altrincham Town Centre. There is a need for affordable homes to enable people to stay in the area they grew up in. Need to protect the small shopping parades in the communities. |
| 1180 | Suggest addition of metrolink phase 3a and link to the airport. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - L1

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1026 | The Council are proposing to release sufficient land to accommodate 11,800 new dwellings however this figure would appear to exclude the four strategic sites that should, in theory, deliver an additional 2,150 units totalling 13,950 dwellings. The forecasted numbers in Table 4 in the SHLAA 2009 review, which includes both the Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations the total number of units, is only 7,357. |
| 1026 | It is worth noting that Table 4 in the SHLAA does not include SL6 Trafford Centre Rectangle which is listed in Table L1 in the Core Strategy as producing 1,050 units, however even with this addition the total figure in Table 4 only increases to 8,407 some 3,000 units less than that proposed in Policy L1. Furthermore there does appear to be some double counting with regard to SS4 Partington Canalside and SL9 Partington. |

| | |
|------|---|
| | Table L1 lists a total number of units of 850 from SL9 (which includes 550 from the Strategic Site SS4). Table 4 in the SHLAA appears to indicate that a total of 1,004 units will result from the development of the Strategic Location and the Strategic Site. |
| 1026 | <p>Policy L1 indicates that of the 11,800 dwellings 42% (4956) will be provided within the Regional Centre and Inner areas, therefore 58% (6844) will have to be provided elsewhere. Of the sites identified in the SHLAA outside of the Regional Centre and the Inner Areas the total number of dwellings identified in Table 4 is 1,936 an apparent shortfall of 4,908 dwellings? Table 1 appears to indicate that some 3,900 dwellings will be forthcoming from other South City Region Sites, although these are not identified and would appear to produce a remarkably consistent 1,000 units for each period of the plan. Even if this were to be the case there still appears to be a shortfall of 1,000 dwellings between the Table L1 and Table L4 in the SHLAA. The figures in the SHLAA, that represent a 2009 Review, do not tally with the figures in the Policy and must raise questions over delivery, suitability and achievability.</p> |
| 1026 | <p>Policy L2 requires developers to make a contribution to the creation of mixed and sustainable communities; to be adaptable to the needs of residents overtime and; to increase to provision of family homes in the north of the Borough, particularly larger properties of 3 or more bedrooms.</p> <p>A mixed use development at Carrington will create a sustainable community that can be adaptable to the needs of residents overtime and, whilst not located in the north has the capacity to provide a range of family homes. It is difficult to interpret from the published information the mix of dwelling types proposed on each site and it is difficult to calculate comparative densities however, from the information available it would appear that in the North and Inner Areas the dwelling mix will be as follows:</p> <p>SL1 Pomona - 1,500 apartments SL2 Trafford Wharf - 900 apartments SL4 LCCC - 900 apartments SL6 Trafford Centre Rectangle - 500 houses, 500 apartments SL7 Stratford Crossroads 125 houses, 125 apartments SS1 Victoria Warehouse - 400 apartments SS2 Trafford Quays - 525 houses and 525 apartments</p> <p>Assuming the above breakdown is correct then of 6,000 units proposed only 1,150 (19%) will be family housing. This hardly meets the requirements of Policy L2 which seeks to encourage a range of family houses. The remaining 4,850 apartments will be in direct competition not only with each other but also with the large number of apartments proposed immediately to the north in and around the Quays in Salford. There is an existing oversupply of apartments in the Manchester City Region which is evidenced by the markets lack of appetite for apartments, the demise of many city centre developers and the fact that none of the major housing development companies intend to construct any apartments in the foreseeable future. In addition the large number of apartment consents in neighbouring areas around Salford Quays that have yet to be implemented and the banks reluctance to fund such schemes brings into question the feasibility of these allocations and the delivery of this large number of apartments at the northern area of Trafford.</p> <p>Contrary to the claim in paragraph 7.3 of the Preferred Option the policy as drafted with the locations and sites identified cannot and will not in our opinion deliver a balanced housing offer.</p> |
| 1026 | A report was published on 30th July 2009 at the NHPAU (National Housing and Planning Advice Unit) calling on Government to revise its housing supply by between three and five percent. It argues that at least 237,800 new homes are needed every year between now and 2031 and that these figures should be used to inform regional plans. No |

| | |
|------|--|
| | allowance is currently made within the Core Strategy Preferred Option for this forecast increase in demand. |
| 1031 | At publication stage the Core Strategy should include trajectories in respect of previously developed land and the rate of housing delivery in accordance with paragraphs 43 and 55 of PPS3. |
| 1036 | <p>Draft Policy L1 identifies the sites where new housing is to be directed in the Borough and indicates that the Woodfield Road Strategic Location could accommodate up to 400 units during the lifespan of the Core Strategy. It is estimated that 100 units could be delivered on the site by 2011 and a further 300 units by 2016. The land at Woodfield Road is well located in relation to public transport and is surrounded by existing residential areas, which make it an appropriate location for new housing as part of a wider mixed use development, support the principle of delivering new housing here.</p> <p>It is considered that the site has the potential to accommodate more than 400 units. This potential is recognised in Trafford's "SHLAA 2009 Review" which indicates that Woodfield Road could accommodate 478 new residential units, including 243 on a single site within the Woodfield Road location. On this basis it is suggested that Draft Policy L1 should be revised so that it more accurately reflects the capacity for new housing on the site.</p> |
| 1040 | In terms of existing commitments it may need to be assumed that many higher density schemes (apartments especially) will not be developed, given the poor state of this market. In excess of 50% of existing commitments may need to be discounted (depending on the proportion of apartments) to reflect this. Furthermore due to contractions in the capacity of the house building industry, other commitments should also be discounted, as developers now have significantly lower expectations based upon much lower sales over the past 12-18 months or so. Failure to make these adjustments will inflate commitments beyond what will actually be delivered. |
| 1040 | The Councils 5 year supply will need to be amended accordingly to reflect current market conditions. This will have implications for the Councils SHLAA as sites might need to be brought forward earlier than previously envisaged. There will be a greater pressure to identify within the SHLAA sufficient (new?) sites for the Core Strategy period. |
| 1040 | It is requested that Council owned land and surplus property be positively utilised to deliver new homes and recommend a coordinated approach (Estates and Planning) be adopted. |
| 1040 | In relation to PDL resistance is still being experienced from landowners to sell PDL at an appropriate value. Their expectation is that values will rise and that this is halting the release of PDL for development. Any policy/strategy must take this into account. An over reliance on PDL could jeopardise the delivery of RSS targets (as well as Growth Point uplift for the City Region). |
| 1040 | <p>There is concern that the Core Strategy relies too heavily upon those Strategic Sites, which whilst important regeneration priorities, will not provide the amount of new homes envisaged. Many of these sites are included for higher density residential use (some as part of mixed use schemes) which are unlikely to come forward in the short term. The commercial market is equally depressed so these schemes will be slower to materialise. We therefore ask that the Councils policies allow for residential development (at lower densities) elsewhere outside of these areas and that they are not refused for not being in these areas or for prejudicing the delivery of these developments.</p> <p>Otherwise support the policy approach to selected areas and support their regeneration, but simply wish to be realistic in this tough market. If these sites do not deliver, simply need policy to support (or not obstruct) other sites that can deliver the RSS target for new homes.</p> |
| 1045 | Policy L1 appears to be inconsistent with other parts of the Core Strategy and in particular with the allocation in part D of the document of land as 'Strategic Sites and Locations'. |

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>Para 4.12 of the draft document states that the 'Strategic Sites' are specifically defined sites which "will deliver significant development that is central to the achievement of the Core Strategy" and their allocation on the proposals map will give them a "high status in decision making on planning applications." Following on from this the allocation of land at Trafford Quays for a high quality residential led mixed use development as a Strategic Site clearly means that the Council considers the delivery of housing development on that site to be a key component in meeting its housing development needs and this is confirmed in the SHLAA which forms part of the evidence base. However part L1.6 of Policy L1 sets out a clear order of priority for land release for development which makes no mention of the Strategic Sites that have been allocated, even though they are stated to be central to the delivery of new housing. In addition part L1.8 states that greenfield land (which most of the Trafford Quays site is) will only be released in exceptional circumstances where the housing land needs cannot be met on brownfield sites.</p> |
| 1045 | <p>Part L1.6 of Policy L1 sets out a clear order of priority for land release for development which makes no mention of the Strategic Sites that have been allocated, even though they are stated to be central to the delivery of new housing.</p> |
| 1045 | <p>Part L1.8 states that greenfield land (which most of the Trafford Quays site is) will only be released in exceptional circumstances where the housing needs cannot be met on brownfield sites. There is not even any reference to in the Policy to PPS3 guidance that greenfield sites in sustainable locations are to be preferred to unsustainable brownfield sites as locations for new housing.</p> |
| 1045 | <p>The current wording of Policy L1 is contradictory to the allocation of Trafford Quays and other land as strategic sites and strategic locations. Object to the draft policy and seek that it be amended to include Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations within the first order of priority under L1.6 and L1.8 and would also need to be amended to the effect that the allocated sites are not subject to these policies.</p> |
| 1045 | <p>Question the inclusion of the suggestion that growth in Trafford must be seen to "strengthen" the more vulnerable market areas both within and adjacent to Trafford. It is difficult to envisage how any development which is not physically within or contiguous with such areas could be shown to have a strengthening effect. Accordingly this requirement could be used to resist or call into question development proposals that are acceptable in all other respects. This should therefore be deleted from the text.</p> |
| 1045 | <p>In respect of the detailed figures in Table 1 support the total quantum of contribution assumed from the Wharfside and Pomona sites but it requests that the Pomona contribution be rephased as follows:</p> <p>2008/9 - 2010/11 - 0 2011/12 - 2015/16 - 550 2016/17 - 2020/21 - 550 2021/22 - 2025/26 - 400</p> <p>The capacity of the Trafford Quays site is such that it could make a larger contribution to housing development in the plan period and the Council may therefore consider increasing this in the final version of the Core Strategy.</p> |
| 1047 | <p>No concern regarding the scale of new housing provision proposed. However, as the figure of 11,800 is net of clearance replacement (reflecting RSS) it would be helpful for the supporting text to explain that additional provision to take account of clearance activity will be taken into account through the annual monitoring report.</p> |
| 1047 | <p>With regard to the prioritisation of brownfield sites in L1.6, clause (b) cross refers to Policy L3 on regeneration, but not the wider spatial strategy. As a result Old Trafford (SL3), Partington (SL9) and Sale West (SL10) are identified as priorities, whereas the spatial strategy's focus on Carrington (SL8) and town centres such as Altrincham (SL13), Sale (SL11) and Stretford (SL7) is lost.</p> |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1047 | Clause L1.8 sets out the exceptional circumstances under which greenfield housing development will be considered. It makes no reference to the proposed greenfield allocations at Trafford Quays and Partington Canalside (SS2 and SS4) and is therefore unclear how these sites might be phased relative to other brownfield housing sites. |
| 1047 | The contribution of housing and employment land requirements detailed in the Strategic Sites needs to be assessed and quantified. The submission draft should state the balance between numbers of residential units and hectares of employment land in each the Strategic Sites. |
| 1050 | The general principles of section L1.2 and L1.3 in Policy L1 are supported. It is not clear why the plan period extends from 2008 to 2026. Clarification should be provided on this. |
| 1050 | It is not clear why the annual requirement from 2008 to 2011 is less than the RSS annual requirement when this period is within the Housing Growth Point timeframe. It is considered that this should be adjusted to allow more dwellings to be brought forward in the early stages of the plan period. |
| 1050 | <p>The wording of the policy could be more simply explained as follows:</p> <p>"Between 2008 and 2026 the Council will seek to deliver high quality housing in lines with RSS Policy L4 and the spatial distribution framework set by RSS Policies MCR1, MCR2 and MCR3 by:</p> <p>a) Releasing sufficient land to accommodate a minimum of 11,800 new dwellings net of clearance between 2008 and 2026. This includes an uplift of 20% on the RSS Policy L4 minimum (578) from 2008 to 2018 to accommodate the Housing Growth Point status.</p> <p>B) Phasing the release of land to accommodate:</p> <p>1,600 new dwellings between 2008/9 and 2010/11 (533 per annum) 4,000 new dwellings between 2011/12 and 2015/16 (800 per annum) 3,300 new dwellings between 2016/17 and 2020/21 (660 per annum) 2,900 new dwellings between 2021/22 and 2025/26 (580 per annum)</p> |
| 1050 | L1.5 states that "Table 1 demonstrates that a significant element (42%) will be concentrated within the Regional Centre and Inner Areas of the Borough in line with RSS." It is considered that L1.5 should be deleted from the policy and included in the explanatory text. RSS does not make reference to any particular percentage of development that should be achieved in the Regional Centre and Inner Areas. The 42% is based solely on Table L1. Although many of the sites listed in Table L1 relate to allocations there is an element of the estimated housing supply that is based on windfall. There is therefore no guarantee that 42% would be achieved. |
| 1050 | L1.6 sets out the priority for the use of the land. The redevelopment of previously developed land in preference of greenfield land is supported. However the wording of the proposed policy does not reflect the wording in the Policy DP4 of the RSS. Guidance in PPS3 and the RSS encourage the re-use of previously developed land but there is no guidance to suggest that derelict, vacant or under-used land should be used as a priority over other previously developed land. |
| 1050 | <p>It is considered that L1.4 should be broken into 2 sections and worded as follows:</p> <p>Distribution Priority should be given to developments in locations consistent with the Spatial Strategy set out in Chapter 4.</p> <p>Use of existing resources To ensure that the indicative 80% target proportion of new housing provision to use previously developed land and buildings set out in RSS is achieved, development should accord with the following sequential approach:</p> |

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>a) First using existing buildings (including conversion) and previously developed land.</p> <p>b) Second using other suitable infill opportunities within settlements, where compatible with other development plan policies</p> <p>c) Third the development of other land where this is well located in relation to housing jobs, other services and infrastructure and which complies with other policies in the development plan.</p> |
| 1055 | <p>When considering the national planning policy basis for the supply of land for housing, it is considered that the housing figures set out in Table L1 to be too site specific. For example, the 900 units identified within the Trafford Wharfside Strategic Location directly relate to two specific sites identified in the Trafford SHLAA (June 2009) - 1450 Victoria Warehouse (400 units) and site 1609 Wharfside, Trafford Park (500 units). So despite the Spatial Profile stating that Trafford Wharfside as a whole is to be the focus for sustainable residential development, just 2 sites in single ownership have been identified in this location to deliver housing until 2026. In effect by including the specific targets for each Strategic Location in Table L1, the Core Strategy has introduced a series of Strategic Sites, which requires a substantial set of criteria to be fulfilled.</p> <p>It is questionable whether Table L1 in its current form is the most appropriate for the Core Strategy and suggest that the parameters for broad locations should be introduced rather than a direct correlation between individual sites contained within the June 2009 SHLAA which is to be updated on a regular basis in any case. The emerging Trafford Park Masterplan would appear to be the most appropriate forum for the analysis of Trafford Park and its environs in respect of the potential for alternative uses such as residential to be introduced on individual sites.</p> |
| 1070 | <p>There is concern that Trafford appears to be committed to an uplift of 20% to its minimum housing target set out in RSS Policy L4. Table L1 shows a Policy L1 allocation total of 11,800 units compared to a total of 9300 units in the comparable table in the Preferred Options (July 2008) document albeit the latter figure seems to be for 2 years less. A significant cause of the higher figure is the 20% voluntary uplift in the housing target. Furthermore Table L1 shows that all of this increase of 2500 units from the July 2008 document is to be built on 'Other South City Region Sites' which is to provide 33% of the total units. The Spatial Strategy sets out the Councils priorities in line with the RSS for the North West and Table 1 accommodates all these priority sites (or Strategic Locations as they are described) but it still leaves 33% of the total to be built in the South City Region. It is considered that this results in the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council is not following properly the spatial planning framework set out in RSS for the North West. 2. There will be immense pressure to release sites or units in places which are not priority areas as described in the Spatial Strategy so that the character and appearance of places such as Bowdon will be threatened. We trust that the various guidelines will be adequate to protect the Conservation Areas but it is these and areas around them which together make up the character of places such as Bowdon and which are an asset to Trafford which could be destroyed. <p>If the Council cannot find, as it would appear from the document, sufficient units within the Strategic Locations to accommodate the voluntary uplift of 20% then we consider that the voluntary uplift should be abandoned.</p> |
| 1073 | <p>Over 1,000 dwellings are to be located within the Trafford Centre Rectangle, and although this is a 'third priority' location in terms of locating development, this location aims to deliver almost 10% of the housing provision across the Core Strategy (Table L1). A development quantum of 1,000 dwellings in a location close to the SRN causes some concern, and therefore requires sound transport evidence to support the development aspirations at this location.</p> |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1073 | In addition 3,900 dwellings out of the 11,800 total are to be delivered in 'Other South City Region Sites', although locations are not specified within the document, these sites do not appear to be located within Strategic Sites or Strategic Locations, therefore they will have to be delivered in other areas across the Borough. Work will continue to be carried out with Trafford to ensure that any sites which emerge to accommodate these dwellings are sustainable and do not impact on the operation and safety of the SRN predominantly through the planning and pre-application and application process. Large scale housing developments close to the SRN which may impact upon the SRN should be discouraged, unless it is demonstrated within the supporting evidence base, that the impact on the SRN can be minimised through the use of sustainable modes. In addition there should be stronger links between Core Policy L1 and the delivery of housing outside of the Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations as this may trigger (depending upon scale and location) a review of the Local Infrastructure Plan, to ensure these new sites can be delivered sustainably. The mechanism for such a review needs identifying in the LIP reflected in the Core Policies. |
| 1073 | It is pertinent to comment that the Core Strategy review identified a shortfall in housing proposed at the Strategic Sites and Locations when compared to the numbers proposed in the RSS. This shortfall of 3,900 is significant in scale; need to ensure that the SHLAA addresses this shortfall, with any proposed large housing sites supported by sustainable transport measures. |
| 1076 | We support the ensurance that 80% of new housing provision will come from brownfield land as set out in RSS. |
| 1076 | It is considered that the exceptional circumstances described in L1.8 should only be considered as a last resort and not as an option. |
| 1078 | The table is based on a flawed SHLAA (see comments on SHLAA) and grossly exaggerates the deliverable and developable housing land supply. Specifically it makes inflated assumptions about the capacity of sites and the delivery of completions, especially the Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations. Many of those sites are subject to significant constraints and the claimed capacities must assume high density development for which there is no market and no finance available, at least in the short to medium term. High numbers of apartments would also be at odds with the SHMA which identifies a need for more traditional family housing. |
| 1078 | The wording of sub paragraph L1.2 should be strengthened to give a clear and explicit commitment to meeting the minimum housing requirements set out in the RSS, plus a 20% uplift for growth over the period 2008 to 2018 as a result of the Growth Point initiative. |
| 1078 | The proposed phasing is sub- paragraph L1.2 is not explained or justified. In the absence of any special justification, the housing requirement for the first three years should be 2080 (3x694) not 1600. |
| 1078 | The plan should set out a mechanism for addressing any shortfall in housing land supply, including a trigger level (e.g. less than 6 years supply) and the approach to be taken to bringing other sites forward earlier. This will provide necessary transparency and certainty. |
| 1089 | The sequential approach to the release of land for housing in L1.6 requires flexibility so that a balance can be struck between the delivery of the housing requirements and the sequential priorities of the borough. The policy should include provision for flexibility when the minimum housing numbers are not being delivered. The application of this policy and the need for flexibility to deliver the housing numbers should be informed by regular liaison with the house building industry. The need for liaison with the house building industry should be reflected in paragraph 6.13. |
| 1093 | Would like to state the importance of using previously developed/brownfield land and the re-use of existing buildings is encouraged by RSS policy DP4. It is noted that the Core Strategy has highlighted this and that the majority of the local/smaller sites which are identified are previously developed which is in line with DP4. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1093 | The use of previously developed land is also needed within the inner areas where the majority of development should be focussed. |
| 1093 | In terms of Policy L1 note the use of the word minimum. L1.2 states that the Strategy is seeking to accommodate a minimum of 11,800 new dwellings, whilst it is recognised that the area has been identified as a Growth Point, and therefore there is some 'pressure' to develop above the RSS figures, would like to emphasise that the RSS does not express the provision figures as minimum. The supporting text clearly states that the figures are not absolute targets and may be exceeded. However similarly the same paragraph says that some areas will achieve lower levels in earlier years (para 7.19). This approach is comfortable with RSS, however RSS in itself does not specify that the figures are minimum. It states that Local Authorities should seek to achieve the housing provision set out in Table 7.1 (Policy L4) and that the annual average figures may be exceeded where justified (para 7.19). In relation to the RSS therefore there is no requirement to express the provision as a minimum and if the figures are to be minimum it will be important to demonstrate that they will be deliverable on that basis. |
| 1093 | Table L1, which supports the policy also raises some concern. Clearly the RSS directs residential development to the Regional Centre (as part of mixed use employment schemes) and the inner areas. The policy in relation to the southern part of the city region (which includes those parts of Trafford outside of the Regional Centre and Inner Areas is for residential development that supports local regeneration strategies and to meet identified local needs. The table shows a much higher proportion of residential development in the South City region area as opposed to the regional centre and the inner areas. |
| 1120 | Acknowledge the objectives set out at Table 1 'Strategic Options' and Policy L1 (Land for new homes), Policy L2 (Meeting Housing Needs) and Policy R5 (Open Space and Recreation). |
| 1129 | The mix of uses to be brought forward within Strategic Locations, particularly those within the North of the Borough, should be determined having regard to potential impacts on regeneration priorities within Trafford, adjoining areas and the wider City-Region. |
| 1135 | Concern that too much conversion/sub division will alter the character of some areas, there is already too much of this in Bowdon, or in other areas give rise to tenements rather than high quality housing. There should be control over such use. |
| 1135 | Whilst it is agreed that brownfield sites should be used do not want any more large gardens of old properties turned into high density housing, this has already blighted parts of the Borough. This should be strictly limited as an exception rather than a rule. |
| 1144 | Support L1 |
| 1145 | It is important to protect Trafford's existing Town Centres and therefore the Plan should state clearly that the land around the Trafford Centre where it's proposed to develop housing, will not be designated a "Town Centre". Also there should be a higher percentage of affordable properties built in this area. |
| 1152 | The policy sets out the scale and distribution of new housing development. In terms of scale the policy identifies that up to 2016 the Council will seek to deliver high quality housing in line with RSS Policy L4 i.e. 11,800 new dwellings including a 20% uplift (until 2018) on the RSS Policy L4 minimum to accommodate the housing growth point status. This part of the policy is supported as the Altair scheme is considered both developable and deliverable in accordance with PPS3. This site constitutes previously developed land in a highly sustainable location and as a result can make a valuable contribution towards Trafford's housing requirements. |
| 1152 | Policy L1 seeks to direct significant new housing development to certain locations/sites and this is set out in Table L1. The table demonstrates that a significant proportion will be directed to the Strategic Location, which for Altrincham Town Centre comprises 250 units to be provided within the plan period. Support is also given to this approach and it is worth noting that the Councils draft SHLAA forecasts 150 residential units to be provided at Altair. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - L3

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1013 | Support the concept of reducing inequalities. There is some concern that the reduction of inequalities appears only to refer to appropriate regeneration of disadvantaged communities. This in itself is imperative. However, the reduction of inequalities can only take place if there is sufficient redistribution of resources; otherwise the gaps will remain and could conceivably worsen even if limited improvement takes place in disadvantaged areas. Would like to see a more implicit indication that sufficient local authority resources for effective regeneration will be targeted on those areas with greatest need. |
| 1026 | <p>Partington is effectively at the end of a cul-de-sac and its regeneration is primarily linked to land allocated for residential development and associated improvements to its shopping centre. There are no employment proposals proposed as part of the regeneration and there is no possibility of improving highway and public transport access to the area.</p> <p>Carrington and its redevelopment as a mixed use sustainable community holds the key to the successful regeneration of Partington because the scale and mix of the proposed uses at Carrington can be delivered with the associated infrastructure improvements, community benefits, access to green space and the improved public transport connections.</p> |
| 1028 | Why is reference made to 'the provision of further cultural facilities' in Old Trafford but not Sale West and Partington? |
| 1047 | The Policy is intended to regenerate disadvantaged communities and reduce inequalities in accordance with Strategic Objective SO2. However rather than supporting and encouraging regeneration as suggested in L3.1, the rest of the Policy imposes additional information requirements on developers wanting to build in these areas. Some of these requirements (e.g. L3.6) are not expressed very clearly. It is suggested that the policy requires substantial revision to positively encourage the types of development from which the regeneration areas would benefit, rather than adding to the burden of information on prospective developers. |
| 1050 | Policy L3 relates to regeneration areas and inequalities. The identified areas have been recognised as in need of regeneration for a number of years. The key issue in the regeneration areas is ensuring private investment that will provide investor confidence and encourage others to also invest in these areas. Investors and developers need encouragement to do this. |
| 1050 | Our concern with Policy L3 is that it is too restrictive and will discourage developers from investing and developing in this area. |
| 1050 | The Policy sets out the Councils support for the regeneration of the Old Trafford, Partington and Sale West areas as a priority but then goes on to set a number of criteria which must be met for development to be acceptable. Para L3.2 of the policy is not precisely worded and is open to misinterpretation. It is also very restrictive to the types of development that will be allowed in the regeneration areas. For example the intension of the policy seems to be to restrict new development in Old Trafford to new housing, commercial, cultural and community facilities. This should be deleted from the policy. |
| 1050 | Paragraph L3.3 states that in 7 further locations, developers will be required to demonstrate how their proposal addresses and reduces inequalities. This is non specific and it is not clear what is being asked of the developer in order to show that inequalities would be reduced by a proposed development. Further information should be set out either within the Policy or the explanatory text. |
| 1050 | L3.6 states that where a development proposal outside an identified regeneration area would be required to provide facilities that would also be of significant benefit to one or more of the identified regeneration areas, this would be a material consideration in the determination of the application. The purpose and intension of this paragraph is not clear |

| | |
|------|---|
| | and it is not clear to what circumstances it relates. Furthermore, there is no explanation of what is considered to be a 'significant benefit'. |
| 1050 | The Policy states that it is the intention to prepare supplementary planning documents and development briefs for each of the identified areas. In the absence of these development briefs, it would be very difficult to show how these criteria can be achieved. It is considered that the information in L3.7 would be more appropriately set out in supplementary planning documents once these have been prepared. |
| 1073 | Encouraged by Trafford's intention to regenerate deprived areas, this should not be at the expense of unsustainable land allocations being brought forward with inappropriate or insufficient infrastructure. |
| 1073 | Encouraged that Core Policy L3 aims to improve access to employment opportunities and community facilities. Access should be improved by focusing on or promoting sustainable modes of travel in the first instance. |
| 1129 | The mix of uses to be brought forward within Strategic Locations, particularly those within the North of the Borough, should be determined having regard to potential impacts on regeneration priorities within Trafford, adjoining areas and the wider City-Region. |
| 1130 | Affordable homes must be a priority for the Authority and it is pleasing to see that points L2 and L3 have identified that. |
| 1145 | The Old Trafford Neighbourhood area - There is an improved need for youth and community facilities. |
| 1145 | Stretford Neighbourhood Renewal area - need for improved youth and community facilities. |
| 1145 | Town Centre shops need redeveloping as a matter of urgency. There is a real need to develop a better mix of Social/Private housing. A comprehensive strategy is needed to address the isolation of Partington (road and public transport) More job opportunities need to be created for the people of Partington. |
| 1145 | In the Urmston Neighbourhood area there is a need for youth and community facilities |
| 1145 | Needs to be much more emphasis on the Borough's more deprived areas such as Sale West, Sale Moor, Lostock, Broadheath, Old Trafford, Partington, Lostock, Broomwood. There should be improved environment, youth, leisure, education, health, community facilities, jobs and support for those neighbourhoods. |
| 1145 | There is a lack of youth facilities in Old Trafford, Stretford, Lostock, Urmston, Flixton, Davyhulme, Sale and other areas of the Borough. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - W1

| W1 | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1013 | There should be more encouragement for small scale enterprise, dispersed across the Borough. Focusing on major employment sites is contrary to sustainability principles and leads to more travel over greater distances. To develop small scale industries in residential areas is a more sustainable pattern of living. |
| 1026 | Support for the identification of sufficient quality and choice of land to deliver new employment land, however the spatial distribution of employment land should be more closely aligned to the provision of land for housing where possible, and areas such as Carrington to be identified for mixed use development. |
| 1031 | This policy will need to be informed by the GM Employment Land Study, which will examine how to apportion the RSS employment land requirement. The policy should indicate the proposed distribution of employment land and state the percentage of the overall requirement across the Borough. |
| 1035 | Support for the protection and enhancement of leisure and cultural facilities through Policy W1 which recognises that creative industries are an important growth area. |
| 1045 | Policy W1 needs to detail how employment uses are defined and how this policy should |

| | |
|------|--|
| | be read against the Strategic Sites and Locations section. |
| 1045 | Support for the list of economic growth sectors to focus economic development. |
| 1045 | There is a need to provide clarification as to how land uses identified within the key economic sectors, that do not fall within the employment uses listed in the Use Classes Order, can be justified in the Strategic Locations. |
| 1045 | Support the wider range of economic uses in the Strategic Locations. |
| 1045 | Section W1.10, detailing steps for the development of alternative uses on existing employment sites, needs clarification as to what uses would be determined as “alternative uses”. This section of the Policy appears to be in conflict with sections W1.3 and W1.6 and the broader range of uses within the Strategic Locations section. |
| 1047 | Additional work is needed to quantify the Borough’s employment land requirement in the context of the sub-regional requirement for Greater Manchester as set out in the RSS. |
| 1047 | The contribution of housing and employment land requirements detailed in the Strategic Sites needs to be assessed and quantified. The submission draft should state the balance between numbers of residential units and hectares of employment land in each of the Strategic Sites. |
| 1047 | It is noted that the Employment Land Study details there is sufficient supply of sites without the need to retain Davenport Green, additionally it should be noted that the site has been removed from the NWDA’s list of strategic regional sites |
| 1055 | Support expressed for the inclusion of Wharfedale, Trafford Park Core and Trafford Centre Rectangle as Strategic Locations for the focus of economic activity. |
| 1064 | Disappointment voiced that the Core Strategy contains no aspiration to either improve access to/from the airport or to take advantage of the proximity of the airport which would enable the Borough to capitalise on the economic activity arising from having a major gateway airport on its boundary. In that respect it is considered that the Core Strategy is still rather inward looking and does not fully reflect emerging thinking for the Manchester City Region and the case for sustainable economic growth arising out of such work as the Manchester Independent Economic Review (MIER). Both of these see the airport as one of the major assets of Greater Manchester and with considerable potential to stimulate economic activity which is even more pressing given the current economic conditions. Trafford is extremely well placed to accommodate both our intermediate supply chain activities and also those activities which find it necessary or beneficial to be located very close to a major international airport. |
| 1064 | The work relating “Airport City” has now been progressed further and has confirmed that a significant opportunity exists for a major air freight logistics operation. This was first set out in the Airport’s Masterplan 2030 and through previous consultation responses to Trafford’s Core Strategy. The LDF process should consider the allocation of land for this type of strategic economic development. This type of development has to be a ‘near airport’ location, with suitable convenient access to the Airport site. |
| 1064 | A representation was made to the NWDA, as part of its recent Review of Strategic Sites, to designate the Airport and its environs as a designated Strategic Site and had expected the future of Davenport Green to be part of this. The NWDA are conducting a review into new sites and these two streams of work should be brought together. |
| 1072 | The Employment Land Study does not form a robust and credible evidence base. |
| 1073 | Policy W1.9 should include – sites that are accessible by a range of alternative modes other than the private car. |
| 1093 | It is noted that the Regional Centre will be the primary economic driver and the focus for retail, culture and tourism, in accordance with MCR2. |
| 1093 | The Proposed approach of 6 areas of economic growth in Trafford is broadly consistent with RSS policies W1 and MCR5; however the approach does include some dispersed development in smaller settlements, which need to be justified in terms of delivery to ensure general conformity with RSS. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1093 | The Policy recognises the importance of improving the Borough's economic performance, reducing unemployment levels and diversifying employment opportunities, which conforms with RSS Policy W1. |
| 1100 | There is a need to define terms such as economic activity and economic development, which are not defined in RSS. RSS currently defines some, but not all, of the terms used in its glossary. |
| 1100 | "Bad neighbour industries" do not have a formal definition, and the environmental control attached to certain of these 'non standard' economic uses, such as modern waste to energy plants, would avoid any material harm to amenity. |
| 1100 | Policy W1 only considers industrial, commercial, warehousing and storage uses associated with Manchester Airport. There is insufficient reference to the importance of Manchester Airport as an economic driver, given its proximity to the Borough. |
| 1100 | There is a need to justify the case for not carrying forward the UDP Policy E15 – which relates to Carrington providing land for off-airport car parking, passenger and baggage terminal facilities and airfreight handling facilities for Manchester Airport. Trafford Employment Study states that the potential of Carrington to attract high profile uses is complemented by its proximity to Manchester Airport, therefore it should retain specific reference to airport-related uses. |
| 1100 | There is a need to revisit Policy W1 and Carrington Strategic Location to address the potential of airport-related development. |
| 1129 | The Core Strategy should make it clear (at 14.7) that PPS6 considerations apply within strategic locations outside of the Regional Centre or town centres and that such uses should be highly accessible by a choice of transport modes and should only play a secondary or supporting role. |
| 1129 | The mix of uses to be brought forward within Strategic Locations, particularly those within the North of the Borough, should be determined having regard to potential impacts on regeneration priorities within Trafford, adjoining areas and the wider City-Region. |
| 1146 | Support for the decision to not roll forward the UDP allocation for a high amenity employment site at Davenport Green in to the LDF. |
| 1150 | Support for the decision to not roll forward the UDP allocation for a high amenity employment site at Davenport Green in to the LDF. |
| 1150 | The policy lacks safeguards for Davenport Green, given that Airport expansion is likely to be the biggest threat to this area. The absence of a summary of RSS Policy RT5 makes it impossible to make a more informed objection. |
| 1152 | The content of Policy W1 is supported. It is important to guide economic regeneration and development in such locations as Altrincham town centre in order to assist growth of the City Region. Altair is specifically recognised as one of the most important regeneration sites in Altrincham town centre and represents an opportunity to enhance the town centre's viability and contribute towards Altrincham's role as a sub-regional centre. The mixed use regeneration of the site will encourage shoppers and business to Altrincham. |
| 1165 | The economic growth sectors as identified in W1.3, should be expanded to include retail and leisure development – in accordance with draft PPS4. |

Further consultation on Core Policies (Nov 2009) responses - W1

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1026 | Policy does not consider the wider sustainability criteria for employment uses and the opportunity that exists to create a mixed use sustainable community at Carrington. It continues to see Carrington as a purely employment allocation. The policy does not recognise the major brownfield mixed use sustainable opportunity in Carrington. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1031 | It is unclear how the policy accords with PPS6 as regards the location of new office development. B1 uses are said to be focused in the Regional Centre (Pomona and Wharfside) and the Town Centres. Whilst RSS policy MCR2 says that the Regional Centre of the Manchester City Region should continue to develop as the primary driver providing the main focus for business, retail, leisure, culture and tourism development in the City Region, this needs to be read in the context provided by PPS6 which identifies offices as a town centre use. Office proposals will need to be consistent with national policy in terms of the need for development and the sequential approach. |
| 1031 | Not clear the extent to which office developments would take place in other locations outside the Regional Centre listed in W1.3., for example at Trafford Centre Rectangle. The Policy will need to be clear how the proposals are consistent with PPS6. |
| 1031 | Concerns in regards to delivery of strategic locations. It is assumed that this information is being set out else where in the Core Strategy. There needs to be sufficient evidence to show in principle that the proposals for strategic locations are capable of being delivered. It would need to be demonstrated that the infrastructure could in all probability be provided and that there are probable and timely solutions to any concerns. More detailed delivery information would need to be set out in subsequent DPD dealing with the allocation of sites. |
| 1045 | Objects to the proposed removal of the reference to the key economic growth sectors (W1.3) as this reference was much broader than the currently proposed B1, B2, and B8. |
| 1045 | Object to the proposed wording of Policy W1 in particular the proposed distribution and allocation of employment land contained within Table W1 on the basis that the justification and assumptions used to determine these figures are unclear. It is suggested that further information be made available with regard to how these figures have been arrived at with reference to the evidence base. |
| 1045 | Reiterate concern with regard to the proposed paragraph W1.5 (formerly W1.10) and the policy hurdle created for developing alternative uses on existing employment sites. Maintain previous objection to the use of the tests set out in paragraph W1.5 which contradict the Core Strategy's aspiration for a broader range of uses to be brought forwarding the Strategic Locations [sic]. |
| 1047 | Welcome the inclusion of Table W1 in the policy. |
| 1047 | It is noted that Table W1 relates to the supply of land for 'B' uses. The supporting text at para. 5.7 however, refers to the wider range of 'town centre uses' as identified in PPS6, adding that proposals for such uses will be determined in the context of the tests set out in PPS6. Whilst these uses provide employment opportunities, many of them (leisure, entertainment, arts and tourism) fall outside Use Classes B1, B2 and B8. Suggest para. 5.7 is amended to explain that such uses, where permitted, will not be treated as contributing towards the employment land figures in Table W1. |
| 1051 | Support the approach proposed in particular the reference to spatial locations in Policy W1 and the identified Strategic Locations and Sites identified in Part D and the sites identified through the forthcoming Land Allocations DPD. |
| 1051 | Concern about Employment Land Study as this has not been the subject of any formal consultation and contains incorrect information – specifically in respect of land owned by the National Trust at Broadheath as investment land for disposal at the appropriate time. The detailed information on which Table 1 is based is inaccurate, being based on incorrect assumptions, and has not been the subject of proper scrutiny. |
| 1064 | Welcome the recognition of the role and importance of the Airport in the Trafford economy through additions to both the policy wording of W1 and the supporting text, particularly paragraph 5.8. |
| 1064 | Concern regarding work carried out to identify the locally derived employment land needs of Trafford (a 'bottom up approach') this seems to close the door on the prospect of economic development that is part of a wider sub-regional, or even regional objectives (a 'top down approach'). The bullet points in para. 1.4 of policy W1 should be altered to allow the prospect of such a site within the Borough with the inherent wider benefits and |

| | |
|------|---|
| | effects. |
| 1072 | This policy purports to show how the Council will meet the need, identified in RSS and the GM Employment Land Statement for some 170 hectares of land for employment in the period 2021. Factually this appears to be incorrect in that Table W1 only shows 128 hectares as available for development in this period; the balance of 62 hectares is available after 2021 so cannot count towards the requirement for 170 hectares. |
| 1072 | Policy fails to address the objectives which it is designed to achieve for the city region. |
| 1072 | Policy fails to relate the sites identified to particular sectors of activity or types of investment. |
| 1072 | Para W1.3 indicates that “the detail of the employment uses within these places is shown in Table W1”. Table W1 makes no reference at all to employment use types. |
| 1072 | Similarly para 5.6 (Justification) states: “The range of activities to be prioritised and encouraged in each of the Strategic Locations is summarised below”. No such summary is provided. |
| 1072 | Reference is also made (in para 5.6) to the Strategic Locations section of the Plan, but, in relation to Pomona, Wharfside and Altrincham town centre (the three locations/sites identified for office uses) the Plan merely indicates a possible floor area of B1 use. There is therefore no evidence of how the sites identified will meet a variety of employment uses other than in very broad use classes. |
| 1072 | The present consultation (para 5.5) dismisses Davenport Green as an employment site on the ground that the Council has a sufficient supply of suitable and developable employment sites to meet the requirement for 170 hectares. However this finding is not justified; assessment of the candidate sites (for example at Appendix D of the Employment Land Study) has not evaluated sites in terms of their scale, quality and location, to meet different sectors of demand in the market. The sites identified in Policy W1 appear to be justified purely on supply side grounds (they are available and the Council wants to see them developed) without any interrogation of the potential supply from the perspective of the market. Demand is only considered by reference (para 5.4) to a list of growth sectors; the requirements of these sectors or of different types of firm within these sectors are not considered. This is the very unsure foundation on which the Council reaches its “sufficient supply” conclusion and on which it dismisses Davenport Green. |
| 1072 | Specifically in relation to Altrincham town centre there are considerable discrepancies between the allocations shown in different documents: 1.the present Consultation shows a total of 10 hectares for employment use 2.the Trafford Employment Land Study (May 2009) shows 2.99 hectares of employment land 3. The Strategic Locations section of the Plan/Core Strategy (29/06/09) shows 10,000 sq.m of office development in the town centre. Such discrepancies raise serious doubts about the soundness of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. This is important as the land in Altrincham is the only land identified in the south of the Borough/conurbation, where the demand is concentrated. |
| 1072 | In relation to the ambitious objectives for economic development, there is a lack of any site that is capable of competing for regionally, nationally or internationally mobile investment, the class of investment that would be capable of delivering net additional employment and economic activity i.e. contributing to the growth of the City Region. This omission is confirmed by the fact that the Council has not identified any of the sites in Policy W1 as Locations for Regionally Significant Economic Development (RSS Policy W2). |
| 1072 | The Council makes some acknowledgement of the role of industrial, commercial, warehousing and storage development in association with Manchester Airport, but only in the Justification (para 5.8). It states that the appropriateness of proposals will be determined in relation to the provisions of RSS Policy RT5. This latter policy opens with recognition of the economic driver role of the Airport: “Plans and strategies should |

| | |
|------|--|
| | support the economic activity generated and sustained by the Region's airports, in particular, the importance of Manchester Airport as a key economic driver for the North of England..." It refers to the need for Manchester Airport to prepare a Master Plan, which has already been done and which shows an arc of development to the north of the Airport including Davenport Green as a development site. |
| 1072 | Suggest that part of the Justification (para 5.8) be made part of the Policy W1 itself as it is a new line of policy and not a justification for what is in the Policy. |
| 1072 | Pomona Island was not considered in the site assessments which supported the Employment Land Study (Appendix D), however it is considered in Policy W1 as a focus for employment uses, with 8,000 sq m of office space proposed (p.89 of the Core Strategy Further Consultation). There is therefore concern that the site has not been subject to an appropriately rigorous assessment. |
| 1072 | Para W1.3 in relation to Trafford Park refers to the need to improve the public transport infrastructure to link the location with surrounding residential and commercial areas. This has been a concern for at least 25 years and it has not been addressed satisfactorily in spite of the area having been the subject of a very successful Urban Development Corporation investment and development programme. This demonstrates again the inconsistent treatment of sites in that, in para 23.10 of the Core Strategy Further Consultation Final Report, Davenport Green is dismissed (amongst other factors) because "It is in an inaccessible location with limited public transport access"; there is no recognition of the public transport measures that would be delivered through a s.106 agreement by the developer and which have been agreed with the Council. |
| 1073 | The transformation of the industrial storage and distribution units should benefit the whole of Trafford. The aspiration to improve the transport infrastructure, particularly in relation to the improvements that would facilitate more integrated and frequent services are supported. |
| 1073 | Any significant development proposed should be undertaken using a masterplan approach to ensure that public transport improvements are in place before new developments are occupied. |
| 1073 | The statement that allocation of employment land outside of the core areas would only be permitted where there is access to other modes of transport to the private car is supported. |
| 1073 | In Table W1 Carrington is identified as having the highest allocation of new employment land. There is concern over the development aspirations for Carrington due to its poor transport accessibility and the potential for adverse impact to arise at the SRN if the area is developed without infrastructure. Public transport infrastructure needs to be explicitly identified and phased in accordance with any development proposals at this site, to ensure that any impacts at the M60 are kept to a minimum. |
| 1093 | Welcome the inclusion of Table W1. |
| 1093 | Note that the policy is in line with RSS requirements in relation to the ELR. |
| 1093 | Further detail would be welcomed for Carrington and might be worth stating that the majority of the employment development would be storage and distribution in the policy. |
| 1093 | The inclusion of the statement on B1 uses in the regional centre and town centres is welcomed and in line with RSS Policies W3 & MCR2. |
| 1100 | W1.5 (previously W1.10) has now also been amended with the word "alternative" replaced by "non-employment uses". It is assumed that under this policy such non-employment uses are classed as anything other than B1, B2 and B8 and that this includes a waste management facility with ancillary energy production. An application for this form of development would therefore be subject to the criteria in W1.5. It is considered that this approach is fundamentally misguided. |
| 1100 | The North West RSS defines "employment uses" broadly as "any undertaking or use of land that provides paid employment". It is not accepted that it should be necessary to |

| | |
|------|--|
| | show that the site is not required for B1, B2 or B8 purposes, or that there are no suitable alternative sites for the proposed development, when the proposal would have the characteristics of an employment use in terms of appearance, economic benefits and environmental impact. |
| 1100 | The policy should explicitly state that waste treatment facilities are acceptable in principle on employment land. The Council may wish to qualify this by setting out the criteria which would be taken into account in looking at the suitability of individual locations. |
| 1100 | There are certain locations in which additional conventional power generation facilities might be acceptable on land identified as suitable for employment purposes, as has previously occurred in the Strategic Location of Carrington (SL8). It is therefore considered that the draft policy should be amended to set out how further proposals for economic development outside of the standard B1, B2 and B8 use classes will be assessed. |
| 1100 | Policy W1.6 (previously W1.11) does refer to “bad neighbour” industries albeit it under a heading “Hazardous Installations”. However, bad neighbour industry does not have a formal definition, and we would argue that the environmental controls attached to certain of these „non standard” economic uses, such as modern waste to energy plants, would avoid any material harm to amenity, thus making this approach inappropriate. |
| 1100 | While the policy has been amended since previous representations, it is not considered that it provides sufficient clarity for employment uses such as waste treatment facilities with ancillary energy production or for conventional power stations, which do not fall under the policies definition of “employment uses”. A degree of re-wording is therefore required to provide clarity on the issues raised. This is particularly the case as power generation facilities have already been deemed acceptable on employment land within the Strategic Location of Carrington and are not adequately covered by other Core Strategy policies. |
| 1150 | Object to the phrase “including development proposed to support economic activity associated with Manchester Airport”. Why is the airport specifically mentioned here? It’s outside the Trafford MBC boundary. This statement should say that any development proposals in TMBC’s area associated with Manchester Airport will not be given any special or exceptional treatment. Such wording would protect Trafford residents from the alarming spatial demands of an unrestrained, unregulated aviation industry. |
| 1150 | Davenport Green must be protected from any development which prevents it from being used for agriculture and/or horticulture (including allotments worked by people living locally). This would offset future loss of UK farmland to increased flood plains and/or rises in sea levels. |
| 1150 | This paragraph does not state that Manchester Airport is outside the TMBC boundary and within the Manchester City Council area. Nor is it clear whether it refers to airport proposals to and sited within the MCC boundary but adjacent to TMBC, or to airport proposals to be sited within TMBC’s boundary. This paragraph also seems to imply that whatever the Airport wants it will get, irrespective of the impact on nearby inhabitants. This paragraph should state that any airport related proposals will not receive any exceptional or special treatment, and that TMBC will protect its residents from the alarming spatial demands of an airport whose parent council seems to give it everything it demands (e.g. the recent Hasty Lane planning decision). |
| 1152 | It is important to guide economic regeneration and development in such locations including Altrincham Town Centre and represents an opportunity to enhance the town centres viability and contribute towards Altrincham’s role as a sub-regional centre. The mixed use regeneration of the site will encourage shoppers and businesses to Altrincham which will assist the local economy, provide local job opportunities and provide enhanced facilities for local people. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1189 | It is not considered that the planning policy framework has significantly changed since the adoption of the UDP in 2006 or that there has been a significant change in the need to provide employment sites within the borough that both meet both a local need, and a wider regional and sub-regional need. |
| 1189 | It is not considered that the identified supply of employment land is deliverable. Much of the land identified is subject to considerable constraints, and the supply has been significantly over-estimated. |
| 1189 | The identified supply of employment land (190ha) is heavily reliant upon the development of the Carrington site (75ha). This site is subject to numerous constraints, most notably contaminated land and flood risk. The deliverability of this site is seriously questionable. Additionally, this location is likely to be better suited to heavy industrial uses, and is an unattractive location for high quality employment land. |
| 1189 | The NWDA has removed the site from its list of strategic regional sites. However, it is understood that the decision to remove the site was made as part of a review driven by a reduction in funding. This, combined with a lack of development progress on the site, is the likely reason behind the omission of the site. |
| 1189 | It is noted that a number of proposed employment allocations are carried over from the UDP, despite failing to attract employment development since being designated. There is concern that these sites are rated at 5/5 for 'commercial viability' in the Employment Land Study, whilst Davenport Green scores just 1/5. This scoring is inaccurate, and there are concerns over the robustness of this element of the LDF evidence base. |
| 1189 | The Employment Land Study concludes at section 5.9 (2) that there is a general view that sites such as Davenport Green are attractive to the market for employment development. It is not considered that there are any existing constraints that could prevent the site coming forward for development. This finding is contrary to the 1/5 score the site receives in the same document for 'commercial viability'. |
| 1189 | Representations to previous stages of the Core Strategy have supported the continued allocation of Davenport Green. It is not considered that the omission of the site from the NWDA's list of strategic sites alters deliverability of the site, or its potential contribution to the regional and local economy. |
| 1189 | The proposed development at Davenport Green provides an opportunity to accommodate high quality employment land, preventing this potential displacement. Such displacement would lead to development pressures elsewhere, and could result in a need to release greenfield sites for industrial development. |
| 1189 | Development of the site would be accompanied by improvements to the transport infrastructure, and once developed would represent a highly accessible location. It is noted that previous UDP policies have taken this into account. |
| 1189 | The deliverability of the Council's Employment Land Study is questionable. It is also considered that the current employment land supply is unlikely to provide high quality employment land without displacing existing businesses. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - W2

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1031 | W2.13 is confusing. A plan-led approach is needed rather than relying on proposed floorspace additional to that committed in national policy. |
| 1031 | It is said that development proposals must be supported by a full range of PPS6 (or its replacement) assessments to ensure that any proposed development would not have a negative impact on surrounding areas. Given that the proposal is to identify a strategic area to accommodate a mix of uses including substantial retail development, this assessment should be carried out prior to the publication version of the plan so that its impact on surrounding town centres is clear. Again, a site will need to be identified and allocated via a subsequent DPD. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1035 | Support of policy which now includes cultural facilities as contributing towards the vitality of centres. |
| 1045 | Wording does not accurately reflect what is said in Policy W5 of RSS. There is no justification to adopt a more restrictive policy which should be revised accordingly. |
| 1045 | No justification for the Core Strategy to adopt a restrictive policy and draft policy W2.11 and the related para. 15.6 should be revised accordingly. |
| 1051 | Local centres must be clearly defined by name/location somewhere in the document. It is suggested that new retail and related facilities at Stamford Brook do constitute a Local Centre. |
| 1073 | Support for sequential nature of policy and is in accordance with government policy. |
| 1073 | Encouraged by the presumption of out-of-centre development as developments outside town centre are likely to impact the SRN. |
| 1082 | It is hoped that the DPD's being produced will not affect the significant contributions made already to vitality and viability in a negative way. |
| 1082 | Banks are important contributors to the visitation of town centres and play a critical role in underpinning town centres and the health of town centres. |
| 1082 | Development of Altrincham TC as the priority for development should be encouraged but the delivery of this aim will depend on major financial investment by private sector stakeholders, therefore planning policies should not discourage that investment. |
| 1082 | There is concern regarding the Retail and Leisure Study as a background document to core strategy which seems to reiterate "outmoded" thinking behind UDP policies on non-A1 usages within primary and secondary frontages. Object to use of SPD to control uses within frontages. Policy W2.9 makes brief reference of changes of use from A1, although with the absence of boundaries that the Land Allocations DPD will set out, it is not clear what form any policy will take. |
| 1082 | The percentage of usages within frontages appears to be the reaction to a "perceived concentration of non-retail A3-A5 uses" and does not appear to stem from perceptions of A2 uses. |
| 1082 | Policy SL13 requires development to "positively enhance the vitality and viability of town centres" but this is not compatible with seeking to limit other than A1 uses in prime shopping frontages. |
| 1082 | Greater encouragement should be given to financial services sector because of its contribution to the vitality and viability to town centres. |
| 1082 | There is concern that unjustified restrictions on A2 uses should not be continued in production of DPD's. Banks are subject to high levels of visitation. |
| 1082 | Banks have become more modern and more flexible in order to be sensitive to requirements of each building occupied. |
| 1082 | There is no planning reason to restrict presence of banks at ground floor level in shop frontages and the importance of banks should be reflected in the wording of the LDF. Policies should be clear that A2 uses will be appropriate uses in all shopping frontages and should allow flexibility in change of use from A1 to A2. |
| 1082 | Improvements to shopping provision should be met by improvements to financial services retailing. This can only assist in providing confidence and commercial viability necessary for a programme of regeneration and investment that the core strategy envisages. |
| 1082 | The core strategy should make it clear that A1 and A2 uses are appropriate in all shop frontages. |
| 1093 | It is noted that the Regional Centre will be the primary economic driver and the focus for retail, culture and tourism, in accordance with MCR2. |
| 1093 | Altrincham is identified as the primary focus for development in line with RSS and second priority for Urmston, Sale and Stretford. |
| 1106 | Support is made to the document which seeks to maintain and enhance Altrincham as the primary focus for development, followed by Sale, Urmston and Stretford. |
| 1140 | It is suggested supermarkets be replaced with independent shops. There's no |

| | |
|------|--|
| | greengrocer in Sale. |
| 1145 | It is important to protect Trafford's existing Town Centres and therefore the Plan should state clearly that the land around the Trafford Centre where it's proposed to develop housing, will not be designated a "Town Centre". Also there should be a higher percentage of affordable properties built in this area. |
| 1145 | It is suggested local shopping parades in Old Trafford be protected as they are the life blood of the community. |
| 1145 | Tesco land on Chester Road at the rear of the Stretford Leisure Centre should not be allowed to increase its present planning permission size of 48 000 sq ft. Anything above this would have a detrimental effect on Stretford TC and other town centres in the Borough. |
| 1145 | There is a need to protect the small shopping parades in communities. |
| 1145 | There is a need to protect small shopping parades in communities for example Altrincham and Sale |
| 1145 | Need to protect small shopping parades in communities. |
| 1145 | In Partington Town Centre shops need redeveloping as a matter of urgency |
| 1145 | In the Urmston Neighbourhood area there is a need for youth and community facilities |
| 1145 | Superstores should not be supported out of town centres. |
| 1145 | It is suggested the Council's Core Strategy recognise the value and contribution that local neighbourhood shopping makes to community wellbeing; these small concentrations perhaps as few as three shops together often with a shared forecourt are important. |
| 1145 | The Council needs to be more proactive in coming forward to take over vacant properties for community use in local shopping parades. |
| 1145 | The Core strategy should state the case for the balanced provision in locations of shopping parades. Identifying something exists is often the vital first step. |
| 1147 | Tesco would have a detrimental effect on Stretford Mall and the diversity of local shops and would encourage car usage away from Stretford TC which in turn increases congestion on the A56. Tesco should be part of redevelopment of Stretford Mall similar to development of Sainsbury's in Urmston. Land at Gorse Hill could then be used for sport excellence activities, which is more relevant to that area. |
| 1152 | The content of Policy W1 is supported. It is important to guide economic regeneration and development in such locations as Altrincham town centre in order to assist growth of the City Region. Altair is specifically recognised as one of the most important regeneration sites in Altrincham town centre and represents an opportunity to enhance the town centre's viability and contribute towards Altrincham's role as a sub-regional centre. The mixed use regeneration of the site will encourage shoppers and business to Altrincham. |
| 1152 | Support Altrincham as the primary town centre as a location where comparison retailing facilities should be encouraged and enhanced. |
| 1165 | The policy guidance for out of centre development set out in paras. W2.10 and W2.12 is objected to. PPS 4 emphasises and supports development that provides employment opportunities and achieves sustainable economic growth and should be considered in tests in accordance with PPS6. |
| 1165 | It is inappropriate to limit further development at Altrincham Retail Park and the borough's existing retail warehouse parks only where such sites are located in accessible mixed use areas. |
| 1165 | The limitation of goods sold should be left to the case for development against national PPS 1 and PPS 6 criteria. The text "any further development within the retail warehouse parks..." should be removed from para. W2.12 |
| 1166 | Para. W2.3 should be amended to state that: "Within these centres as a minimum there will be a focus on the consolidation and improvement of the convenience and comparison retail offer, with the potential to |

| | |
|------|---|
| | strengthen and enhance the retail offer where suitable, as well as diversification to other uses such as office, leisure, cultural and residential as appropriate". This approach will better maintain the strength, diversity, viability and vitality of the town centres. |
| 1167 | Para W2.13 should be amended to refer to a large superstore instead of a new food store to reflect the nature of the need and the terminology used in PPS6. In order to maintain consistency with policy SL4, the policy should also make clear that the superstore would be cross funding the redevelopment of LCCC. The last sentence should be deleted as it is unnecessary to refer to PPS 6, |
| 1169 | Questions robustness of RSS as it seems to restrict development in town centres. |
| 1169 | Improvements to the market in Altrincham are needed as other areas are better (e.g. Bury) |
| 1169 | There is concern regarding the fate of the market. It is suggested a "Friends of the Market" group should be set up. The Council should not to be too prescriptive about the Altrincham market until more is known about the hospital site. Whatever happens to the hospital site will impinge upon the market. |
| 1169 | Parking in Altrincham TC is poor which is affecting the main shopping centre. Large supermarkets are killing small businesses and the Council should subsidise small shops and TC should have a good mix of type of shops. |
| 1170 | How are towns, districts and local centres designated? Why are Partington, Ashton Village and Sale Moor excluded? |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - R3

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1026 | This policy is supported and discussions with the Council's Green Strategy team have explored the opportunity presented at Carrington for a mixed use development to open up the site but also the adjoining open land to link into the wider Green Strategy agenda in Trafford of linking the Mersey Valley through to Dunham Massey. |
| 1034 | The green infrastructure policy is very strong on the benefits of GI to wildlife and the link to enabling adaptation to climate change. |
| 1034 | The Open Space policy states the benefits of access to open space in improving the health and well being of people in the local community. This is particularly true of natural green space and especially woodland so it would be good to have a mention of health/well being benefits in the GI policy. |
| 1051 | A specific policy on climate change is welcomed. With regards to adaptation measures further consideration is required for impacts on specific areas such as nature conservation. |
| 1051 | The overall approach appears to accord with adopted RSS and adds an appropriate local dimension. |
| 1066 | The wording in para L5.11 to change to 'where it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effects on the natural environment' is welcomed. However an addition to the policy should be considered of the need for new developments to maintain links and provide space for habitats and species to adapt to climate change. |
| 1066 | The principles outlined under this policy are welcomed, in particular the prominence given to nature conservation and biodiversity. |
| 1066 | Since the Spatial Profile has the objective to explore opportunities for green roofs and tree planting in the Stretford area, it is suggested that these be included within the Development Requirements. |
| 1073 | The Policies will help to promote the use of cycle ways and greenways, which are more sustainable forms of travel resulting in less use of the private car to make journeys. |
| 1074 | The reference to the historic environment in Policy R3 and its justification are welcomed. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1093 | The inclusion and promotion of multi-functional green infrastructure network within the borough is welcomed. The policy is positive, and complies with most of RSS EM3 policy. |
| 1093 | The policy could do more to ensure the enhancement of functionality and accessibility. It would be useful if the policy linked to climate change and promoted the positive functionality of GI for example integrating sustainable design such as SUDs. RSS policies DP9 and EM5 emphasise the importance of this approach. |
| 1096 | The importance of GI is recognised and the development of GI networks is supported. These can help deliver a range of EA objectives including the Water Framework Directive, as well as wider community benefits. Identifying land as GI where there is a high level of flood risk (i.e. functional floodplain) will provide opportunities to mitigate against flooding and provision of additional compensatory flood storage. This may reduce flood risk at a strategic level and enable development to take place elsewhere. It is recommended that the findings of the SFRA are used to inform the issue of flood risk and GI. |
| 1145 | Any new development within the Borough should be augmented with tree and shrub planting, to improve our environment. |
| 1160 | Despite there being 4 Policies covering the topic of green spaces, not one of them mentions the intention to protect any of the smaller green open spaces under 2000sq metres, which are not currently protected under the UDP. It is understood that neither the Green Space Strategy, nor the Integrated Green Plan will mention them or protect them in any way. Yet these smaller green spaces are very vulnerable to development, despite them being essential for the environment and visual amenity. Currently and in the future, any planning application to build upon them will not be rejected, as no policy protects them, this is a serious oversight in the document. |
| 1180 | Another benefit of GI is sustainable transport links. 19.8 – It would be beneficial to specifically mention the Trans Pennine Trail and Bridgewater Canal here. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - R4

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1026 | Policy R4.6b suggests that land to the south of Shell will remain as Protected Open Land. Para. 20.15 states that the land could be used for employment use. Should be more certainty in the wording. Support the retention of the majority of the open land to the south of Carrington in long term employment but would like flexibility to accommodate Biomass plant on this site in the short term. |
| 1031 | It is unclear from R4.1 whether it is the intention to protect all Green Belt from inappropriate development. The policy only refers to 4 broad areas. |
| 1031 | It is understood that the Council no longer wishes to include Davenport Green in the NWDA's list of strategic sites for economic development. Is it proposed to add land at Davenport Green back into the Green Belt? |
| 1047 | Carrington is not designated as a strategic regional site by the NWDA. |
| 1047 | The strategies approach to farm diversification may need to be revised to reflect the more flexible approach advocated in the recent consultation draft PPS4. |
| 1047 | New consultation draft PPS4 states that planning authorities should 'support diversification for business purposes that are consistent in their scale and environmental impact with their rural location removing the current PPS7 requirement that farm diversification schemes should help to sustain the agricultural enterprise. |
| 1051 | It is especially welcomed in the latest document that the role of agriculture within the Borough is recognised and the need to look positively at opportunities for rural diversification (especially if viable uses are to be found for important historic and vernacular buildings in such areas. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1066 | The principles outlined in this policy are welcomed, in particular the prominence given to nature conservation and biodiversity. |
| 1073 | The content and aims of the Policy to protect Green Belt and other protected land is supported. Development in these locations/redesignation could impact upon the Strategic Road Network. |
| 1076 | The retention of the Green Belt is supported. Also, the protection of the Protected Open Land from development during the plan period (to 2026) and the recognition of the importance of the agricultural land in Warburton and Dunham, not only to the rural community of Trafford but also as a contributor to the nation's food supply - an issue of increasing importance. |
| 1076 | Paragraph 20.15 should read "land in Warburton" (south of Partington) as it does on page 76 (R4.6) as the land is in Warburton and should be recognised as such. |
| 1078 | Insufficient land has been identified within the Plan to meet requirements and provide flexibility/contingency. The land in Warburton immediately south of Partington was previously protected to provide a suitable reservoir of land outside the Green Belt to meet Trafford's housing needs post 2016. Its suitability for housing has therefore long been established and recent work undertaken by GMPTE confirms it is well located in relation to frequent bus services, underlining its sustainability credentials. Development here would also significantly assist the regeneration of Partington and lead to the creation of a more balanced and sustainable community. The land to the north of Moss Lane and east of Warburton Road should be excluded from the Protected Open Land and identified as a reserve housing site, which could be released in the event of a shortfall in deliverable housing supply. |
| 1097 | Substations are vital to the efficient operation of the electricity transmission network for switching circuits or transforming voltage. Both National Grids, Carrington and South Manchester substations are located in areas identified as Green Belt are an essential part of the transmission network and have an important role to play in maintaining the supply of electricity to the local distribution network operation and therefore ultimately to homes and businesses throughout Trafford and the wider area. The sites are therefore "Operational Land" and as outlined above there is a need for further essential utility development at the sites in the future. This essential development may need to take place outside National Grid's existing land holding and therefore permitted Development rights may not exist for extensions to the substations. It is therefore requested that both substations are identified as major development sites in the Green Belt. |
| 1114 | Policy R4 of the core strategy seeks to continue to protect the Green Belt in four broad areas; one of which is the area to the south of Hale and Bowdon to the Bollin Valley and the Greater Manchester County southern boundary. The general thrust of this policy direction is supported as it would accord with national guidance in PPG2. |
| 1114 | Policy R4 should be reconsidered in respect of Brooks Drive. Brooks Drive and Hasty Lane are the only residential roads in Hale Barns that are excluded from the settlement boundary and included in the Green Belt. The characteristics of Hale Barns are suburban and similar to a large part of Hale Barns. PPG2 states that Green Belt Boundaries should be carefully drawn so as not to include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. There is no requirement to keep Brooks Drive permanently open on the basis that it is already a ribbon of development. On this basis it is considered that Brooks Drive should be removed from the Green Belt. This would not comprise exceptional change to the Green Belt and would accord with the RSS. |
| 1114 | Should the Council consider that it is not appropriate to release Brooks Drive from the Green Belt then it should be washed over by the Green Belt on the basis that it comprises a ribbon development but identified in the development plan as an area in which limited infilling can take place in accordance with the text at 2.11 of PPG2. R2 should be amended to identify Brooks Drive and the policy should state that the first four |

| | |
|------|---|
| | categories of appropriate development set out at paragraph 3.4 if PPG2 would be acceptable along Brooks Drive. |
| 1130 | The term "unsuitable development" needs to be clearly defined within the core strategy and planning policy. |
| 1146 | The paragraph 20.9 that for the avoidance of doubt the land identified within the adopted UDP for a Major High Amenity employment site at Davenport Green will be retained within the Green Belt in accordance with Policy W1 of this plan is strongly supported. |
| 1150 | Support for the decision to not roll forward the UDP allocation for a high amenity employment site at Davenport Green in to the LDF. |
| 1150 | The policy lacks safeguards for Davenport Green, given that Airport expansion is likely to be the biggest threat to this area. The absence of a summary of RSS Policy RT5 makes it impossible to make a more informed objection. |
| 1150 | It is unclear if the 90 acres of Davenport Green which were removed from the Green Belt Status in the UDP for the purpose of becoming a Major High Amenity site are still proposed to remain outside the Green Belt. This would not be supported. The past decade of "boom" has not resulted in the site being developed and it is unlikely that the high quality client specified in the Planning Inspectors Report on the UDP will ever emerge. The Green Belt Integrity of Davenport Green must be restored and maintained not only because of its inherent quality as Green Belt but because of its use as a source of local food production. |
| 1158 | The policy should allow for local detailed boundary changes where it would support development that meets specific local need. Providing development close to existing urban areas and in areas of need is likely to prove to be the most sustainable way of achieving the Core Strategies wider objectives and in supporting regeneration. |
| 1158 | Flexibility to amend the Green Belt boundary to allow for new affordable housing is essential. Development of affordable housing on sites of sufficient size is more likely to be successful in the current housing market than piecemeal provision of smaller sites. |
| 1160 | Despite there being 4 Policies covering the topic of green spaces, not one of them mentions the intention to protect any of the smaller green open spaces under 2000sq metres, which are not currently protected under the UDP. They will not be mentioned in either the Green Space Strategy or the Integrated Green Plan or protected in any way. Yet these smaller green spaces are very vulnerable to development, despite them being essential for the environment and visual amenity. Currently and in the future, any planning application to build upon them will not be rejected, as no policy protects them, this is a serious oversight in the document. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - R6

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1028 | The Policy needs to refer to Leisure Management review as detailed in the Cultural Strategy Action Plan and the Leisure Management Review July 2009. |
| 1028 | Please amend wording from 'The introduction of accessible cultural facilities can play a role....' to 'The introduction of accessible cultural facilities play a significant role....' Please also add 'in particular those of increasing participation, reducing crime, promoting learning.....' |
| 1035 | Policy supported as provides protection and enhancement for leisure and culture. Policy will support improvements and expansion to the cultural offer. |
| 1045 | Paragraph 22.3 should include a reference to the Trafford Centre as a major visitor attraction to provide for consistency with wording of draft Policy R6 |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1051 | Whilst the inclusion of Dunham Massey as a cultural and tourism resource is welcomed it is noted that, as per earlier submissions, the significance is wider than just the Hall and Registered Park and Garden. Rather it encompasses the significance of the wider agricultural estate (including related buildings) and the ownership interests in the settlements of Dunham Town and Dunham Woodhouses, as well as related features such as the Mill at Bollington, the Estate Office in Altrincham and woodland areas. |
| 1074 | Policy supported and reference made to planning obligations (L8) that will address where the historic environment needs to be covered. |
| 1093 | It is noted that the Regional Centre will be the primary economic driver and the focus for retail, culture and tourism, in accordance with MCR2. |
| 1145 | Sale Waterside Arts Centre should continue to be managed by the Council for the benefit of the local community and arts organisations. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses – SL1

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1031 | Advised previously that Strategic Locations should be shown diagrammatically on the Key Diagram. |
| 1031 | Site needs allocating on a DPD. Further planning guidance could also be set via SPD. It should not be handled via informal planning guidance. It will need to be demonstrated that the proposals for hotel and leisure uses accord with sequential approach set out in PPS6, Para 2.44. |
| 1045 | Object to proposals being brought forward having the requirement of being in accordance with the Irwell City Park informal guidance. |
| 1045 | The proposal for a new bridge crossing should be deleted from the development requirements set out in SL1 due to possible adverse effects on any Pomona development proposals. |
| 1066 | The proposal for an ecological corridor should be included as a development requirement rather than in justification. |
| 1073 | Support location for development. |
| 1073 | Encouraged by mixed use development in this location as it is sustainable in terms of public transport. Additional pedestrian and cycle routes also encouraged. |
| 1093 | Recognise priority given to site for development and regeneration. |
| 1096 | Support the development requirements of reviewing the outputs of Level 2 SFRA and methods of sustainable energy generation. |
| 1181 | Concerns were raised over Pomona having enough resources to look after all the new residential properties. |
| 1181 | There are not many family friendly homes in Pomona and more flats would be considered a mistake. It is up to the Council to show that the need for these residential units has been understood. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL2

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1031 | Will the results of the SFRA be available before the publication version of the core strategy? |
| 1031 | Site needs allocating on a DPD. Further planning guidance could also be set via SPD. It should not be handled via informal planning guidance. |
| 1031 | Office proposals will need to accord with national planning policy in terms of the need for development (PPS6 Para 2.39) and the sequential approach. |
| 1045 | Object to Strategic Proposal setting out limit on quantum of development of |

| | |
|------|---|
| | commercial office development on the following ground: - No work has been done to assess realistic capacity of Wharfside or what the most appropriate mix of commercial viable mixes might be. - No evidence to support the inclusion of limit up to 10,000sqm - Setting of limit without evidence is contrary to RSS and to objectives of core strategy looking to maximise growth to support and contribute to economic growth. |
| 1055 | Welcome inclusion as first priority site for development and their inclusion within the defined regional centre and Inner Areas. |
| 1055 | Strategic proposal does not go far enough to help achieve the mix use redevelopment potential that has been earmarked for Trafford Wharfside as referenced throughout the document. |
| 1055 | To limit residential development in the Mediacity development to two specific sites limits the potential to achieve a comprehensive mixed use development throughout Trafford Wharfside. The opportunity to assess sites on a site by site basis should be catered for and the development of initiatives such as the Trafford Park Masterplan will provide an appropriate vehicle for this to happen. This should be the aim for the Strategic Proposal for this area. |
| 1073 | Supports location for development. |
| 1073 | Encourages joint working with Salford City Council to ensure the Media City development does not impact on the operation and safety of the M602, as well as ensuring public transport and sustainable links work with regards to cross boundary movement. |
| 1093 | Recognise priority given to site for development and regeneration. |
| 1096 | Carrington, Partington and MediaCity are areas with sewer capacity and drainage issues. Careful consideration is required of the planned significant development. |
| 1096 | Supports the development requirements of reviewing the SFRA Level 2 and methods of sustainable energy generation. |
| 1130 | The Core Strategy has been well thought through and considered. Of the opinion that the right areas of the Borough highlighted as Priority 1 locations for change, have been selected. Pleased to see that this is not just housing led regeneration, but does include the redevelopment of Lancashire County Cricket Club, Mediacity:uk, an increased focus on employment and improved public transport. |
| 1133 | It is considered that Lancashire Cricket Club, Trafford Park Core and Wharfside areas are key to promote Trafford's status as the major sporting and economically active borough in the sub region. |
| 1145 | It is important to protect Trafford's existing Town Centres and therefore the Plan should state clearly that the land around the Trafford Centre where it's proposed to develop housing, will not be designated a "Town Centre". Also there should be a higher percentage of affordable properties built in this area. |
| 1180 | It would be useful to mention walking and cycling links to Salford Quays, e.g. proposed extension of Manchester Cycleway. |
| 1181 | The Wharfside site has the potential to alter depending on the possible move of Granada to this site. Wharfside is directly opposite Media City and there is big scope for development on this site. Cycle routes from Fallowfield will run through this site and Matt Busby Way will become a pedestrianised area. Concern raised over the effect this will have on the traffic in this area. |
| 1181 | This site is taking in other areas which is always challenging as projects that were meant for Wharfside will start bleeding into other areas. |
| 1181 | Land ownership should not have any impact but it could be a much bigger issue for larger sites. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL3

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1018 | Support the inclusion of Old Trafford as a strategic location but believe the key issues and place objectives section does not include all the relevant issues. Other areas that should be listed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The enhancement of green space to make it a safe place to enjoy - Improve road layout into Old Trafford and the specific neighbourhoods within Old Trafford to encourage permeability - Improve access to city centre, digital city, Stretford to access jobs, employment and training |
| 1031 | It is said that details of the amount, location and type of development will be in accordance with an agreed masterplan for Old Trafford. Again, a site will need to be identified and allocated via a subsequent DPD. Further planning guidance could then be set via SPD. It should not be handled via informal planning guidance. |
| 1066 | Since the spatial profile has the objective to maximise opportunities for green roofs and tree planting in this area, we would suggest that these be included within the Development Requirements. |
| 1145 | Because Old Trafford is a heavily populated area it is important to protect its green open spaces and there is a need for more open spaces for recreational use, i.e. football, cricket, netball, tennis etc. |
| 1145 | It is suggested local shopping parades in Old Trafford be protected as they are the life blood of the community. |
| 1145 | Within the Old Trafford Neighbourhood Area, there is a need for more open spaces for recreational use i.e. football, cricket, netball, tennis etc. |
| 1168 | It is considered in general that the draft objectives and policies now being consulted on in the Preferred Option for the Core Strategy document are a compromise that will provide the basis for spatial planning guidance for the future development proposals throughout the Borough. The present buildings and the full site occupied by the enterprise are a key location in the Old Trafford neighbourhood and have strategic potential for its future development and regeneration. <p>Specific Objection relates to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Development Requirements (SL3 Old Trafford) being subsumed into a generic requirement that states that development proposals must be in accordance with an agreed Masterplan for Old Trafford, or otherwise, development proposals might be refused on the grounds of prematurity if they would compromise the deliverability of a Masterplan. 2. The reliance placed on the provisions of the Masterplan for Old Trafford is unsound, as that document it is understood is not yet adopted by the Council for spatial planning purposes, guidance and delivery of strategic development proposals in the narrowly defined area of the much larger Old Trafford neighbourhood. It is presumed that the adoption of this masterplan might only be a formality. This process is contrary to the guidance provided in the PPS12 paras 1.4 and 5.2 (4) for the preparation of the development plan documents, and specifically the Core Strategy documents. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL4

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | It is said that development proposals must be supported by a full range of PPS6 (or its replacement) assessments to ensure that any proposed development would not have a negative impact on surrounding areas. Given that the proposal is to identify a strategic area to accommodate a mix of uses including substantial retail development, |

| | |
|------|--|
| | this assessment should be carried out prior to the publication version of the plan so that its impact on surrounding town centres is clear. Again, a site will need to be identified and allocated via a subsequent DPD. |
| 1047 | With regard to Lancashire County Cricket Ground Area (SL4) the Agency has already funded improvements to the cricket ground and is involved in ongoing discussions regarding the regeneration of the surrounding area. |
| 1057 | Response about LCCC & Tesco received for workshop on Locations & Sites |
| 1073 | It is noted within the development requirements that public transport infrastructure improvements may be required to cope with the increased capacity at LCCC. Currently the site is well served by public transport, however an increase in capacity at the site may induce network impacts further a field, and as such encourage and support any public transport infrastructure improvements which will mitigate these impacts as identified by the LIP. |
| 1074 | Whilst SL2 requires the protection and enhancement of the setting of the listed Town Hall a development requirement should include securing an appropriate use for the building in order to safeguard its long term future. This should be part and parcel of the strategic proposal for the area and merits specific mention in the CS. |
| 1120 | The Core Strategy should make specific reference to the important role that Trafford College plays in the Borough, and allow it to continue to develop in the community. The College has recently been graded 'outstanding' by OFSTED and offers great potential to assist the Council in delivering its policies and aspirations including those within the Sustainable Community Strategy. In particular, the College provides access to high quality training and education needs that raise the skills level of local residents to meet the demands of the local and wider regional economy. |
| 1120 | The Core Strategy should not undermine the potential contribution that the College can make towards widening housing choice in the Borough, and improving the quality of and access to open space. |
| 1130 | The Core Strategy has been well thought through and considered. The right areas of the Borough highlighted as Priority 1 locations for change, have been selected. Pleased to see that this is not just housing led regeneration, but does include the redevelopment of Lancashire County Cricket Club, Mediacity:uk, an increased focus on employment and improved public transport. |
| 1133 | It is considered that Lancashire Cricket Club, Trafford Park Core and Wharfside areas are key to promote Trafford's status as the major sporting and economically active borough in the sub region. |
| 1145 | Need to protect both Town Halls. |
| 1145 | The Tesco on Chester Road at the rear of Stretford Leisure Centre should not be allowed to increase its present planning permission size of 48,000sq ft store (this is in line with previous planning permission and that of the planning inspector, decided at a public enquiry). Anything above this size would have a detrimental impact on Stretford Town Centre and other Centres in the Borough. |
| 1145 | There is a need to protect the small shopping parades in communities. |
| 1145 | There needs to be much more consideration for residents living near to Sporting Stadia on match days and event days (a commitment needs to be made by the Council to limit the adverse effects of anti-social behaviour, noise, litter, traffic and parking problems etc). |
| 1148 | Happy to see Old Trafford Cricket Ground improved and the redevelopment of the surrounding area, but not at the cost of accepting one of the largest Tescos in the UK being built on this site. They have planning permission for a medium sized supermarket that should be sufficient for the area. |
| 1154 | Agree with the redevelopment of LCCC, but not on the basis of an extended Tesco store. |
| 1167 | Support the place objectives for Old Trafford, in particular the need to maximise the |

| | |
|------|--|
| | potential of LCCC as a visitor attraction and recognise its potential to lead major regeneration in the area. |
| 1167 | <p>Draft Policy SL4 sets out the strategic proposal for this area. Supportive of this proposal subject to a number of revisions being made to the Strategic Proposal and Development Requirements parts of the draft policy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal needs to be amended to reflect the requirement for the improvements to the Cricket Ground to be cross funded by the provision of a superstore. 2. Old Trafford Cricket Ground is the only venue in North West England where international standard cricket matches can be played. These matches provide significant income to LCCC and the wider regional / local economy as well as considerable profile to Trafford, Manchester and the North West region. However, the LCCC has fallen below the standards required to host test matches and requires an upgrading of its facilities in order to stage international cricket in the future. 3. Urgent action and considerable investment is needed to upgrade and modernise facilities to ensure Old Trafford regains its test match status and its profile as one of the world's great cricket venues. This will have a highly beneficial effect on the area and enable it to build upon its reputation as a world class attraction as sought by the Vision for Trafford. 4. Cross funding is required to finance most of the necessary works. A superstore will cross fund the works needed to upgrade the ground to meet Test match standards. This will result in sporting, community and cultural benefits being achieved. 5. There is also an acknowledged need for a large superstore in the Old Trafford area and this can be provided at the Stretford Playing Fields site where food retail development has previously been permitted. A superstore will deliver retail employment and economic regeneration benefits for the area in keeping with national policy objectives. 6. The combined stadium and superstore development will contribute to the comprehensive regeneration of the area by improving the attractiveness of the location to new investors and helping to stimulate new commercial, residential and educational development in the remaining area. 7. The proposed change would involve deleting the reference to retail floorspace being delivered and replacing it in a reformatted policy with the following text: Provision of a large superstore on the Stretford Playing Fields site to meet the recognised need in the Old Trafford area and to cross fund the Stadium redevelopment works being undertaken. 8. A need and a strategy for the creation of a high quality public realm along Warwick Road and Brian Statham Way has not been demonstrated. This part of the Strategic Proposal should therefore be deleted. |
| 1167 | <p>Support the first, fourth and sixth requirements.</p> <p>In response to the second requirement which indicates that an increased capacity at the Cricket Ground has the potential to exacerbate congestion on the highway network and overcrowding on the Metrolink at peak times, the capacity of the Cricket Ground will not change significantly following redevelopment. As a result there will not be a marked increase in the number of spectators attending test matches. In any event, due to the timing of cricket matches, most spectators do not travel to or from the ground in peak periods. Consequently, the redevelopment of the ground will not exacerbate any congestion on the highway network and overcrowding Metrolink that may occur at peak times. The first sentence should therefore be deleted.</p> |
| 1167 | The words "where appropriate" should be added at the start of the second sentence to reflect the fact that the requirement for any contributions must take account of the circumstances of each case. This sentence also requires adjustment to reflect the proposed deletion of the first sentence. |
| 1167 | The third requirement should be deleted as PPS12 advises that it is unnecessary to reiterate national policy in a Development Plan document. In any event, the sporting, |

| | |
|------|--|
| | community, economic and retail benefits that the scheme will bring are consistent with national policy. |
| 1167 | The fifth requirement should be amended to include the words "fronting the A56" after the words "development proposals" to reflect the provisions of the SPD. |
| 1167 | <p>The amended Policy SL4, taking into account suggested revisions would read as follows:</p> <p>The comprehensive regeneration of the area will be delivered by: Provision of a redeveloped and much improved LCCC sports stadium and ancillary sport and leisure facilities; Provision of a large superstore on the Stretford Playing Field site to meet the recognised need in the Old Trafford area and to cross fund the stadium redevelopment works; Business floorspace and new residential accommodation (up to 900 units); Improvements to educational facilities; and Public transport infrastructure improvements as necessary.</p> <p>Development Requirements. Development Proposals must demonstrate a positive contribution to the delivery of the comprehensive regeneration of the area as set out in the Strategic Proposal. The settling of the Grade II listed Trafford Town Hall should be protected and, if possible, enhanced. Development Proposals fronting the A56 to accord with the development guidelines set out within the A56 Corridor SPD. Where appropriate, development proposals should include Combined Heat and Power systems or alternative methods of sustainable energy generation / conservation.</p> <p>Justification for the Proposal. The proposal is in accord with the RSS policy framework for the Manchester City Region area as set out in policies MCR1, MCR2, W3 and W6. Redevelopment to upgrade and modernise facilities at the Old Trafford Cricket Ground will enhance Trafford's reputation as a location for national and international sporting events and directly and indirectly deliver additional employment opportunities and sporting and community benefits for local people. There is an acknowledged need for a large superstore in Old Trafford and its provision will cross fund the upgrading and modernising of the Cricket Grounds facilities. Proposals will focus significant business and housing regeneration schemes in the Gorse Hill, LCCC and Trafford Town Hall area and incorporate improvements to the education facilities in the area, high quality public realm and active street frontage improvements. The proposals will promote the regeneration and development of an area that is highly accessible by a choice of modes of transport with access to the Metrolink and bus services linking the location to the wider area.</p> <p>Delivery Mechanism & Funding The location is in a mix of private and public sector ownerships. Funding and delivery of the proposal principally will be the responsibility of the private sector and development partners.</p> <p>Development Phasing Housing element to commence post 2011 / 12 with 35% built by 2015 / 16, 65% by 2020 / 21 and 100% by 2025 / 26.</p> |
| 1169 | In relation to LCCC there is currently a consultation being carried out in relation to the proposals which include a large Tesco supermarket. This will have a huge impact on other areas in Trafford including those outside Trafford such as Chorlton, why does |

| | |
|------|--|
| | there need to be a supermarket in that area. |
| 1170 | <p>In regards to the proposed Tesco store at LCCC, why was a previous application for a 50,000sq m floorspace refused and yet an application for a store more than twice its size (140,000sq m) been accepted.</p> <p>Additional concerns over whether planning permission and the details of the planning permission will be enforced in regards to floorspace for example.</p> <p>New jobs will be provided; Tesco has a track record of exceeding original planning permission and then applying for retrospective permission.</p> <p>Concerns over sustainability of store in terms of detrimental effects on other local businesses. Concerns echoed over the future of Stretford Mall which is in a state of decay and that efforts should be focused on improving the quality and vitality of the shops here.</p> |
| 1181 | Particularly looking at affordable housing in this area. |
| 1181 | This will be a major economic and redevelopment project. |
| 1181 | Detailed routes for public transport may be necessary. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL5

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | It is proposed that the emerging Trafford Park Masterplan will provide additional guidance for development and change. This would appear to be informal planning guidance. Further guidance should be set out in an LDD. What is the scope for new development in this area? If the scope is limited it is not clear what the purpose is in identifying it as a strategic location for new development. |
| 1045 | Clarification is required within the text of the Strategic Proposal of what is intended by the words "supporting commercial office accommodation" to avoid any confusion between the anticipated roles of Trafford Wharfside, the Trafford Centre Rectangle and the Core of Trafford Park. If the Core is to be protected and developed for modern industrial storage and distribution uses then this wording should be expanded to confirm that there is a presumption against general office development within Trafford Park Core which is not ancillary or directly related to a manufacturing or other industrial/storage/distribution use. |
| 1055 | Welcome inclusion as first priority site for development and their inclusion within the defined regional centre and Inner Areas. |
| 1055 | Trafford Park should retain its status of national significance and continue to be regarded as the key location for industry and business activity in the Manchester City Region. Therefore support is given for the stance taken in the strategic proposal for Trafford Park Core. Particular support is given to the proposal to 'improve the public transport infrastructure to provide integrated frequent public transit system linking the location with surrounding residential and commercial areas. |
| 1055 | There is some uncertainty as to the form of improvements and exactly how they are to be delivered. Delivery of this key transport infrastructure is essential if Trafford Park and the immediately surrounding area is to realistically achieve the sustainable mixed use development referred to throughout the Core Strategy document. |
| 1073 | Supports location for development. |
| 1073 | Welcome and encourage the aspiration to deliver associated public transport infrastructure improvements alongside the delivery of additional floorspace, to ensure that workers can access Trafford Park on a sustainable basis rather than using the |

| | |
|------|--|
| | private car. |
| 1073 | Any significant development proposed that is not covered in the LDF Modelling work should be undertaken using a masterplan approach to ensure that public transport improvements are in place before new developments/floorspace is occupied at this location. |
| 1096 | Development requirements should include the need to review the findings of the Level 2 SFRA. This strategic location borders both the Manchester Ship Canal and the Bridgewater Canal. |
| 1133 | It is considered that Lancashire Cricket Club, Trafford Park Core and Wharfside areas are key to promote Trafford's status as the major sporting and economically active borough in the sub region. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL6

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | This is said to include a mix of uses including commercial offices, hotel and leisure development. It is not clear whether this will accord with national planning policy. |
| 1031 | It is proposed that the emerging Trafford Park Masterplan will provide additional guidance for development and change. This would appear to be informal planning guidance. Further guidance should be set out in an LDD. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. It is noted that it is proposed to allocate part of this strategic location as a strategic site in the core strategy. Besides the proposed development on the strategic site at Trafford Quays and the development referred to that has planning permission, what is the scope for further development within this strategic location? If the scope is limited, it is not clear what the purpose is in identifying it as a strategic location for new development. |
| 1045 | Support in principle for the strategic proposal but object to the inclusion of the words "where appropriate" in respect of commercial office, hotel and leisure accommodation. This could be open to many different interpretations and is likely to give rise to major difficulties in promoting development proposals. These words should be deleted and replaced by a reference to the need for any proposed development in these use categories be subject to the tests set out in PPS6 or its successor. This would also provide for consistency between SL6 and SS2. |
| 1045 | The SA assertion that public transport to the TCR is presently limited contradicts conclusions in the Trafford Park and Salford Quays Accessibility Study and TCR's bus station is categorised as a Category B Major Transport Interchange by GMPTE. It is considered that the conclusions in relation to accessibility are flawed and require revision. |
| 1045 | The Trafford Quays Delivery Report has been prepared on behalf of the landowner for the site. It sets out in detail the level of proposed development and associated development. It should be read alongside documents submitted in August 2008. |
| 1055 | Support for the inclusion of the Trafford Centre Rectangle as a Strategic Location. Land holdings immediately adjacent to the Strategic Location could make a significant contribution towards the sustainable mixed use development included in the Strategic Proposal. Further clarification may be required with regard to the 'significant improvements to public transport infrastructure' in particular the timing and method of delivery. |
| 1073 | Over 1,000 dwellings are to be located within the Trafford Centre Rectangle, and although this is a 'third priority' location in terms of locating development, this location aims to deliver almost 10% of the housing provision across the Core Strategy (Table L1). A development quantum of 1,000 dwellings in a location close to the SRN causes some concern, and therefore requires sound transport evidence to support the |

| | |
|------|---|
| | development aspirations at this location. |
| 1073 | Concern is raised over promoting residential development within Air Quality Management Areas, of which the Trafford Centre Rectangle is one. |
| 1073 | The Trafford Centre Rectangle site is identified as having a mixed-use (non-residential) development quantum. Development in this location will impact upon the SRN, and as such, any development needs to be supported by extensive public transport improvements to ensure the impact on the SRN is minimised. Therefore any proposal will need to be supported by sound transport evidence for the site, as well as being clearly demonstrated within the Local Infrastructure Plan that the site can come forward on a sustainable basis. |
| 1074 | SL6 includes a Grade I church within its boundaries and the need to safeguard and enhance its settings should be included in the development requirements. |
| 1145 | It is important to protect Trafford's existing Town Centres and therefore the Plan should state clearly that the land around the Trafford Centre where it's proposed to develop housing, will not be designated a "Town Centre". Also there should be a higher percentage of affordable properties built in this area. |
| 1181 | There is difficulty in getting early numbers for the plan period. WGIS has received approval however this could take 7 years to implement. |
| 1181 | Manchester and Salford have raised concerns over development in this location, in particular they have sought assurances that development here will not jeopardise regeneration in their districts. |
| 1181 | Housing numbers are still required. |
| 1181 | Discussion needed about the development of this site and how it will add to the borough's housing. The long term effect has not been fully thought through. |
| 1181 | Businesses in the area will be reluctant to locate to this site for fear of public complaints regarding traffic noise if residential development goes ahead. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL7

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1013 | Following major developments in Sale, Altrincham and Urmston Town Centres, Stretford is the only one of the major centres still to be considered. Concerned that proposals appear to be targeted at some relatively distant point in time. The potential to create something fine for Stretford is not fully covered and cannot be delayed for this long. Certain issues need to be stressed: The A56 is a major barrier between the shopping centre and other strategic parts of the centre, including the canal, the Metro and the Essoldo. Thought must be given to strategic redevelopment to unify the centre, including sinking the crossroads and giving the ground level to pedestrians. More emphasis needs to be placed on the corridor linking the shopping centre with Longfield Park. The Bridgewater canal needs to be linked to the centre and made a major feature to include recreation, leisure and canal-based commercial activity. Cycle storage/hire/repair facilities need to be added to the Metro station and bus stops to create a truly sustainable transport interchange. A wider, more strategic vision is needed to re-join the two halves of the centre and regenerate it as a community based entity. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. Is it necessary though to identify this as a strategic location? |
| 1066 | Since the Spatial Profile has the objective to explore opportunities for green roofs and tree planting in the Stretford area, it is suggested that these be included within the Development Requirements. |
| 1073 | Development in this location is encouraged, due to its town centre location and public transport accessibility characteristics. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1074 | SL7 makes reference to the listed Essoldo cinema under the justification for the proposal and refers to funding for its re-use. It would be better if the development requirements section set out more clearly the mechanisms to achieve this. |
| 1142 | Aware that Stretford Mall is privately owned but consider there should be discussions about the number of dwindling shops. |
| 1145 | There is a desperate need for the Council to develop a 'Comprehensive Stretford Town Centre Plan' which develops first class shopping, leisure, recreation and job opportunities for the people of Stretford. The Council will further help support regeneration of the Town Centre, recognising its 10% stake in the Mall and how this can be best used towards such regeneration projects, and would seek to involve all local stakeholders. |
| 1147 | <p>A number of people have previously raised concerns over the existing underpass system linking the four areas of Stretford Crossroads. Quoting paragraph 6.6 of the A56 Corridor SPD, commitment to improve crossing facilities which includes Stretford Crossroads. The response stated that pedestrian controlled crossings are not within the scope of the Core Strategy but are the responsibility of the Transport department. It is suggested that all of the relevant departments of the Council liaise with the Transport Department and engage in joint planning so that the preferred crossroads can be installed at the same time as the redevelopment takes place. This would allow easier crossing, and allow development around the Essoldo Cinema and Newton Street. The underpass may remain until such funding allows them to be filled in / closed as long as pedestrians have the option of controlled crossing.</p> <p>Increased residential accommodation further justifies pedestrian crossings and Stretford town centre regeneration to provide more local employment and easier access to the Metro Link for cross city travel.</p> <p>Council policies are in favour of a more cyclist and pedestrian friendly A56 and installing facilities to encourage the use of public transport. Surely installing pedestrian crossings will encourage more use of the Metro Link thus removing cars from the road as part of the Councils remit.</p> <p>It is also proposed that Kingsway from below the car park entrance to the traffic lights on Chester Road is pedestrianised, with traffic diverted along Barton Road. This would instantly rejoin two halves of Stretford crossroads bringing the library and clinic back to the town centre.</p> |
| 1147 | With the regeneration of Stretford town centre, what are the proposed plans? The current documentation is vague. What are the exact details of the new improved floor space to enhance the offer of the town centre? What are the exact intentions regarding improvement and development in and around Stretford Mall to improve retail facility and offer available to the local community? This could range from a fresh coat of paint to demolition, please clarify. |
| 1147 | What are the plans to increase accessibility to the Metrolink? |
| 1147 | What are specific proposals for the Essoldo? |
| 1148 | Over 25 retail units and nearly all the market at the mall is now vacant. The Council should encourage investment in Stretford Town Centre not killing any future opportunities by building a massive Tesco nearby. Sale, Altrincham and Urmston have had significant investment, nothing has improved in Stretford for a long time, we need a new town centre. |
| 1153 | This is a thoroughly thought out paper on the borough as a whole, but as a resident in Stretford, living near the centre it is considered that this part of the town requires careful consideration. The shopping mall at the moment is not very enticing as many units are unlet, most likely due to the economic situation. It is appreciated that this is privately owned. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1153 | The Essoldo Cinema has been in private ownership for some years and work in progress is very slow. Recently a few bricks were replaced at roof level. Appreciate that it is difficult to persuade the owner to 'get a move on' but something needs to be done as this listed building is not being used to its full potential. |
| 1153 | Reference is made to Stretford Crossroads Strategic Option in relation to housing. Certainly this area needs improving to make it more attractive and safer. Cyclists using the pavements in Stretford rather than the cycle paths are a menace, as bikes don't have bells these days you can't hear them. |
| 1153 | Definitely need a good restaurant. Sale, Urmston and Altrincham have plenty, so why can't Sale? |
| 1154 | Stretford is the only town centre without recent substantial investment and should be given priority. It has become merely a main road, the underpass should be allocated to cars not to people. |
| 1154 | This is vague. Stretford is the area which needs the most help and more varied shopping. |
| 1154 | Stretford must be the priority for development. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL8

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1026 | Carrington to be developed as mixed use, which will meet many of the Council's strategic objectives. It is of a scale sufficient to generate investment required to improve accessibility and infrastructure in the area, to open up Partington for Regeneration and offer range of housing and employment opportunities therefore reducing the need to travel. Carrington also provides opportunities for on-site energy generation, improvements to public transport, a green space strategy with development over the next 25 years. |
| 1026 | Carrington provides an alternative location for housing. |
| 1026 | The development at Carrington will adopt measures to reduce carbon emissions. As well as sustainable construction, there is potential for a Biomass low carbon energy facility to be developed on site. The SFRA work will inform of any risk from flooding, the site has not been flooded in over 60 years. |
| 1026 | Support the identification of Carrington as a Strategic Location, but have proposals for the type of use and infrastructure. |
| 1026 | Do not support the proposed development of Carrington and we are currently producing a masterplan for the area and would like for the early outputs of this work to be incorporated within the Core Strategy. |
| 1026 | The development of a bridge crossing over the Manchester Ship Canal is not required as part of the masterplan development for mixed use. There are other local highway opportunities to deliver the scale and mix of proposed development. |
| 1026 | Agree with the justification for SL8 and see these appropriate to justify the mixed use community development. |
| 1026 | Carrington will meet the majority of the Council's Strategic Objectives. |
| 1026 | Propose a mixed use sustainable phased development of housing, employment, open space and other ancillary uses. New elements of and improvements to the highway and public transport infrastructure to improve the accessibility of the location. The masterplan provides an opportunity to re-develop a large area of currently under-utilised brownfield land to accommodate mixed use development that will support the regeneration of Carrington as an economic driver in the sub-region. The location is in a single private sector ownership. |
| 1026 | A masterplan vision has been prepared for the Carrington site. The aim of that Vision |

| | |
|------|---|
| | is to produce a sustainable mixed use development on this large brownfield site at Carrington over the next 25 years that is achievable and deliverable. |
| 1026 | The land within the clients ownership meets all of these criteria (available, suitable, and achievable) with the added bonus of the opportunity to create a new sustainable community around the existing housing and employment around Carrington. |
| 1026 | Our proposals for Carrington represent an ideal marriage of opportunity and need, a large area of brownfield land becoming available in parallel with the preparation of the Core Strategy and an increase in housing numbers required by the Growth Point Agenda with the delivery of a sustainable mixed use development. |
| 1026 | In order to achieve all of the 'Place Objectives' for Carrington, particularly the major improvements to infrastructure, then these can only be delivered by a mixed use sustainable development of the brownfield land that will also help to bring about the regeneration of Partington. The mixed use development of Carrington is key to delivery of the regeneration of the substantial area of brownfield land within Shell's control but also the infrastructure required to open up the wider area. |
| 1026 | It is considered that the Council are missing a major opportunity in the Preferred Option to create a truly sustainable, vibrant, prosperous, well designed and deliverable mixed use community on the brownfield land at Carrington in accord with both national and regional policy. |
| 1026 | SO1 - The site at Carrington will provide sufficient family housing throughout and beyond the plan period to meet the Borough's needs and will create a sustainable community linking housing with employment and the supporting social infrastructure. |
| 1026 | SO2 - The development of a mixed use community at Carrington will have positive regeneration benefits not only for Carrington but also for Partington creating a range and choice of jobs and housing with improved accessibility and public transport. |
| 1026 | SO3 - Carrington can as a mixed use development deliver a range and choice of employment opportunities in this sustainable location. It is the intention to retain all of the existing jobs on site in addition to creating a range of new employment opportunities. |
| 1026 | SO5 - The Shell ownership at Carrington includes a significant amount of green space which through a masterplan for the area to be protected and enhanced increasing local accessibility but also creating linkages to the wider area. |
| 1026 | SO6 - The promotion of a "significant" level of mixed development on the brownfield land at Carrington will reduce the need to travel and improve accessibility. |
| 1026 | SO7 - The development at Carrington, because of its scale and the timescale for the overall delivery, will include new technologies such as biomass and innovative waste management to combat climate change and to minimise the impact on Trafford's resources. |
| 1026 | Carrington should be considered a Strategic Site rather than a Location. |
| 1026 | In Paragraph 23.5 the Council makes reference to the production of planning guidance for each site, have already commenced work on a masterplan for Carrington in consultation with the Council and have produced a vision which has already been the subject of consultation with local stakeholders as well as Members and Chief Officers of the Council. |
| 1031 | There are significant concerns regarding highway improvements as development is planned to commence by 2010/11. It will be necessary to indicate in some detail the infrastructure required and who will provide it. Also for the impact of the development to be considered and explained how it will be mitigated. |
| 1031 | Will the Level 2 SFRA be available to examine flood risk issues prior to publication version? It will be necessary to indicate how flood risk issues will be dealt with given the proposed to commencement of development early in the plan period. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. |
| 1045 | The text should make mention of the role of the Manchester Ship Canal in handling of |

| | |
|------|--|
| | freight for users in this area. |
| 1047 | Carrington is not designated as a strategic regional site by the NWDA. |
| 1051 | Support the general principles, however there is some concern about the allocation of undeveloped land to the south of the former railway line and any new development on it. It should be given greater consideration as it is located approximately 100 metres from the historic agricultural estate of Dunham Massey. Thereby development proposals consider their impact on the landscape of the surrounding area. |
| 1066 | Suggest relocation of wording from the last bullet point in the justification for the proposal text to be included under the development requirements. |
| 1073 | Concerns raised over public transport accessibility to Carrington and Partington. More detailed work will therefore need to be done to support these locations. This work should establish the likely origin-destination travel patterns from the LDF modelling arising from development at these locations, the level of public transport infrastructure required to support these movements and the timescales over which infrastructure will be required to be provided in order to support the development quantum proposed. This will need to be supported by operational analysis to ensure that the scale of any impact at the SRN is quantified and the appropriate sustainable transport is provided. This is a wider point also relevant to the cumulative transport impact of the strategy as a whole that the LDF modelling should help address. |
| 1073 | The development aspirations for Carrington raise concern due to its poor public transport accessibility and potential impact on the Strategic Road Network. Links to enhance accessibility to the M60 are not supported. If this is to encourage car borne journeys. No alternative options are detailed. An iterative process should be undertaken to identify more suitable travel options. Concerns are raised about the additional Manchester Ship Canal crossing and should be subject to LDF modelling work and all details for infrastructure in the LIP. |
| 1073 | The locations of Partington and Carrington do generate car borne trips due to poor public transport trips. Welcome the development in Partington to improve public transport provision. |
| 1074 | SL8 includes a Grade 2* listed Church, this should be referred to in the development requirements. |
| 1093 | In terms of Transport it is recognised that Core Policy L4 commits to accessible locations for development, however question the inclusion of Partington and Carrington. Both of these locations are only served by a single road in/out, they are 'rural' in nature and are severed from the network by the Manchester Ship Canal. The sustainable nature, or lack of, at these locations has been raised before. |
| 1093 | SL8 specifically mentions the need for a new crossing over the Manchester Ship Canal in order to link to the motorway network, with little information to say how such a major structure would be funded. |
| 1096 | Carrington, Partington and MediaCity are areas with sewer capacity and drainage issues. Careful consideration is required of the planned significant development. |
| 1096 | Parts of SL8 lies within flood zones 2 and 3. Following outputs from SFRA Level 2, it is expected that a sequential approach is applied at site level so that buildings are located away from areas of risk. Principles of Green Infrastructure should be applied in these flood risk areas to provide multifunctional benefits and requirements of policies L5. R2 and R3. The vulnerability of developments should be considered if located in flood risk areas. |
| 1100 | Object to the reduced size of the Strategic Location if the outputs of the SFRA Level 2 stated so. Consideration of flood risk should be integrated within the policy wording for each development proposal. |
| 1100 | Support SL8 and its regeneration benefits, including utilising large area of under-utilised brownfield land, large scale industrial development which will support Carrington's role as an economic driver, increased employment opportunities. There is |

| | |
|------|---|
| | a need to enhance accessibility and developments might help to fund this. The SA details the need to remediate contaminated land. |
| 1100 | There is an overwhelming case for regeneration of Carrington, which will complement the remodelling of the residential area of Partington. These benefits will not be achieved by a significant reduction on the amount of economic development proposed in SL8. |
| 1100 | Understand the development of land in Carrington will be subject to flood risk assessment. |
| 1100 | There is an inconsistency between policy L6 and SL7, whereby in L6 Carrington is identified as a location for waste management, but there is no mention of this in SL8. |
| 1100 | Consideration of conflicting land use types should be undertaken in Carrington, particularly with regard to power generation and waste management sites. |
| 1100 | It is suggested to amend SL8 to incorporate reference to the potential for additional economic development to exploit the potential of the new power station and a waste to energy facility. Thereby using surplus heat in local industry, or by district heating schemes or anaerobic digestion plants. Another option is intensive agriculture, which is less vulnerable to flood risk. |
| 1100 | Large areas of Carrington are used for airport related uses. |
| 1100 | There is no justification to drop airport related uses from Carrington. |
| 1100 | There is a need to revisit Policy W1 and Carrington Strategic Location to address the potential of airport-related development. |
| 1100 | The SL8 policy should be revisited to exploit its potential. |
| 1145 | Carrington community centre and youth facilities need improving. As well as public transport provision. |
| 1156 | Carrington should be developed as a mixed use site. |
| 1156 | Urge the reconsideration of SL8 to a mixed use site. |
| 1181 | 40% of locations are in single ownership, flats do not meet housing needs in the borough. These findings put Carrington back in for consideration as a residential area. |
| 1181 | It is important to make the Highways Agency comfortable with this site. |
| 1181 | There is a critical mass of development in Carrington. |
| 1181 | Housing will be the best option for this site. |
| 1181 | There needs to be a big public service intervention to get Carrington functioning properly. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL9

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1013 | Partington desperately needs resourcing to create a more vibrant community. Perhaps more emphasis on training programmes to help local residents into new local employment could be given. Partington is an isolated community and it needs local jobs, shops and facilities to avoid locals having to travel long distances, which in itself would be unsustainable and undesirable. With the surrounding agricultural area, perhaps Partington could pilot schemes based upon local food production, allotments, markets etc for consideration regarding possible cascading around the Borough? |
| 1051 | The identified area is close to the wider Dunham Massey Estate - On this occasion within less than 50 metres. Accordingly the impacts upon the wider landscape and its historical importance require more detailed consideration. In particular it is requested that the Development Requirements are supplemented to ensure that development proposals consider their impact upon the landscape character of the surrounding area, including the historic Dunham Massey Estate and are designed accordingly. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1067 | Development Requirements - Critically important - apart from country lanes there is only the A6144 giving access to the location from either east or west which is at peak times to say the least liable to congestion. |
| 1067 | Justification for the proposal - Redevelopment of the shopping centre will not create 'but support' a more sustainable community. |
| 1073 | Concerns raised over public transport accessibility to Carrington and Partington. More detailed work will therefore need to be done to support these locations. This work should establish the likely origin-destination travel patterns from the LDF modelling arising from development at these locations, the level of public transport infrastructure required to support these movements and the timescales over which infrastructure will be required to be provided in order to support the development quantum proposed. This will need to be supported by operational analysis to ensure that the scale of any impact at the SRN is quantified and the appropriate sustainable transport is provided. This is a wider point also relevant to the cumulative transport impact of the strategy as a whole that the LDF modelling should help address. |
| 1073 | The locations of Partington and Carrington do generate car borne trips due to poor public transport. Welcome the development in Partington to improve public transport provision. |
| 1073 | Until a sound transport evidence base is developed via the LDF modelling and the LIP to support the development aspirations at this location, the Agency holds similar concerns for the Partington site as those held for Carrington. |
| 1078 | The land to the south of Partington, currently Protected Open Land, should be included within the boundary of the Strategic Location to recognise its future potential for housing development which would support the regeneration of the area. |
| 1093 | In terms of Transport it is recognised that Core Policy L4 commits to accessible locations for development, however question the inclusion of Partington and Carrington. Both of these locations are only served by a single road in/out, they are 'rural' in nature and are severed from the network by the Manchester Ship Canal. The sustainable nature, or lack of, at these locations has been raised before. |
| 1096 | Carrington, Partington and MediaCity are areas with sewer capacity and drainage issues. Careful consideration is required of the planned significant development. |
| 1130 | The comment (SL5) 'Improvements to public transport access are essential' is also true of priority 2 sites Partington (SL9). Any efforts to regenerate these communities that will allow access to jobs throughout the Borough and encourage people to live there will undoubtedly fail, without effective public transport provision. |
| 1141 | Regarding Partington give them decent shops and other facilities. |
| 1145 | Town Centre shops need redeveloping as a matter of urgency. There is a real need to develop a better mix of social and private housing. A comprehensive strategy is needed to address the isolation of Partington (road and public transport). More job opportunities need to be created for the people of Partington. |
| 1154 | Partington is desperately in need of a choice of retail outlets. |
| 1187 | Partington is identified as accepting considerable residential build. Would like to see all brown/green potentials in closer proximity to the city fully utilised before any semi rural build. Partingtons curse for decades has been lots of houses and nothing else. Fine words allied with nebulous promises of improvements have yielded little. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL10

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1031 | It is said that the proposal will be delivered by RSL and private sector partners and that it is likely to be dependent on funding from the Homes and Communities Agency. Given that development is proposed to commence in 2010/11 it will be necessary to |

| | |
|------|--|
| | indicate what level of funding is required and who will be providing it. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. Is it necessary though to identify this as a strategic location? |
| 1067 | Opportunity to encourage cycling to be applauded but also open to abuse. Create linkages to other employment opportunities - what, where, how? Potential for development within the specified boundary is very limited unless designated green spaces are built on. |
| 1073 | Due to edge of Town Centre location of this site and the relatively small amount of development there is less concern. |
| 1130 | Improvements to public transport are essential. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL11

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | Given that development is proposed to commence in 2010/11 it will be necessary to indicate what level of funding is required and who will be providing it. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. Is it necessary though to identify this as a strategic location? |
| 1067 | Selected up-dates have been incorporated onto a map which is roughly 20 years out of date. The P.O. relocated out of that building in about 1990. The road on your map named Roman Road has not been called that for the last 40 years. School Road is to the East of the A56. Ashton Road is to the West of the A56. Is the redesignation part of the Strategy? Hope Road is not recognised. |
| 1073 | Due to the edge of town centre nature of the site, combined with the relatively small amount of development at this site, the development aspirations at Strategic Location SL11 are encouraged. |
| 1145 | Should be a definite statement to work towards supporting and enhancing Sale Town Centre. |
| 1166 | Support the Council's identification of Sale town centre as a Strategic Location (SL11) within the draft Core Strategy. However, it is felt that the policy should provide for 'strengthening and enhancement' of the centre, rather than the 'consolidation and improvement' which is proposed. This approach would provide increased economic and social benefits for the centre and assist in achieving the stated Development Requirement of positively enhancing the vitality and viability of the centre. |
| 1166 | In regard to the Strategic Proposal criteria, support an improvement to the mix and quality of the existing retail offer; however it is believed that the new retail floorspace proposed should be focussed around 'The Square' and serve to improve the quality of both convenience and comparison provision within the centre, which can be achieved through increasing the scale of the unit shops and enlarging the Tesco foodstore. As such, a maximum level of retail floorspace should not be contemplated, as it may unnecessarily restrict the appropriate level of development required. |
| 1166 | The Strategic Proposal for new commercial office accommodation, additional leisure and community facility development and additional residential accommodation is also supported, although a maximum level of commercial floorspace or number of residential units should not be specified within the policy, as it may unnecessarily restrict the appropriate level of development required. |
| 1166 | In terms of the Development Requirements, strongly support the first criterion that development should enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre. |
| 1166 | It is suggested that the second criterion should be amended to state that 'development proposals in Sale town centre which front onto the A56 should accord with the development guidelines set out within the A56 corridor SPD' in order to ensure that |

| | |
|------|---|
| | this requirement does not apply to development which has no frontage on the A56. |
| 1166 | With reference to the Justification for the proposal, the enhancement of Sale town centre fully accords with Policy W5 of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) which seeks investment of an appropriate scale within defined centres to maintain and enhance vitality and viability, and also does not conflict with Policies MCR1 and MCR3 in the RSS. |
| 1166 | Agree that Sale town centre is located in a most accessible location due to its excellent links to public transport including bus and tram services. |
| 1166 | The third bullet point should be amended in order to maximise the benefits for the vitality and viability of the centre, such that it states 'the proposed development will allow for enhancement of the town centre to strengthen the commercial and civic focus - providing convenient services to local people and contributing to economic growth. |
| 1166 | <p>It is suggested that the final bullet point for the justification of the proposal, which refers to the conclusions of the Trafford Retail Study (TRS) should be deleted, because the recommendations of the TRS did not take account of the potential for the enhancement and strengthening of Sale town centre.</p> <p>Therefore this point should be written more positively to read 'The emphasis should be on quantitative and qualitative expansion of the town centre for both convenience and comparison goods through the redevelopment of the square and the surrounding units, along with the extension of the Tesco foodstore'. This will allow for the creation of larger footplate units which are better able to attract National multiple retailers, and also modernise the Tesco store which is some 30 years old, such that the range and choice of goods available can be expanded in order to improve the level of provision available to local shoppers. This approach will serve to positively enhance the vitality and viability of Sale town centre.</p> |
| 1166 | Agree with the Delivery Mechanism and Funding section. |
| 1166 | In regard to Development Phasing, suggest that this is deleted as it is not possible to predict with any accuracy when elements of the development will be provided. |
| 1166 | <p>It is considered that the Sale Town Centre Strategic Location should read as follows.</p> <p>Strategic Proposal - Redevelopment to promote the strengthening and enhancement of the town centre to provide:</p> <p>Improvements to the mix and quality of the existing retail offer. New retail floorspace focussed around the Square to increase the range and size of the unit shops, and extension of the Tesco foodstore to improve the quality and choice of the retail offer. New commercial office accommodation. Additional leisure and community facility development. Additional residential accommodation.</p> <p>Development Requirements: Development should positively enhance the vitality and viability of the existing town centre. Development proposals in Sale town centre which front onto the A56 should accord with the development guidelines set out within the A56 Corridor SPD. A review of impact of the proposed development on flood risk related to the adjoining Bridgewater Canal to be undertaken when the findings of the Level 2 / Hybrid SFRA for Manchester, Salford and Trafford are published.</p> <p>Justification for the Proposal. The proposal is in accordance with the RSS policy framework for the Manchester</p> |

| | |
|------|--|
| | <p>Region area as set out in policies MCR1, MCR3 and W5.</p> <p>Sale town centre is located in a most accessible location with excellent links to public transport services such as Metrolink and bus services,</p> <p>The proposed development will allow for enhancement of the town centre to strengthen the commercial and civic focus - providing convenient services to local people and contributing to economic growth.</p> <p>The emphasis should be on quantitative and qualitative expansion of the town centre for both convenience and comparison goods through the redevelopment of the Square and surrounding units, along with an extension to the Tesco foodstore.</p> <p>Delivery Mechanism & Funding:</p> <p>The area is a mix of private and public sector ownership.</p> <p>The proposals will be delivered principally by private sector land owners and development partners.</p> |
| 1180 | <p>Under point 2 of Justification for the Proposal, links to cycling and walking need to be made clear. Cycling also needs to be more prominent across other strategic locations and sites.</p> |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SL12

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | Will the Level 2 SFRA be available in order to examine flood risk issues prior to the publication version of the core strategy? It will be necessary to indicate how flood risk issues will be dealt with given that it is proposed to commence development early in the plan period. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. |
| 1036 | Support the identification of the wider Woodfield Road site (including the land within its ownership) as a Strategic Location. However the strategic proposal should be revised to reflect the potential that exists for the site to accommodate more than 400 residential units. In addition, it should acknowledge that any residential-led mixed use development of the site may comprise a range of other uses in addition to new housing and offices such as, for example ancillary retail. |
| 1051 | It will appear that consideration will need to be given to the impact of the development on the nearby Linotype Estate. |
| 1066 | Welcome the statement that the proposals will include enhancements of the ecological corridor running along the Bridgewater Canal but would suggest that this should be included under Development Requirements rather than just as a justification for the proposal. |
| 1067 | Highway improvements are critical but difficult to deliver. Residential developments to date have already resulted in problems. |
| | Protection and enhancement are important - the luxi warehouse is decaying rapidly |
| 1067 | Too much emphasis is given to offices. Modest workshop facilities must also be incorporated. Units of 50-80 sqm are too scarce. |
| 1073 | The development aspirations at Woodfield Road aim to redevelop redundant industrial premises in this "most accessible location" for residential led mixed use development, including up to 400 residential units and 2000 square metres of office floor space. The Woodfield Road site is accessible via sustainable modes, and due to its location and relatively small development quantum the Highways Agency can encourage the proposed development. |
| 1074 | Welcome the reference to the setting of the listed buildings. However the policy should go further than this and address the future of the buildings themselves and how they will be safeguarded. |

| | |
|------|---|
| 1180 | Under bullet point 3 in Development requirements, it would be useful to add improvements for encouraging cycling along the Bridgewater Canal. |
|------|---|

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses -SL13

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1031 | The proposal includes a variety of elements including improved public transport interchange, enhancement to the public realm and improvements to pedestrian routes. It is unclear what funding will be required, when it will be needed and who will deliver it. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to identify and allocate sites in a subsequent DPD. |
| 1051 | Insufficient consideration has been given to the relevant historic environment resources within the identified area - these are more extensive than as listed in the third bullet point under Development Requirements. The fourth bullet point under "Justification" provides a more accurate reference to these resources and how they should influence development proposals. It is suggested that it is moved to the Development Requirements section. |
| 1067 | Development of the "Historic Market Quarter" must be ignited by major investment in the Market itself. King's Court (off Railway Street) should be added to the list. |
| 1067 | The most recent proposal is that the residential component for Altair be substantially reduced from the original figure of 150. |
| 1073 | Encouraged by the concentration of development in Altrincham Town Centre as it benefits from established public transport links to local and regional centres via a number of differing modes, and also plays host to a number of key services, retail, leisure and employment opportunities. |
| 1073 | Locating significant amount of development in this location may see demand for the Junction 6 and 7 of the M56, and as such, development pressures may impact upon the operation of these junctions. Any large-scale development aspirations in this location will need to be brought forward sustainably to minimise any impact on the SRN. Any large scale development sites should be supported by the appropriate infrastructure and sound evidence bases to ensure any impact on the SRN is minimised. |
| 1074 | Policy SL13 is supported. Given the significance of the town centre's conservation areas it is suggested that this area is prioritised for the preparation of Conservation Area Management Plans. |
| 1082 | Policy SL13 requires development to "positively enhance the vitality and viability of town centres" but this is not compatible with seeking to limit other than A1 uses in prime shopping frontages. |
| 1133 | The continued development of Altrincham town centre is vital as the largest town centre in the Borough and a key destination for those who live outside the Borough in addition to visitors across Trafford. |
| 1140 | Concerned regarding the larger River Island. It is considered an unethical company. |
| 1145 | Need to protect both Town Halls. |
| 1145 | It is important to continue the development of Altrincham Town Centre. |
| 1152 | First priority of Spatial Strategy to direct development to the North East of Trafford within the Regional Centre and Inner Areas. Second priority Altrincham Town Centre. Priority 3 relates to the remaining Strategic Locations and the fourth explains that outside of these growth areas, new growth will be focussed on meeting local needs with market housing in sustainable locations well served by public transport. |
| 1152 | Directing growth to this area will assist in contributing to the regeneration of Altrincham Town Centre by encouraging business and shoppers to locate there. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1152 | Presently the Altair site which is located within SL13 makes no contribution to the character or well-being of the Town Centre. The site is located within a prominent gateway position next to Altrincham's Transport interchange and is in need of investment and development. The Altair scheme will include the demolition of all existing buildings and replace them with a comprehensive regeneration scheme for a mix of high quality uses. In addition to the facilities proposed, the scheme will also provide a high quality public realm with street furniture and art work to attract members of the local community. |
| 1152 | The content of Policy W1 is supported. It is important to guide economic regeneration and development in such locations as Altrincham town centre in order to assist growth of the City Region. Altair is specifically recognised as one of the most important regeneration sites in Altrincham town centre and represents an opportunity to enhance the town centre's viability and contribute towards Altrincham's role as a sub-regional centre. The mixed use regeneration of the site will encourage shoppers and business to Altrincham. |
| 1159 | There is no mention in the document about the declining state of Altrincham Market, which is at the core of the towns existence. The market is dying and no longer a visitor or tourist attraction. Money needs to be spent on the infrastructure and a programme put in place to attract more traders and to hold events to encourage people back to the market and town centre. |
| 1160 | Despite there being 4 policies covering the topic of green spaces, not one of them mentions the intention to protect any of the smaller green open spaces under 2000sq metres, which are not currently protected under the UDP. It is understood that neither the Green Space Strategy, nor the Integrated Green Plan will mention them or protect them in any way. Yet these smaller green spaces are very vulnerable to development, despite them being essential for the environment and visual amenity, as well as providing places for people to sit, especially in town centres. Currently and in the future, any planning application to build upon them will not be rejected, as no policy protects them, this is a serious oversight in the document. |
| 1169 | What will happen to Altrincham Market? |
| 1169 | Improvements to the market in Altrincham are needed as other areas are better (e.g. Bury) |
| 1169 | There is concern regarding the fate of the market. It is suggested that a "Friends of the Market" group should be set up. The Council should not be too prescriptive about the Altrincham market until more is known about the hospital site. Whatever happens to the hospital site will impinge upon the market. |
| 1169 | There is a need to maintain facilities as there is no point implementing them if they are not maintained. |
| 1169 | The document focuses on large development sites but does not consider smaller sites. The Stamford Bowling Club and a site next to the High Bank Adult Centre have become vacant. The site has been advertised for parking which is not a good use of the site. Question what is going to happen to the sites and are the Local Authority considering proposals of a smaller scale. |
| 1169 | Against the Altair development. The focus has to be on redevelopment rather than new development. Businesses come and go all of the time as people do not visit the town centre. People don't come to Altrincham as there is the perception that there is no parking, but the problem is that it is not readily accessible or seen. Need to make it easier for people to visit Altrincham. |
| 1169 | 30 years ago Altrincham was thriving; people are now shopping elsewhere e.g. Warrington. We should rectify the problems created in the past rather than looking to the future. |
| 1169 | Parking should be free in the Stamford Quarter and should be free on Saturdays. There are a number of sites which are empty which could be used as car parks. |
| 1169 | Should be looking at making Altrincham more attractive. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SS1

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | The proposals here for this out of centre location include offices and hotel uses. It will be necessary to show how these proposals comply with national planning policy. Has the need for new office floorspace over the plan period been assessed (PPS6 para 2.39)? Has a sequential approach been applied in terms of selecting sites for allocation (PPS6 para 2.44)? |
| 1031 | The Level 2 SFRA need to be available in order to examine flood risk issues prior to the publication version of the core strategy. It will be necessary to indicate how flood risk issues will be dealt with given that it is proposed to commence development early in the plan period. |
| 1031 | Further guidance for the development of the site can be set out in SPD. It would not be appropriate for this to be handled through informal planning guidance as has been indicated. |
| 1041 | The site should include reasonable access to bus services and Metrolink. The bus service capacity would be challenged once the development is fully occupied therefore developer contributions for service improvements would be reasonable to include in the Development Requirements of SS1. Pedestrian permeability and access across the Bridgewater Canal are already a Development Requirement. |
| 1045 | Where references are made in the "Development Requirements" sections in respect of Strategic Sites these state the development should make a contribution to affordable housing provision "of at least" (x or y%). Objection to the principle of this being set as a minimum requirement as this is not considered that this is supported by the Economic Viability Study which expresses the various figures in its findings as "targets" and a starting point for negotiations with developers/landowners. Given the acknowledgement in the EVS that it represents a "snapshot" in time and that sites will need to be subject to reappraisal in the market conditions in which they are brought forward in planning applications and with regard to other costs that may apply, the setting of minimum level of affordable provision for individual sites is not appropriate at this stage. |
| 1047 | Four of the five strategic sites (SS1, SS2, SS4 & SS5) lie within the proposed strategic locations. Where this is the case, it would be helpful to clarify whether the indicative housing numbers and floorspace figures given for the strategic locations include the contributions from the strategic site. |
| 1055 | There appears to be an error with regard to the site boundary for the Victoria Warehouse Site. The representor is in ownership of the site referred to as 'Land West of Victoria Warehouse', which was considered as part of the Trafford Employment Land Study (Ref: 70125). The site was subsequently considered as part of the SHLAA and page 6 of that document demonstrates that the site was included as part of the Victoria Warehouse Site (Ref: 1450) as does map 2 on page 110. In addition to the sites inclusion in the SHLAA, an outline planning application for a mixed use development that included the representors site in addition to Victoria Warehouse. It is requested that the SS1 boundary be amended to include the representors land as per the SHLAA. Its inclusion allows for more options to be considered as it provides additional land on what is essentially a tight constrained site. |
| 1066 | The requirement to provide measures to enhance the Bridgewater Canal for ecological purposes is welcomed. |
| 1073 | Development will benefit from accessibility via public transport, as well as being located on the edge of the Regional Centre. |
| 1073 | Proposed development uses are complementary to the nearby uses and as such, the site should benefit from linked trips. Further response is not felt to be needed subject to the results of the transport evidence base and LIP required to demonstrate that the site can be delivered on a sustainable basis. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1074 | Consideration should be given to a tall buildings policy within the LDF. |
| 1096 | Contamination may be an issue when detailed proposals are considered due to former landfill site. There is an opportunity as part of any development to pull the existing warehouse back from the canal frontage. This would support policy R2 of the Core Strategy. |
| 1155 | Strongly against demolishing Victoria Warehouse. Already a surfeit of flats in these areas. |
| 1170 | Would not like to see Victoria Warehouse demolished |
| 1180 | First bullet point – this point could be included for SL12 and SL7 too. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses -SS2

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1019 | Account should be taken that the site is next to the Wastewater Treatment Works - Davyhulme. There is potential for nuisance impact from vibration, noise, traffic, dust etc and the site should be designed in such a way to confine the impact of nuisance in accordance with this paragraph. |
| 1031 | It will be necessary to show how this proposal accords with national planning policy. Has the need for new office floorspace over the plan period been assessed (PPS6 paragraph 2.39). Has a sequential approach been applied in terms of selecting sites for allocation? (PPS6 paragraph 2.44). This will need to be demonstrated to support the allocation of the site rather than relying on this to be done following allocation. |
| 1031 | It is said that improvements to public transport infrastructure may be phased over the plan period in accordance with an agreed strategy for the delivery of improvements for public transport accessibility and usage and that this will require substantial improvements to be put in place prior to the first occupation of any development at Trafford Quays. More detail is necessary to explain what improvements are necessary, when they will be delivered and who will be delivering them. Also it needs to be clearer as to what substantial improvements need to be in place prior to the occupation of any development. More detail is also required about the impact of the development on the highway network and what improvements are necessary. It is said that development will be phased to reflect the timing of such highway infrastructure provision. Details of this phasing should be set out. |
| 1031 | Will flood risk information be available prior to the publication stage of the Core Strategy? It will be necessary to indicate how flood risk issues will be dealt with given that it is proposed to commence development early in the plan period. |
| 1031 | The proposed phasing of the housing on this site is set out in table L1 and housing will be provided over the plan period. Is it appropriate for housing to be developed in the early stages of the plan period given that housing here is to be developed on a green field site? |
| 1041 | <p>Under half the site is well served by the bus service. This is particularly unfortunate considering the large amount of traffic the site will generate and the extra strains it will put on the local highway already congested by traffic to and from the Trafford Centre and surrounding developments.</p> <p>Ensure that Development Proposals to 'Significantly improve public transport infrastructure including an integrated, frequent public transit system linking the location with surrounding residential and commercial areas' are ensured through commitments from Trafford MBC to secure adequate amounts of developer contributions.</p> <p>No bus service truly serves the entire site well in terms of distance from stops however the walking distances do reach part way into the site.</p> |

| | |
|------|--|
| | There are frequent bus services that connect the accessible parts of the site to areas in Manchester, Trafford, Salford and Stockport. |
| 1045 | Where references are made in the "Development Requirements" sections in respect of Strategic Sites these state the development should make a contribution to affordable housing provision "of at least" (x or y%). Objection to the principle of this being set as a minimum requirement as this is not considered that this is supported by the Economic Viability Study which expresses the various figures in its findings as "targets" and a starting point for negotiations with developers/landowners. Given the acknowledgement in the EVS that it represents a "snapshot" in time and that sites will need to be subject to reappraisal in the market conditions in which they are brought forward in planning applications and with regard to other costs that may apply, the setting of minimum level of affordable provision for individual sites is not appropriate at this stage. |
| 1045 | The text in the Strategic Proposal should be revised to make it clear that not all of the Trafford Quays site does contain "greenfield" land. |
| 1045 | The SA concludes Trafford Quays has major negative impact on conserving land resources but does not give explanation or justification for this except that it is green field. The sub objectives of E6 suggest little conflict. Conclusions reached would only be appropriate if there was adequate brownfield land to meet housing land elsewhere in Trafford but as it is a strategic site it is assumed everything to conserve land resources is being done. |
| 1045 | The Summary SA of TQ says there maybe an adverse impact on objective E2. However ecological assessments have demonstrated limited value but the scope for enhancement through development is significant |
| 1045 | The SA conclusions on the TQ site state the site has poor accessibility by public transport. This is contrary to the conclusions of the Trafford Park Accessibility Study which says the immediate area of the site is "well served by buses". TQ is highly sustainable location for development and enhancements to public transport can be made without significant investment in new infrastructure. The SA Accessibility conclusions are flawed and need to be revised. |
| 1045 | The Trafford Quays Delivery Report has been prepared on behalf of the landowner for the site. It sets out in detail the level of proposed development and associated development. It should be read alongside documents submitted in August 2008. |
| 1047 | Four of the five strategic sites (SS1, SS2, SS4 & SS5) lie within the proposed strategic locations. Where this is the case, it would be helpful to clarify whether the indicative housing numbers and floorspace figures given for the strategic locations include the contributions from the strategic site. |
| 1073 | As with development at the adjacent Trafford Centre Rectangle site, development in this location will impact upon the SRN, and as such, any development needs to be supported by extensive public transport improvements to ensure the impact on the SRN is minimised. These public transport improvements should be identified and programmed within the supporting Local Infrastructure Plan to justify the deliverability of the site, ensuring it comes forward on a sustainable basis. |
| 1073 | Significant measures to improve public transport accessibility are welcomed and have been identified as important to delivering the site for development; however these need to be explicitly identified with mechanisms put in place to ensure they are delivered before the site is operational through the LDF Modelling and LIP. Until the evidence and infrastructure information is presented, a view can not be formed regarding the aspirations at this location. |
| 1074 | SS2 reference to the listed buildings in the development requirements section is welcomed. It is suggested that a similar and consistent approach is taken to heritage assets in or adjacent to the sites and locations throughout this section of the document. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1093 | There could be an issue in terms of the Trafford Quays site as there is a proposal for 1,050 dwellings. |
| 1096 | <p>We have records which show that this site was built on a former landfill. Therefore contamination may be an issue when detailed development proposals are considered.</p> <p>There is an opportunity as part of any redevelopment to pull the existing warehouse back from the canal frontage. This would support policy R2 of the Core Strategy.</p> |
| 1096 | <p>The review of flood risk is supported following the completion of the Level 2 SFRA and where applicable the application of the sequential test.</p> <p>This site contains several ponds and land drains. An objection would be raised to any culverting as part of the redevelopment and appropriate ecological assessments should be undertaken as required under policy R2.</p> |
| 1145 | <p>It is important to protect Trafford's existing Town Centres and therefore the Plan should state clearly that the land around the Trafford Centre where it's proposed to develop housing, will not be designated a "Town Centre".</p> <p>Also there should be a higher percentage of affordable properties built in this area.</p> |
| 1145 | There should be a higher figure stated on the number of new dwellings built which should be affordable in this area. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SS3

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|---|
| 1031 | Is it intended that this site be retained in the Green Belt? |
| 1066 | Welcome this proposal. |
| 1067 | <p>Strongly support the creation/enhancement of woodland/meadow provision.</p> <p>In 1989 the restricted access junction from what is now the M60 to Stretford Road was closed with the impending opening of the junction to accommodate the Carrington Spur. This had a negative economic impact on the Western Part of Stretford and the South East part of Urmston. Might consideration be given to the construction of a link from the (north east) roundabout at junction of Carrington Spur/M60 to meet up with Stretford Road (about Newcroft Road). A single carriageway linked flanked by trees as the existing Carrington Spur.</p> |
| 1073 | Provided development at this location is purely leisure based, with no ancillary trip-generating uses, there is no objection to the development proposals at this site. However, this site should come forward with cycling and walking infrastructure to ensure the site is permeable by non-motorised modes to reduce the need to travel by private car to the site. |
| 1096 | Support the inclusion of the Stretford Meadows site within the Core Strategy. In particular they support the development requirements to improve drainage and provide enhancement of watercourses. |
| 1097 | <p>National Grid's ZNN 275kV overhead electricity transmission line runs from Danes substation to South Manchester substation crossing through the south eastern corner of the site. National Grid does not object to the proposals but the following points should be taken into account:</p> <p>National Grid does not own the land over which the overhead lines cross, and obtains the rights from individual landowners to place their equipment on their land. Potential operators of the sites should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain their existing overhead lines in-situ because of the strategic nature of their network.</p> |

| | |
|------|---|
| | Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. |
| 1125 | Would like to see more natural, safe but challenging play spaces on these plans including picnic/family dedicated areas. |
| 1133 | Delighted with the proposals for Stretford Meadows which will turn a former landfill site into a recreational "green area". |
| 1135 | Part of this land is currently owned by GMWDA as a closed landfill and may require special consideration. |
| 1149 | Concern about the proposal for the site as have not agreed or had consultation on these proposals and feel would affect the development potential of the site. |
| 1154 | The area should be a much bigger area with Stretford Town Centre as a focus. It should stretch from Stretford Meadows via the crossroads to the canal side and as far as Longford Park. |
| 1180 | Under the strategic proposal, it would be useful not to limit the recreation uses to 'informal'. Could consider e.g. pay for play or a cycling centre. |
| 1181 | Does the use of informal recreation hinder multiple activities? |
| 1181 | May include provision for formal recreation uses. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SS4

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | Will flood risk information be available prior to the publication stage of the Core Strategy? It will be necessary to indicate how flood risk issues will be dealt with given that it is proposed to commence development early in the plan period. |
| 1031 | It needs to be explained how the development of the site is linked to the redevelopment of the shopping centre. |
| 1041 | Poor access to public transport services as it is outside of acceptable walking distance by a large margin. Development requirements for this Strategic Site include 'additional contributions towards additional bus service provision' which is promising as long as it is done for every development and dependent upon how much is asked for. |
| 1045 | SA conclusions in regards to development in Partington pay no regard to mitigation and enhancement proposed relating to the planning application for residential development. This should be revised. |
| 1047 | Four of the five strategic sites (SS1, SS2, SS4 & SS5) lie within the proposed strategic locations. Where this is the case, it would be helpful to clarify whether the indicative housing numbers and floorspace figures given for the strategic locations include the contributions from the strategic site. |
| 1066 | It is suggested that the need to protect the wildlife corridor along the ship canal be included under Development Requirements. |
| 1067 | Support the redevelopment of the main local shopping centre. Support the justification for the improvement of the public transport provision. |
| 1073 | Although Partington is not close to the SRN its poor public transport accessibility means that the use of the private car is a highly viable option to accessing this location. As such it is likely that development in this location will impact on the M60 and M6. Welcome the development requirement for the Partington area is to improve public transport accessibility and usage in the area. Notwithstanding this until a sound transport evidence base is developed via the LDF modelling and LIP to support the development aspirations at this location. |
| 1076 | It is noted that phase 1 of the redevelopment of the shopping centre in Partington has to be completed by the time the first 250 houses of Partington Canalside are completed. This is important. Phase 2 of the development should be tied into the planning agreements more closely so that the developers don't walk away at the end leaving the retail centre redevelopment incomplete. |

| | |
|------|--|
| 1141 | Regarding Partington give them decent shops and other facilities. |
| 1145 | Town Centre shops need redeveloping as a matter of urgency. There is a real need to develop a better mix of social and private housing. A comprehensive strategy is needed to address the isolation of Partington (road and public transport). More job opportunities need to be created for the people of Partington. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses - SS5

| ID | Summary Of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1031 | Given that the site has an outline planning permission for the uses described in the proposal is it necessary for it to be identified as a strategic site. |
| 1041 | Highly accessible by a multi modal choice of public transport. |
| 1045 | Where references are made in the "Development Requirements" sections in respect of Strategic Sites these state the development should make a contribution to affordable housing provision "of at least" (x or y%). Objection to the principle of this being set as a minimum requirement as this is not considered that this is supported by the Economic Viability Study which expresses the various figures in its findings as "targets" and a starting point for negotiations with developers/landowners. Given the acknowledgement in the EVS that it represents a "snapshot" in time and that sites will need to be subject to reappraisal in the market conditions in which they are brought forward in planning applications and with regard to other costs that may apply, the setting of minimum level of affordable provision for individual sites is not appropriate at this stage. |
| 1047 | Four of the five strategic sites (SS1, SS2, SS4 & SS5) lie within the proposed strategic locations. Where this is the case, it would be helpful to clarify whether the indicative housing numbers and floorspace figures given for the strategic locations include the contributions from the strategic site. |
| 1067 | Support SS5 |
| 1073 | The comments made regarding SL13 also apply to this site. Any large-scale development aspirations in this location will need to be brought forward sustainably to minimise any impact on the SRN. Large scale development sites should be supported by the appropriate infrastructure and sound evidence bases to ensure any impact on the SRN is minimised. |
| 1093 | Question the reason for including the "smaller" development sites within the document and the fact that they are classified as strategic sites e.g. SS5 Altair. These sites are very localised and small in size and do not specifically fit within the spatial/strategic strategy, these sites should be accounted for within an additional document. |
| 1096 | Specific reference has been made for the Altair site to be built of high quality standards under BREEAM, Code for sustainable Homes. Would expect this development requirement is identified for all of the strategic sites, particularly as Trafford is part of the AGMA growth point. |
| 1133 | Agree that the Altair scheme is a key redevelopment scheme. Key to this redevelopment will be the provision of a permanent ice rink which is in line with aspirations to keep an ice rink facility in Altrincham. The provision of increased car parking is also integral to boosting the local economy in Altrincham. |
| 1145 | It is important to continue the development of Altrincham Town Centre. |
| 1152 | Directing growth to this area will assist in contributing to the regeneration of Altrincham Town Centre by encouraging business and shoppers to locate there. |
| 1152 | Presently the Altair site which is located within SL13 makes no contribution to the character or well-being of the Town Centre. The site is located within a prominent gateway position next to Altrincham's Transport interchange and is in need of investment and development. The Altair scheme will include the demolition of all |

| | |
|------|---|
| | existing buildings and replace them with a comprehensive regeneration scheme for a mix of high quality uses. In addition to the facilities proposed, the scheme will also provide a high quality public realm with street furniture and art work to attract members of the local community. |
| 1152 | The content of Policy W1 is supported. It is important to guide economic regeneration and development in such locations as Altrincham town centre in order to assist growth of the City Region. Altair is specifically recognised as one of the most important regeneration sites in Altrincham town centre and represents an opportunity to enhance the town centre's viability and contribute towards Altrincham's role as a sub-regional centre. The mixed use regeneration of the site will encourage shoppers and business to Altrincham. |
| 1152 | Support the development parameters of the uses listed in line with the outline planning permission (H/OUT/68603) a variety of other uses are also suitable for the town centre site, such as a hospital or other public buildings for example. It is important therefore to maintain flexibility within SS5 and not to limit the site solely to the approved uses. |
| 1159 | Object to the proposed Altair scheme apart from the ice rink and hotel. The retail and restaurant aspect will draw business away from the main town centre streets. The latter is dwindling with shops closing and businesses struggling. Any new development should be concentrated in the existing town centre, including Railway Street and the old Altrincham General Hospital site and only when there is a need to expand further, should an extension be considered, certainly not beforehand. The town will be split in two and both sides will dwindle. |
| 1159 | The architect for the Altair scheme is noted for his highly modern and "statement" glass buildings, which are totally inappropriate for the historic market town character of Altrincham, being primarily built of brick, stone and terracotta. The listed Stamford House building, the station and the Bonson Warehouse are all in close proximity to the Altair site and any form of glass and steel building will not be in keeping nor enhance the character of the town, going against all the proposed new policies. Unless the style in the revised Planning Application is compatible with the historic fabric of the town it should be rejected. |
| 1169 | What will happen if there is a lot of opposition to the proposal? |
| 1169 | Against the Altair development. The focus has to be on redevelopment rather than new development. Businesses come and go all of the time as people do not visit the town centre. People don't come to Altrincham as there is the perception that there is no parking, but the problem is that it is not readily accessible or seen. Need to make it easier for people to visit Altrincham. |

Preferred Option (June 2009) responses – ALL Strategic Sites and Locations

| ID | Summary of Representation |
|------|--|
| 1026 | The Council have identified 11 Strategic Locations and 4 Strategic Sites. Of these, seven (46%) are in the ownership or control of a single landowner who it is anticipated will deliver 4,550 (62%) units out of 7,300 proposed in the SL and 1,600 (75%) of the 2,150 on the SS. At the top of the housing market, but particularly over the next 3-5 years, it is difficult to envisage a single landowner wishing to bring forward seven separate sites, probably with a similar mix of units, all of which will be in competition with each other. The Council's anticipated commencement sites on each site must be seriously questioned as is their ability with the current allocations to meet their 5, 10 and 15 year targets. |
| 1026 | In general terms it should be noted that seven of the Strategic Locations are to be reviewed for the impact of flooding and this also applies to all four of the strategic housing sites. Two of the Strategic Sites are on Greenfield land, Partington and Trafford Quays whilst the Trafford Rectangle is a partial greenfield site. The RSS |

| | |
|------|--|
| | policies seek to encourage the re-use of disused land and buildings, in line with national policy, and see this as being critical to improving the Regions image. |
| 1026 | The Council have assumed optimistic development phasing for each location or site, in all but two cases the Council have indicated that development will commence in 2010/11 and in the two exceptions commencement is delayed 2011/12. In the current economic climate it is unlikely that the housing market will recover until 2013 and, as stated previously, this will be a cautious recovery where developers will not be producing the historic volume of units from a site until perhaps 2015. Furthermore the heavy reliance on apartments is unrealistic as the market in the Manchester sub region has already has an oversupply of apartments and this market has collapsed. |
| 1026 | There are questions over the deliverability, achievability and suitability of some of the Strategic Sites and Locations in the preferred option, particularly in regard to the ownership, location and anticipated commencement dates. |
| 1031 | Paragraph 23.4 says that for each strategic location consideration will be given to producing planning guidance which may take the form of an AAP, Land Allocations DPD, SPD or informal masterplan. It needs to be made clear that following the identification of a strategic location in the Core Strategy, which would be indicated on the key diagram, it would be necessary to allocate the site in a subsequent DPD. |
| 1031 | Paragraph 23.5 says that for each strategic site consideration will be given to the production of planning guidance which may take the form of SPD, a development brief or informal planning guidance. Firstly, such guidance should take the form of SPD. PPS12, paragraph 6.4, says that Councils should not produce guidance other than SPD where the guidance is intended to be used in decision making or the coordination of development as this could be construed as wishing to circumvent the provisions for consultation and sustainability appraisals. Secondly PPS12 para 4.11 says that infrastructure planning for the Core Strategy should include the specific infrastructure requirements of any strategic site allocated in it. |
| 1031 | It is unclear from para 23.6 whether the flood risk issues in relation to strategic locations and sites will be addressed prior to the publication stage of the Core Strategy. As indicated previously, it is necessary for the Core Strategy to reflect the Councils strategic approach to flood risk and the Council need to explain how it has informed the preparation of the Core Strategy. PPS25 Practice Guide indicates that the LPA should demonstrate through evidence that it has considered a range of options in conjunction with the flood zone information from the SFRA and applied the sequential test and where necessary the exception test in the site allocation process. This can be undertaken directly as part of the SA. |
| 1031 | It is also unclear whether the highway implications of the strategic locations and sites will be considered prior to publication. Aware that transport modelling is currently being undertaken. It will be necessary for the results of this work to inform the core strategy. The impact of major proposed developments on the highway network will need to be understood and the measures to deal with and mitigate this impact should be set out. This is particularly important in relation to the impact of schemes on the motorway network and it is likely that you will need to engage with the Highways Agency prior to the publication of the plan to agree how this impact can be mitigated. It may also be necessary to consider how the phasing of development can ensure a good fit with planned transport infrastructure. |
| 1036 | It is understood that the "Strategic Locations" will set the framework for future land allocations, including those that are brought forward within the Council's "Land Use Allocations DPD" or via Area Action Plans at a later date. This approach is supported. |
| 1040 | Remain concerned that the Core Strategy relies too heavily on those Strategic Sites which, whilst important regeneration priorities, will not provide the amount of new homes envisaged. Many of these sites are included for higher density residential use (some as part of mixed use schemes) which are unlikely to come forward in the short term. The commercial market is equally depressed so these schemes will be slower to |

| | |
|------|---|
| | materialise. It is therefore requested that the Council's policies allow for residential development (at lower densities) elsewhere outside of these areas and that they are not refused for not being within these areas or for prejudicing the delivery of these developments. Otherwise support the policy approach to selected areas and support their regeneration. If these sites do not deliver then policy is needed to support (or not obstruct) other sites that can deliver the RSS targets for new homes. |
| 1045 | Support the allocation of Pomona, Wharfside, Partington and the Trafford Centre Rectangle as Strategic Locations and of Trafford Quays as a Strategic Site. |
| 1045 | By reference to PPS12 and to paras 4.11 and 4.12 of the draft CS, it is understood that one of the key distinctions between a Strategic Location and a Strategic Site is that the strategic sites are already much more clearly defined at this stage, in respect of a site boundary, the range and mix of land uses proposed and the general scale of development likely to be brought forward on them. Hence it is both possible and appropriate to define them on the proposals map and in line with para 4.12 this is a specific land use allocation which gives them high status in decision making on planning applications. Given this status the allocation of a Strategic Site in the CS should be capable of providing a landowner with a level of certainty and confidence to invest time and to incur architects and other fees in developing detailed proposals and submitting a planning application. This level of confidence is undermined by the Council's proposal at para 23.5 of the draft CS that consideration will be given to further planning guidance or an SPD for the Strategic Sites. Whilst this may be necessary for Strategic Locations where proposals are less clearly defined, it is not necessary for the Strategic Sites. Any suggestion of such a requirement will serve simply to remove the certainty that a land use allocation should provide. Para 23.5 should therefore be deleted. |
| 1045 | Strategic Proposals Sections: The reference to numbers of residential units in each of the Allocations and Sites should be amended to clarify that this figure reflects the assumed contribution within the plan period and does not define or seek in anyway to limit the capacity of the site or location for residential development. |
| 1045 | Strategic Proposal Sections: Object to the use of the words "up to" in relation to the quoted housing numbers. This appears to imply a limit on the scale of development each site or location although the figures do not generally reflect known development capacity. More importantly the setting of such limits is unwarranted since the RSS housing land requirement are not to be treated as a maximum figure. |
| 1045 | Development Requirements Sections: The specific reference to CHP in each of the development requirement sections may be seen to imply that this is a preferred option whereas there may be a number of equally suitable or even more preferable options in respect of these development opportunities as is recognised in policy L5.8 of the draft CS. Hence it is considered that the specific reference to CHP is over prescriptive and should be replaced by a more generally worded requirement for renewable energy provision. |
| 1047 | It is noted that the Employment Land Study details there is sufficient supply of sites without the need to retain Davenport Green, additionally it should be noted that the site has been removed from the NWDA's list of strategic regional sites. |
| 1051 | The reference to environmental management and mitigation in the seventh bullet point is too limiting and should be broadened to encompass opportunities for enhancement, e.g. through heritage led regeneration or the promotion of tourism opportunities. |
| 1051 | The reference to environmental management and mitigation in the fifth bullet point is too limiting and should be broadened to encompass opportunities for enhancement, e.g. through heritage led regeneration or the promotion of tourism opportunities. |
| 1067 | Designating priority locations for change as priority 1/2/3 suggests that those locations in priority 1 are of a greater priority than those in priority 2 and 3 and those in priority 2 are of a greater priority than those in priority 3. It is understood that this is not necessarily the intention but that the groupings are for other reasons. Suggest that the |

| | |
|------|---|
| | designations should have been pink, orange, and yellow. An explanation as to how the groupings were determined would have helped the reader. |
| 1072 | Concerned that "questions" relating to deliverability, and compliance with national and regional policy, are not explored or detailed in the Core Strategy or the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Questions are quite different from evidence and carry correspondingly less weight. The Employment Land Study (ELS) provides a cursory assessment of Davenport Green against planning policy in its Appendix. It is also unclear which "emerging spatial strategy" para 23.11 is referring to, RSS for the North West was published in September 2008. Finally in stating that Davenport Green is "not required" it can only be assumed that para 23.11 is drawing on the ELS, which recommended that Davenport Green be released from Trafford's stock of employment land (as stated in para 14.5 of the Core Strategy: Further Consultation). |
| 1072 | Development at any site will have both positive and negative impacts. The SA assesses social, environmental and economic impacts, to give an overall assessment of the sustainability of development. Unfamiliar with the term "positive sustainability impact". Rather the sustainability of a site for development should be judged once positive and negative impacts are taken into account. Para 23.10 directly quotes from the SA in listing negative impacts; evidence for these potential impacts is to be found in the Appendix to the SA. It is suggested that the public should be given a summary of positive impacts as well as negative impacts, in order to be able to respond usefully to this para. |
| 1072 | Regarding para 23.11 it is noted that issues of deliverability were considered in Trafford's own assessment of employment sites, as part of the employment land study (para 6.1 of the ELS). If it is assumed that deliverability relates to the "planning policy" and "market attractiveness" aspects of this assessment, detailed in Appendix D of the ELS, then Davenport Green does not score significantly better or worse than a number of other sites, including strategic sites and other sites located within strategic locations. The average score, out of 70, for "planning policy" and "market attractiveness" combined was 51. Davenport Green scored 47 and 17 of the 48 other sites scored lower. |
| 1072 | <p>Para 23.11 is not explicit in stating the basis upon which it is "clear" that the "proposal is not required in order to meet employment or housing needs". As the ELS establishes there is a need for 100-170ha of employment land from 2007 to 2026. None of the sites, individually, are strictly "required" to meet this need. Rather the Councils responsibility as part of the LDF should be to identify which sites offer the best potential for sustainable economic development, and create a policy framework in which sufficient sites can be expected to come forward for employment development over the plan period. The contrast between the Councils proposed policy and the Councils existing policy framework for Davenport Green Policy E14 of the UDP is striking. The supporting text in the UDP to justify policy E14 clearly articulated that Davenport Green was an allocation designed to meet a need which exists at the regional and sub regional scale. Hence the allocation of Davenport Green was designed to ensure that Davenport Green complemented employment sites within the existing urban areas as explained in the UDP.</p> <p>(Note Para 6.1 of the ELS claims that "For this employment land study, Trafford Council have carried out a detailed assessment of the current and potential employment land sites within Trafford. This was completed in terms of location, availability and deliverability". However location is not an explicit category in the assessment (detailed in Appendix D to the ELS). Location is considered within the "sustainability" set of criteria. Availability is considered within the "market attractiveness" set of criteria; Davenport Green scores 3/5. Deliverability is not explicitly mentioned.)</p> |
| 1073 | Encouraged by the 'headline requirement' for the need for development to be accessed by 'adequate public transport', although this requirement is not fully reflected |

| | |
|------|--|
| | within some of the land allocations within the Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations (SS/SL). |
| 1073 | Encouraged by the first priority for locating development - Pomona Island (SL1); Trafford Wharfside (SL2); Old Trafford (SL3); Lancashire County Cricket Club (SL4); and Trafford Park Core (SL5). Notwithstanding that, appropriate sustainable transport infrastructure (or better links to existing infrastructure) may have to be delivered, alongside development in these locations to ensure any wider traffic impacts are not at the SRN. |
| 1073 | Policy W1.9 should include - sites that are accessible by a range of alternative modes other than the private car. |
| 1073 | It should be noted that all of the comments regarding strategic sites and strategic locations are made without sight of the LDF Modelling Outputs and as such the comments are subject to results and subsequent discussions to produce the LIP. |
| 1073 | In regard to the Strategic Sites and Strategic Locations, where development is to be phased, the support infrastructure to support this development must also be phased to ensure that sustainable development comes forward. This should be reflected in the transport evidence base and local infrastructure plan. |
| 1074 | Part D on strategic sites and locations now includes reference to some of the heritage assets included in previous representations. As a general comment it is suggested that the development requirements should include a more pro-active approach to securing the conservation and enhancement of these assets. |
| 1089 | UUPS wishes to support the identification of SHLAA site 1591 Davyhulme Wastewater Treatment Works as a potential site for residential uses. For confirmation this support is offered in respect of that area which is identified as a disused sewage works. The main part of the site remains a strategic operational asset of United Utilities. The site is identified as having a capacity of 501 dwellings in the SHLAA. Given this size UUPS suggests this site should be included in Table 4: Strategic Sites and Locations Summary Table. |
| 1125 | Not sure how additional housing will help regeneration when there are issues with employment and transport. In each of the planned sites for development there is no mention of schools and/or childcare provision. There is a gap in childcare provision in areas of deprivation evidenced in the Trafford Childcare Sufficiency Assessment Plan 2008. |
| 1125 | The Local Authority has statutory responsibility to take a strategic lead and facilitate the childcare market. This is proving very difficult due to the lack of, or extreme costs of venues across the borough. This makes it difficult to attract and develop local accessible childcare for families and employers thus creating a problem for regeneration plans. |
| 1125 | These locations for change bring an opportunity for developing spaces/sites for childcare in or around schools and larger commercial business areas. Childcare does need to be sustainable before it can be successful and therefore needs to be part of the strategic planning process. |
| 1181 | There are some sites that are not considered to be strategic enough to be included within the Core Strategy. |
| 1040 | We remain concerned that the Core Strategy relies too heavily upon those Strategic Sites, which whilst important regeneration priorities, will not provide the amount of new homes envisaged. Many of these sites are included for higher density residential use (some as part of mixed use schemes) which are unlikely to come forward in the short term. The commercial market is equally depressed so these schemes will be slower to materialise. We therefore ask that the Councils policies allow for residential development (at lower densities) elsewhere outside of these areas and that they are not refused for not being in these areas or for prejudicing the delivery of these developments. |

| | |
|------|---|
| | Otherwise support the policy approach to selected areas and support their regeneration, but simply wish to be realistic in this tough market. If these sites do not deliver, we simply need policy to support (or not obstruct) other sites that can deliver the RSS target for new homes. |
| 1093 | Encourage the consideration of alternative methods for delivery of the core strategy should not all the strategic sites go ahead. |
| 1093 | The disaggregation of the RSS sub-regional requirement is currently being considered by the Greater Manchester Authorities through a study which will provide evidence to inform the amount of employment land that needs to be provided in Trafford. As there is a list of strategic sites within the document, appropriateness of these sites should be considered by the Council through the Employment Land Review. |
| 1130 | Support the principal of the sites identified for redevelopment notably Victoria Warehouse, Trafford Quays, Stretford Meadows, Partington canal-side and Altair. |