



## **TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION**

---

**Programme Officer: Ms Yvonne Parker**  
**Tel: 01282 450522 / Mobile 0781 333 4305**  
**[Programme.officer@ntlworld.com](mailto:Programme.officer@ntlworld.com)**

**Assistant Programme Officer: Ms Andrea Edwards**  
**Tel: 0161 912 4061**  
**[Andrea.Edwards@trafford.gov.uk](mailto:Andrea.Edwards@trafford.gov.uk)**

---

Please send hard copies of any correspondence to Yvonne Parker, The Programme Officer, c/o Trafford Council, First Floor, Waterside House, Sale Waterside, Sale, M33 7ZF

---

Dear Sir or Madam

I am the Programme Officer for the above Examination. I will be working under the direction of the Inspector Dr Shelagh Bussey DIPTP DIPEM MA PHD MRTPI.

Andrea Edwards is my assistant and her details are above. Can you please copy me into any emails that you send to her?

The Pre-Hearing meeting will take place on Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011 commencing at 2pm at Trafford Town Hall in Rooms 2 & 3.

The Hearings will commence on Monday 28<sup>th</sup> February 2011.

I enclose for your information the Pre-Hearing Pack which is the six separate documents listed below but I have put it altogether into one document to assist you when printing it out.

**The Pre-Hearing Agenda**  
**Guidance Notes**  
**Hearings Timetable**  
**The Issues and Matters**  
**Key Dates**  
**Draft Hearings Programme**

I have attached for your information CD/12.4 which is the '**Living Document**' that the Inspector refers to in her notes.

I also enclose a form for each of the representation(s) that you submitted. Could you please check the information on each form and correct it where appropriate and also advise me how you wish to deal with it at the forthcoming Examination. Can you please return the forms to me by **Monday 17<sup>th</sup> January** if possible in order that I can update the programme as soon as possible in time for the PHM? If I do not receive them by the 21<sup>st</sup> January as requested in the key dates I will presume that you do not wish to participate any further in the Examination and that your original representations only will be taken into account.

Please note that each party will be limited to a maximum of two seats at the table.

Please could you give me details of your email address if it is not already on the form?

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

**Kind regards**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yvonne Parker', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Yvonne Parker  
Programme Officer  
4 January 2011**

**TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY  
PRE-HEARING MEETING**

**Tuesday 25 January 2011 at 14.00**

**AGENDA**

1. Opening and Introductions
2. Purpose of the Pre-Hearing Meeting
3. Scope and possible outcomes of the Examination and Role of the Inspector
4. Procedural Questions for the Council
5. Representations on the Core Strategy
6. Methods of Considering Representations
7. Examination Arrangements
8. Examination Programme
9. Main Matters and Issues to be debated at the Hearing Sessions
10. Preparation and Submission of further material as requested by the Inspector
11. Availability of Information
12. Site Visits Arrangements
13. Close of the Examination
14. Considerations Arising from the Inspector's Request for Early Clarification on some Matters
15. Submission of Inspector's Report
16. Questions
17. Close of PHM

**TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY**  
**PRE-HEARING MEETING**  
**INSPECTOR'S GUIDANCE NOTES**

**1 Opening Announcements and Introductions**

- 1.1 I will open the Pre-Hearing Meeting for the Trafford Core Strategy, which forms part of the Council's Local Development Framework, at 14.00 on 25 January 2011.
- 1.2 I will introduce myself as Shelagh Bussey. I am a Senior Planning Inspector for the Planning Inspectorate. I am a Chartered Town Planner and I have a Masters Degree in Environmental Planning, post graduate Diplomas in Town Planning and Environmental Management, I am a Doctor of Philosophy and I am MRTPI. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State under Section 20 (4) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to hold the Examination into the soundness of the Trafford Core Strategy.
- 1.3 I shall introduce the Programme Officer for the Examination; Yvonne Parker and her assistant Andrea Edwards, who for the purposes of the Examination, are acting as independent Officers, under my direction, not as employees of the Council. Yvonne's contact details are on the letter that she out to you with this note and will be in the notes of this meeting. Andrea Edwards, contact details are: First floor, Waterside House, Sale Waterside, Sale, M33 7ZF, 0161 912 4061, [andrea.edwards@trafford.gov.uk](mailto:andrea.edwards@trafford.gov.uk).
- 1.4 The Programme Officer is responsible for finalising the programme for the Hearing Sessions of the Examination, for maintaining the Examination Library, recording and circulating all material received, and assisting me with procedural and administrative matters.
- 1.5 The Programme Officer will be able to advise you on any programming queries, and any procedural queries should be addressed to her in the first instance. Any matters which the Council or anyone wishes to raise with me should also be addressed to the Programme Officer initially.
- 1.6 The Council's team will be introduced as: : Dennis Smith, Strategic Planning and Housing Manager, Rob Haslam, Principal Planning Officer and Clare Taylor-Russell, Senior Regeneration Officer. Most of the Council's attendance at the Hearing Sessions will be covered by these Officers, but it reserves the right to draw on other Council Officers or Consultants, once it has given further consideration to my detailed questions under each of the Main Matters to be discussed.

**2 Purpose of the Pre-Hearing Meeting**

- 2.1 The purpose of the Pre-Hearing Meeting is to explain and discuss procedural and administrative matters relating to the management of the Examination, including the programme for the Hearings, the matters to be examined and related issues, the timetable and participants at each of the sessions, how representations will be heard, key dates for the submission of topic papers and further representations, and any other relevant matters. However, the

contents or merits of the Core Strategy will not be discussed at the Pre-Hearing Meeting.

### **3 Scope of the Examination and the Inspector's Role**

- 3.1 My role is to consider whether the Core Strategy meets the requirements of sections 19 and 24 (i) of the 2004 Act and the associated Regulations, and whether it is sound in terms of being justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
- 3.2 The presumption is that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan, and it should rely on evidence collected while preparing the Core Strategy to demonstrate that it is sound. Representors seeking changes to the Core Strategy have to demonstrate why they consider it to be unsound and how their suggested changes would make it sound.
- 3.3 Representations made to the submitted plan, will be considered only insofar as they relate to its soundness. They will not be reported on individually. I do not have the authority to 'improve' the plan, so I shall ensure that my recommendations for any changes are restricted to those that are clearly essential to make the Core Strategy sound. The approach of the Planning Inspectorate is to work with the Council and all other interested parties in a consensual way, bearing in mind the Government's emphasis on the concept of localism, and from the starting point that the plan being examined is what the Council wishes to see happen.
- 3.4 The Examination will be closed when I submit my report to the Council, on my conclusions and actions or changes needed as regards the soundness of the Core Strategy.
- 3.5 There are several possible outcomes of the Examination of the Core Strategy. The most serious would be a finding of unsoundness in relation to a critically important part of it, leading to a recommendation that it should be withdrawn. However, less serious outcomes may be that:
  - Additional work needs to be undertaken before the Examination can be completed;
  - Part of the Core Strategy should be excluded or changed (having regard to the implications in terms of community involvement and sustainability appraisal requirements), and the remainder adopted;
  - Part of the Core Strategy should be excluded and subsequently brought forward in a revised form, in a fresh DPD, and the remainder adopted.
- 3.6 Ideally, only a limited number of changes should be made to the Core Strategy, if necessary for soundness, at this stage and I shall seek the agreement of the Council to any change which I assess as being essential in the interests of soundness. However, I may only recommend a change to the submitted plan if that change is itself sound and meets the requirements for public consultation and sustainability appraisal.

### **4 Procedural Questions for the Council**

- 4.1 Before outlining the arrangements for the Examination, I shall ask the Council the following procedural questions.
- 4.2 Can the Council confirm that the Core Strategy has been:

- (i) prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures under Section 20 (5) (a) of the 2004 Act?;
- (ii) prepared in compliance with the 2004 Regulations (as amended), specifically regarding the publication of prescribed documents, their availability at the Council's principal offices and website, the placing of local advertisements and notification of the DPD bodies?;
- (iii) is the Council aware of any fundamental procedural shortcomings concerning the Core Strategy?
- (iv) has this meeting been advertised? How?

## **5 Representations made on the Core Strategy**

- 5.1 Some 269 representations were made by a total of 36 organisations and individuals during a 6-week consultation period, from 20 September 2010 to 1 November 2010, prior to the formal submission of the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State. 99 representations considered elements of the Core Strategy to be unsound, 104 representations considered it to be sound and 66 representations were simply comments that did not judge elements of the plan as sound or unsound.

## **6 Methods of considering representations**

- 6.1 Those who have made representations on the Core Strategy and consider it to be unsound need to decide whether they want their views to be dealt with in writing or if they wish to present them orally at the relevant Hearing session of the Examination. Both methods carry the same weight and I shall have equal regard to views put to me orally or in writing. Attendance at the Hearings will only be helpful if you wish to participate in the debate.
- 6.2 With reference to the two main ways in which representations on the Core Strategy can be considered:
- Written representation – This is based on the original representation. Those people who wish to proceed by written representations can, if they wish, rely on what they have already submitted in writing and take no further action, or they may send in a further written representation in support of their position, having regard to my Matters, Issues and Questions Papers that are relevant to their objections. Most representations will be considered by this method. Written representations will not be discussed at the Hearings and attendance at the Hearing sessions is not necessary, although all will be public meetings;
  - Oral representations – Where Representors have indicated on their representation form or in response to the Programme Officer's questionnaire that they wish to be heard, relevant points of their representation will be considered at a Hearing Session of the Examination, where the Council and other participants will be able to debate the main points on the key issues, in a structured discussion led by me.

- 6.3 Whichever method you select, please remember that my role is to consider the soundness of the Core Strategy in the light of the representations received, rather than considering all the points raised in those representations. Only those parties who consider the Core Strategy to be unsound and are seeking specific changes to the plan are entitled to attend the Hearing Sessions of the Examination. There is no need for those supporting or merely making comments on the plan to attend, unless they wish to, as observers.

## **7 Procedure and Programme for the Hearing Sessions of the Examination**

- 7.1 The Hearing Sessions for the Core Strategy will commence at 09.30 on **Monday 28 February 2011**, immediately after a short opening session, in **Rooms 2 & 3 at Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0YT**. and will extend over the remainder of that week and the following week until **Thursday 10 March 2011**.
- 7.2 The sessions will generally start at 09.30 and 14.00 each day, with a break for lunch at about 13.00 and they will finish at about 17.00. When convenient, a short break will be taken mid-morning and mid-afternoon.
- 7.3 The Hearing Sessions will take the form of a structured discussion, where the Council and those who have been invited to participate will discuss the key issues, around a table. This will provide a relaxed and informal setting for dealing with the Main Matters, Issues and Questions. Those attending may bring professional representatives with them, who may ask other participants questions, but there will be no formal presentation of evidence, cross-examination or formal submissions. If the Council or any respondents intend to invite their legal representatives/expert witnesses to any of the Hearing Sessions please would they inform the Programme Officer as soon as possible and provide her with their details so that the necessary administrative and seating arrangements can be made.
- 7.4 I have set out a range of Main Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) on which I need information or a response from the Council and Representors. These accompany this note. They will also be on the Council's LDF website. The discussion at the Hearing Sessions will focus on the relevant MIQs, which will form the agendas. Please note that the MIQs are based on current national and regional planning policies (at January 2011), at which time the Regional Spatial Strategy: The North West of England Plan (RSS) forms part of the development plan for Trafford. Thus to be sound the Core Strategy should be in general conformity with the RSS.
- 7.5 Possible changes to national policy and legislation during the Examination period may require me to amend the intended scheduled timing and content of some of the hearings sessions, but the Programme Officer will keep you informed of any such changes.
- 7.6 I will make a few brief opening comments on the matters I want covered in the session. I shall then invite the participants to make their contribution in response to the points I have raised. The Hearing Session will progress under my guidance, drawing those present into the discussion in such a way as to enable me to gain the information necessary to come to firm conclusions and recommendations with regards the soundness of the Core Strategy. There will

be opportunity in the Hearing Sessions to ask questions, and professional representatives and advocates can also join in the discussion.

- 7.7 The Hearings will be conducted on the basis that everyone taking part has read the relevant documents, although participants will be able to refer to and elaborate on relevant points, as necessary. I shall endeavour to progress the Hearing Sessions in an effective and efficient manner. As part of that process, I aim to minimise the amount of material circulated to that strictly necessary in order to come to informed conclusions on the Main Matters.

## **8 Hearings Programme**

- 8.1 The Hearings Timetable and draft Programme are attached. If you wish to change the method by which you wish your representation to be heard, or to attend additional/different Hearing Sessions to those indicated on the draft Programme, please inform the Programme Officer as soon as possible before **21 January 2011**. It will be for individual participants to keep in touch with the Programme Officer to check the progress of the Examination and to ensure that they are present at the appropriate time.

- 8.2 The Main Matters that I have identified for the Core Strategy Hearing Sessions are:

**Main Matter 1 - An Overview - Sections 1-7 and Key Diagram**

Whether the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy reflect the spatial community strategy and the issues identified to be addressed, and are sound.

Whether the evidence base is complete, up to date and robust, and cross boundary issues have been satisfactorily taken account of.

**Main Matter 2 – Legal Requirements - Whole DPD**

Whether all of the legal requirements have been met.

**Main Matter 3 – The Strategic Locations – Section 8 and Policies SL1, SL2, SL3, SL4 and SL5**

Whether the Strategic Locations are justified by the evidence, are the most appropriate to achieve the spatial vision and objectives, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.

**Main Matter 4 – The Economy – Policies W1, W2 and R6**

Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy are the most appropriate to enable Trafford to remain competitive and to contribute to the economic growth of the sub-region, are justified by the evidence, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.

**Main Matter 5 – The Green Belt and Other Protected Land – Policy R4 and Appendix 2**

Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy, which intend an addition to the Green Belt, are justified and consistent with national policy.

**Main Matter 6 – Land for New Homes/Meeting Housing Needs – Policies L1 and L2**

Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy, which aim to ensure that sufficient land is available in the right place and at the right time to meet housing needs of all of the community and to support the economic growth of Trafford, are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.



**Main Matter 7 – The Historic and Natural Environments and Green Infrastructure – Policies R1, R2 and R3**

Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy will ensure that development respects the historic and natural environment of Trafford, make satisfactory provision for green infrastructure, and are justified by the evidence, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.

**Main Matter 8 - Achieving Sustainable/ Inclusive Communities - Policies L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, W3, R5 and Appendix 1**

Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy that seek to achieve sustainable, inclusive communities and to address the impact of climate change, are justified by the evidence, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.

**Main Matter 9 - Delivery/Planning Obligations/ Implementation/ Monitoring – Policy L8 and Sections 27 and 28**

Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy will enable the provision of all necessary infrastructure in phase with the intended development, and if the mechanisms for their delivery, implementation and monitoring are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

**Main Matter 10 – Miscellaneous DPD and Procedural Matters**

- 8.3 Bearing in mind their associated Issues and Questions, I shall ask for the confirmation of attendees of the Pre-Hearing Meeting that these are the main matters that go to the heart of the soundness of the Core Strategy.

**9 Preparation and submission of further material**

**Core Documents**

- 9.1 The Council has prepared a list of Core Documents. A paper copy of this list can be obtained from the Programme Officer and is also available on the Council's website. Hard Copies of the Core Documents are available for inspection in the Examination Library, which is located within the Strategic Planning and Developments Team at Waterside House, Sale Waterside, Sale, M33 7ZF until the week before the Hearings session start, when the Examination Library will be relocated to the Programme Officer's Office at Trafford Town Hall, Talbot Road, Stretford, M32 0YT for the duration of the Hearing Sessions. They are also available to view on the Council's website at: <http://www.trafford.gov.uk/environmentandplanning/strategicplanning/localdevelopmentframework/corestrategy/> via an interactive version of the Core Strategy Core Documents list. The Examination Library also contains copies of the submitted Core Strategy and associated documents, all representations, the Core Documents and further representations and statements, as received.

**Topic Papers to be submitted by the Council**

- 9.2 In response to **each** of my Matters, Issues and Questions Papers the Council is requested to prepare a full written response in the form of an individual Topic Paper. They should include full and precise references to the evidence base to justify a particular strategy/proposal/policy, along with any supporting documentation. They should also include references to any suggested changes considered necessary to make the Core Strategy sound, bearing in mind that any further changes suggested at this stage should be assessed against an associated sustainability appraisal and the implications for further public consultation. These Topic Papers will provide the Council's detailed answers to

my questions and will set the scene for the issues to be debated at the Hearings sessions. The Council's Topic Papers should be submitted to the Programme Officer by **12.00 Thursday 3 February 2011, so please do not wait until after the Pre-Hearing Meeting before commencing preparation of the Topic Papers. The Council should start work on these now.** In addition, a composite list of the suggested changes arising from the Council's responses to the MIQs is required by the same date.

**Submission of further written statements and other material to be submitted by Representors**

- 9.3 The representations already made should include all the points and evidence to substantiate Representors' cases. However, if you wish to submit further evidence in response to my Matters, Issues and Questions Paper that is relevant to your representation, either for the Hearings or for written representations, it should be sent to the Programme Officer by **12.00 Thursday 3 February 2011, so please do not wait until after the Pre-Hearing Meeting before commencing preparation of your further representations. You should start work on these now.** If your representations are to be considered at more than one hearing session, a copy of your further written statement is required for **each** of the relevant Hearing session. They should not form a composite response.
- 9.4 I stress the need for succinct submissions, avoiding any unnecessary detail and repetition. There is no need for verbatim quotations from the Core Strategy, or other sources of policy guidance. Nonetheless, it is vital that the fundamental elements of cases are set out clearly, since the Hearings are not the place for new points or evidence to be presented for the first time. Please note that it is the quality and substance of the reasoning that carries weight, not the bulk of the documents.
- 9.3 The Programme Officer will require **4 hard copies of all topic papers and written statements, which should also be submitted in electronic form, if possible.** Statements should be no longer than **3,000 words**, either for consideration at a Hearing session or as a further written representation. Statements which are excessively long or contain irrelevant or repetitious material may be returned. Technical evidence should be limited to appendices, and should be clearly related to the Main Matter. Any supporting material should be limited to that which is essential and should not contain extracts from any documents that are already in the Examination Library, although these should be cross-referenced if referred to. All statements should focus on the elements of soundness; justification, effectiveness and consistency with national policy, and they should specifically demonstrate how the submitted Core Strategy is unsound, and how it could be made sound by adopting the approach advocated by the Representor. **All statements should clearly indicate the policy/paragraph/page of the Core Strategy at issue, and the relevant aspect of soundness.**
- 9.4 There is no need for summary statements. Statements should be on A4 paper, not spiral bound, but punched with two holes for filing. Photographs should be in A4 format, annotated on the back. Plans or diagrams should fold down to A4 size. **All statements should be marked with your unique reference number as indicated on your PHM Questionnaire, and the Main Matter to which it refers.** If you have mislaid your reference number please contact

the Programme Officer. If you wish to make further representations that cover more than one Main Matter a separate copy of your statement is required for each Main matter, and should be appropriately referenced.

## **10 Site visit arrangements**

- 10.1 I shall visit of all the main locations referred to in the Core Strategy prior to the Hearing Sessions, on an unaccompanied basis. If, exceptionally, there are particular reasons for an accompanied visit, participants should discuss these with the Programme Officer.

## **11 Close of the Examination**

- 11.1 The Examination will remain open until my report is submitted to the Council. However, I shall not accept any further representations or evidence after the Hearing sessions have finished, unless I specifically request further information on particular topics. Any late or unsolicited material will be returned.

## **12 Submission of the Inspector's Report to the Council**

- 12.1 I shall announce the date when I expect to submit my report to the Council at the last Hearing Session.

## **13 Matters Requiring Early Clarification**

- 13.1 Early into the Examination I identified a number of matters regarding the soundness of the Core Strategy upon which I requested early clarification from the Council. The Council has responded to these in writing in a document referenced **(CD 12.2)**. The Council has responded to these in writing in a document referenced **(CD 12.3)**, together with consequential suggested changes that are listed in a schedule referenced **(CD 12.4)**. All of these documents are contained in the Examination Library and are on the Council's Core Strategy website. At the Pre-Hearing Meeting I shall ask the Council to briefly outline its response on these matters in order that any implications for public consultation and the Hearings Timetable can be considered.

## **14 Questions**

- 14.1 I shall then invite questions from the Council and attendees about the procedure and management of the Examination.

## **15 Pre-Hearing Meeting Note**

- 15.1 The Pre-Hearing Meeting note **(CD 12.6)** will comprise a summary of the Council's responses to my request for early clarification on a number of matters, a summary of any questions from the Council and other attendees of the Pre-Hearing Meeting about the procedure and management of the Examination together with my responses, the final Hearings Programme **(CD12.7)**, **(CD12.4)**, which lists the Council's suggested changes up to the Pre-Hearing Meeting, and a summary of Key Examination Dates, **(CD12.8)**.

*Shelagh Bussey*

Inspector  
3 January 2011

# TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY

## Hearings Timetable Final

<b>Date</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Dealing with</b>
<b>WEEK 1</b>			
Monday 28/2/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Opening Announcements	09.30	
Monday 28/2/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 1	09.45	Main Matter 1 Overview of Soundness of the Core Strategy Vision, Objectives and evidence base Sections 1-4 Sections 1-7 and Key Diagram
Monday 28/2/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 2	16.00	Main Matter 2 Compliance with the Legal Requirements
Tuesday 1/3/11	No Session		Inspector Site Visits
Wednesday 2/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 3	09.30	Main Matter 3 The Strategic Locations Section 8 and Policies SL1, SL2, SL3, SL4 and SL5
Thursday 3/3/11 <b>Room 7X</b>	Session 4	09.30	Main Matter 4 The Economy Policies W1, W2 and R6
Friday 4/3/11 <b>Room 5</b>	Session 5	09.30	Main Matter 5 The Green Belt and Other Protected Land Policy R4 and Appendix 2

<b>Date</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Dealing with</b>
<b>WEEK 2</b>			
Monday 7/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 6	09.30	Main Matter 6 Land for New Homes/ Meeting Housing Needs Policies L1 and L2
Tuesday 8/3/11 <b>Room 5</b>	Session 7	09.30	Main Matter 7 The Historic and Natural Environments and Green Infrastructure Policies R1, R2 and R3
Wednesday 9/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3 (until 4.30pm)</b>	Session 8	09.30	Main Matter 8 Achieving Sustainable/Inclusive Communities Policies L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, W3, R5 and Appendix 1
Thursday 10/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3 (until 3pm)</b>	Session 9	09.30	Main Matter 9 Delivery/Planning Obligations/ Implementation/Monitoring Policy L8 and Sections 27 and 28
Thursday 10/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3 (until 3pm)</b>	Session 10	14.00	Main Matter 10 Miscellaneous Matters

**TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY  
INSPECTOR'S MAIN MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

**MAIN MATTER 1**

**An Overview of the Soundness of the Core Strategy**

*Whether the spatial vision and objectives of the Core Strategy reflect the identified issues to be addressed and are sound. Whether cross boundary issues have been satisfactorily taken account of and the evidence base is complete, up to date and robust.*

**Sections 1-7 and the Key Diagram**

**ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

- 1.1 Is the Core Strategy sufficiently outward looking and does its delivery strategy provide sufficient opportunities to ensure that it will contribute to and support the vision of the Manchester City Region becoming a world-class city?
- 1.2 Does the Core Strategy provide a justified and effective boundary for the Regional Centre and Inner Areas? What others have been consulted upon and for what reasons were those alternatives rejected?
- 1.3 As the Core Strategy defines in Figure 1 precise boundaries for the Regional Centre and Inner Areas should these also be shown on the Proposals Map?
- 1.4 How were the Places in Trafford as shown in Figure 2 identified? What evidence was used to identify them, and to define their associated profiles and key issues? What other Places were considered and consulted upon and for what reasons were those alternatives rejected?
- 1.5 What are the key cross boundary issues to be addressed? How does the Core Strategy address them? Specifically, does the Core Strategy adequately reflect and maximise the potential contribution that Manchester Airport could make to ensuring that the Manchester City Region becomes a world-class city?
- 1.6 Should the Key Issues facing Trafford Park also refer to the Strategic Freight Network and the impact of the resulting large volume of heavy goods vehicles on local roads?
- 1.7 Is there a typographical error in the first Key Issues identified for Urmston on page 11? Should this read 'Insufficient opportunities for...'?
- 1.8 Does the Core Strategy vision appropriately reflect the economic aspirations of the Sustainable Community Strategy?
- 1.9 Should the Core Strategy vision include an intention to address the impact of development on climate change?
- 1.10 Should the Core Strategy vision include reference to the Borough's natural landscape and the desirability of making prudent use of natural resources?

- 1.11 Should the word 'residential' be removed from Place Objective RC01 for Trafford's Rural Communities in order for the Objective to be applicable to all types of inappropriate development?
- 1.12 Should a Place Objective for Altringham identify land at Norman Road as a potential high quality residential site in line with the findings of the Technical Note on the Strategic Locations?
- 1.13 Should the Place Objectives for Altringham emphasise more the asset of the international airport as a stimulus for economic growth and employment opportunities?
- 1.14 To provide greater context should the Key Diagram identify the adjoining Local Authority areas?
- 1.15 Are the references to areas at risk of flooding and areas benefiting from defences highlighted on the Key Diagram justified by the most up-to-date evidence? Does the Key Diagram provide an appropriate level of detail for this information?
- 1.16 Should the Key Diagram highlight all of the key Metro links?
- 1.17 Should the three highlighted transport infrastructure improvements be identified in the key to the Diagram?
- 1.18 To provide necessary certainty for delivery should strategic sites be identified in the Core Strategy? Does the apparent lack of detail to enable this indicate that the Core Strategy is supported by an inadequate evidence base?
- 1.19 Has the level of consultation on the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) been adequate in order to obtain valuable technical information from key stakeholders to inform the preparation of the document, and to ensure a sound approach to evidence gathering? Is the SFRA robust?
- 1.20 Are the sequential and exceptions tests of PPS25 appropriately applied? Or does the Core Strategy adopt an over-cautious approach in determining the range, quantum and distribution of land uses in a number of the Core Strategy Strategic Locations, in particular at Pomona Island (SL1) and Trafford Wharfside (SL2)?
- 1.21 Has the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) been carried out in line with regulations and from the correct baseline position?
- 1.22 With particular reference the Davenport Green site, is its audit trail clear and consistent?
- 1.23 Have all other reasonable strategies been subject to SA and is it clear from the SA process why those alternatives have been rejected?
- 1.24 Has the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) been carried out correctly under the requirements of the Habitats and Birds Directive and Habitat Regulations? Has it adequately assessed the impact of development on regionally important conservation sites? Does it inappropriately rely on the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) evidence and conclusions as to the effect on the Mersey Estuary

Ramsar /SPA designation? Is its methodology and conclusions agreed by Natural England?

- 1.25 Does the Core Strategy adequately refer to all of the mitigation measures identified as being necessary in the HRA, with particular reference to development proposed in SL5 and other policies such as L1 and L4, in order to prevent harm specifically to the Manchester Mosses SAC and the potential need for further HRA to be carried out when further details of development proposals are known?
- 1.26 Is the Local Infrastructure Plan sufficiently up-to-date and robust and does it contain sufficient information with regards to funding requirements and sources to give necessary certainty to the implementation of the Core Strategy policies and proposals?



## **MAIN MATTER 2**

### **Legal Compliance Overview**

*Whether the Core Strategy meets all of the legal requirements under s20 (5) (a) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.*

### **Whole Document**

#### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

- 2.1 What is the evidence to confirm that all the above legal requirements have been met? In particular what is the evidence to demonstrate that the requirements for the following matters are met?
- (i) Has the Core Strategy been prepared in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS); does its listing and description in the LDS match the submission document; have the timescales set out in the LDS been met?
  - (ii) Has the Core Strategy had regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy for the area? What is this, what are its main themes and how are they reflected in the Core Strategy?
  - (iii) Does the Core Strategy comply with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)? What is the evidence that the Council has carried out all consultation consistent with the SCI and the minimum requirements of the Regulations?
  - (iv) Has the Core Strategy been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and has the Council provided a final report of the findings of the Appraisal? Have all alternative strategies and policies also been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and is it clear from this why they have been rejected? How has the Sustainability Appraisal process influenced the formulation of the submitted spatial strategy, policies and proposals?
  - (v) How were the requirements for Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations met before publication of the Core Strategy?
  - (vi) Do policies SL5, L1 and L4 strictly accord with the Habitats Regulations Assessment requirements? Is the approach of policy SL5 correct and appropriate since the completion of a project level Appropriate Assessment could render a key Strategic Location of the Core Strategy undeliverable?
  - (vii) Does the Core Strategy contain any policies or proposals that are not in general conformity with the RSS, and if so, what is the local justification? Has the general conformity of the Core Strategy with the RSS been confirmed by the Regional Planning Body?

- (viii) Does the Core Strategy comply with the Regulations specifically regarding the publication of prescribed documents, their availability at the Council's principal offices and on the Council's website, the placing of local advertisements and notification of the DPD bodies?

## **MAIN MATTER 3**

### ***The Strategic Locations***

#### **Section 8 - Policies SL1, SL2, SL3, SL4 and SL5**

*Whether the Strategic Locations are justified by the evidence, are the most appropriate to achieve the spatial vision and objectives, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.*

#### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

##### **General**

- 3.1 What is the evidence to justify the selection of the five Strategic Locations (SLs)? Which others were considered and consulted upon and what are the main reasons why those alternatives were rejected?
- 3.2 To what extent does each of the SLs satisfy the requirements of paragraph 8.4 of the Core Strategy?
- 3.3 What is the evidence that supports the detailed proposals for each of the SLs? Are they justified, effective and achievable?
- 3.4 Has the Council identified the correct SLs and quantum/phasing of development within them with specific reference to; the quantum of development at Pomona and Carrington, and the omission of land south of Partington, land south of Carrington, land at Ashton-upon-Mersey, land between Altrincham and Timperley, and land at Davenport Green?
- 3.5 Are the quanta of development of the various types specified in SL policies indicative, maxima or minima? Clarification is required for interpretation and effective implementation.
- 3.6 What is the evidence that supports the detailed infrastructure requirements and priorities for each of the SLs? Are they justified, effective and achievable? Has a detailed viability appraisal been carried out for each of the SLs?
- 3.7 Given that the full cost of remediation works and infrastructure are not fully known for each Strategic Location, will the identified SLs be deliverable and will they ensure the timely provision and implementation of the economic and housing requirements for the Borough, and the implementation of the objectives and vision of the Core Strategy, particularly in relation to the wider strategic priorities of the City Region?
- 3.8 Are the timescales for the delivery of required infrastructure, particularly for highways, realistic? What is the evidence?
- 3.9 What is the evidence that demonstrates that the major stakeholders are committed to the delivery of the SLs, including the identified infrastructure requirements?
- 3.10 With reference to evidence, to what extent are the strategies of utility providers aligned to the Core Strategy delivery strategy?
- 3.11 In the event that key elements of proposals for the SLs are not delivered, apart from a review of the Core Strategy, which is not

considered to be a robust fall back position, what are the contingency arrangements for managing under-performance of these critical elements of the Core Strategy delivery?

### **SL1 Pomona Island**

- 3.12 Is the approach of policy SL1 towards residential development at the Pomona Island SL overly cautious?
- 3.13 What does the last clause of SL1.3 mean? Greater clarity is required.
- 3.14 Has a robust accessibility analysis of the site been carried out and has information on trip generation and distribution been provided, as requested by the Highways Agency to demonstrate the impact of the SL1 proposals on the strategic road network?
- 3.15 Has the required funding for the Bridgewater Way Scheme identified in the implementation table been secured? If not what are the implications for delivery and what will be the contingency arrangements if the funding is not forthcoming?
- 3.16 Should reference be made in the implementation table to the provision of a heavy goods rail station at White City?

### **SL2 Trafford Wharfside**

- 3.17 Has the required funding for the Bridgewater Way Scheme identified in the implementation table been secured? If not what are the implications for delivery and what will be the contingency arrangements if the funding is not forthcoming?
- 3.18 There appear to be significant remediation and infrastructure costs associated with the delivery of development proposals at Trafford Wharfside. What evidence provides confidence that their delivery is feasible and viable?

### **SL3 Lancashire County Cricket Club Quarter**

- 3.19 Should the first bullet point to SL3.4 be amended by adding, 'and will not adversely affect the vitality and viability of nearby centres at Stretford, Chorlton and Hulme'.
- 3.20 Is there a proven need for the strategic processional route referred to in the third bullet point of SL3.4? Instead, should this requirement be replaced by prioritising the completion of a pedestrian route between the Cricket Ground and the new superstore, adjacent to Trafford Town Hall?

### **SL4 Trafford Centre Rectangle**

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

- 3.22 Does the fourth bullet point of SL4.4 and paragraph 8.66 properly reflect the tests of PPS25? Should paragraph 8.66 be amended to refer to a Flood Risk Assessment carried out at the Land Allocations DPD stage?
- 3.23 For clarity and flexibility should the fourth bullet point of SL4.5 refer to 'routing' through...?
- 3.24 What is the evidence to justify the mitigation requirements to the M60? If necessary funding streams are not deliverable, what will be the impact on development delivery?
- 3.25 Should the supporting text to policy SL4 refer to a specific requirement for residential development at this location to provide some 'aspirational' housing?

### **SL5 Carrington**

- 3.26 Does policy SL5 meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations Assessment having regard to the Manchester Mosses SAC? Does it take the correct precautionary approach? What gives the Council confidence that appropriate mitigation for the SAC can be provided? What are the contingency plans for delivery of the Core Strategy if appropriate mitigation for the SAC cannot be provided?
- 3.27 It appears that the Carrington SL is the least accessible and is subject to greater/more numerous constraints than the other SLs, including HRA, remediation and infrastructure requirements, together with multiple ownerships. What gives the Council certainty that the required development for this SL is deliverable within the specified phasing?
- 3.28 Taking account of the poor accessibility of this area, should the transportation requirements of SL5.4 also include requirements for improvements to sustainable transport infrastructure to be provided, in line with development delivery?
- 3.29 What is the evidence to justify the requirement of SL5.4 regarding the Manchester Ship Canal?
- 3.30 Should the last bullet point of SL5.4 be amended so that its requirements are applicable to all heritage assets and their settings within the SL, not only the Listed Church of St George?
- 3.31 Should reference to NWDA as a funding agency for highways improvements be removed from the SL5 implementation table?
- 3.32 How is the infrastructure requirement for the Clippers Quay Bridge justified? Is its priority 2 correct, or would a priority 3 be more appropriate?
- 3.33 Should policy SL5 also seek to safeguard the disused rail track from Timperley to Glazebrook via Carrington?

## **MAIN MATTER 4**

### **The Economy**

#### **Policies W1, W2 and R6**

*Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy are; the most appropriate to enable Trafford to remain competitive and to contribute to the economic growth of the sub-region, justified by the evidence, effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.*

#### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

##### **Policy W1**

- 4.1 Policy W1 and its associated text and Table W1 do not make it clear whether the figures for employment land provision relate to the development of new employment land only (i.e. land that is being brought forward for employment use for the first time) or will result in proposals to 'recycle' existing employment land or buildings for new employment uses. In the absence of such clarity the policy is not effective.
- 4.2 If the intention is to 'recycle' existing employment land what certainty/evidence is there that this approach will provide sufficient choice of land and sites for developers to compete with regional, national and international alternatives?
- 4.3 How have the assumptions upon which the economic strategy is based been tested? How does the economic strategy link with the Core Strategy housing strategy and the housing strategies of adjoining Authorities, together with the likely impact on future travel to work patterns?
- 4.4 What is the evidence to support the selection of the employment foci listed in W1.3? Is that evidence sufficiently robust? Are these areas the most appropriate and what certainty is there that they are deliverable?
- 4.5 What is the evidence to support the selection of foci for office development listed in W1.5? Is that evidence sufficiently robust? What certainty is there that they will deliver the required amount, quality and choice of B1 sites? What certainty is there that they are deliverable?
- 4.6 Does policy W1 make it sufficiently clear that the sequential approach of PPS4 will be followed in allocating land and making decisions on proposals for office development?
- 4.7 What is the justification for not identifying land at Davenport Green as a major focus for B1 office development, given its importance in the current development plan? Is such evidence robust and are its conclusions transparent?
- 4.8 Should this land be retained as an employment site to provide flexibility in the Core Strategy employment land portfolio and to take account of cross-boundary housing/employment strategies?

- 4.9 What improvements to the public transport system are required by W1.6? Are they in addition to those listed in the SL policies? What is the evidence to justify their requirement and to give certainty to their delivery at the appropriate time?
- 4.10 Are policy W1 and text at paragraph 13.8 entirely consistent? The latter reference recognises the airport as a major asset with the potential to stimulate economic activity, but W1.10 seeks to restrict economic activity associated with the airport.
- 4.11 What is the justification for the restrictive approach of policy W1 towards airport associated development? How does this align with cross-boundary economic strategies?
- 4.12 All existing employment land should be reviewed with regards to its future suitability as part of the Land Allocations DPD process. Therefore, why are the requirements of W1.11 necessary? If they are necessary are they stated sufficiently clearly to enable effective implementation? Are the tests reasonable, consistent with national policy and not unreasonably restrictive?
- 4.13 Is W1.11 entirely consistent with the Strategic Location (SL) policies which prescribe a mix of uses on such sites, some of which are not B class employment uses?

### **Policy W2**

- 4.14 Is the retail evidence upon which policy W2 is based sufficiently up-to-date?
- 4.15 Is the policy too prescriptive regarding the delivery requirements for the town centres? Are these requirements supported by robust evidence? What certainty is there that they are deliverable?
- 4.16 Should the Core Strategy approach towards out-of-centre retail developments be clarified to inform that sequentially extensions to existing out-of-centre developments will be preferred ahead of proposals for new ones?
- 4.17 Is the inclusion of the word 'normally' in W2.14 too permissive? For clarity should it be omitted?
- 4.18 Is it intended that proposals for the provision of community/small scale retail development will be permitted, in principle, in association with new residential development at the SLs? If so, should this be clarified in policy W2 or its supporting text?

### **Policy R3**

- 4.19 What is the evidence to justify and support the bullet point proposals of R6.4? Is their delivery feasible?

## **MAIN MATTER 5**

### **The Green Belt and Other Protected Land**

#### **Policy R4 and Appendix 2**

*Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy, which intend an addition to the Green Belt, are justified and consistent with national policy.*

#### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

- 5.1 With particular reference to R4.3, the proposed addition of land at Davenport Green to the Green Belt, is the evolution of policy R4 clear and transparent? Has this policy proposal been the subject of adequate public consultation and is it justified by a robust Sustainability Appraisal?
- 5.2 Does the proposed Green Belt addition amount to a local detailed boundary change, or should it be considered as being a strategic change?
- 5.3 If the latter, is the proposal in general conformity with policy RDF 4 of the RSS which presumes against such change in the Greater Manchester area?
- 5.4 Taking into account the recent removal of this land from the Green Belt, is R4.3 consistent with PPG2 which places considerable emphasis on the longevity of Green Belt boundaries?
- 5.5 Do the reasons for R4.3 given in justification text at paragraphs 24.9-24.17 amount to the necessary exceptional circumstances referred to in paragraph 2.7 of PPG2
- 5.6 Has an alternative proposal of designating land at Davenport Green as other protected/safeguarded land been considered? If not, why not? If so, why was this alternative rejected?
- 5.7 For flexibility in housing delivery, has the removal from the Green Belt of land at Ashton upon Mersey been considered? If not, why not? If so, why was it rejected?
- 5.8 What is the justification for protecting land at Warburton and south of Shell, Carrington?
- 5.9 Have any other such sites been considered and if so why were they rejected?
- 5.10 Is the policy towards Protected Land sufficiently flexible to enable land to be brought forward for development if other sites, including the Strategic Locations, fail to deliver as required in order to achieve the housing and economic objectives of the Core Strategy?



## **MAIN MATTER 6**

### **Land for New Homes/Meeting Housing Needs**

#### **Policies L1 and L2**

*Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy, which aim to ensure that sufficient land is available in the right place and at the right time to meet housing needs of all of the community and to support the economic growth of Trafford, are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.*

#### **Policy L1**

- 6.1 Taking into account an under performance in completions over the last few years, does L1.2 make sufficient provision for residential development to meet the RSS minimum requirements projected to 2026, together with Housing Growth Point uplift? A detailed housing trajectory, as required by PPS3, is necessary to demonstrate that adequate provision will be made and that the intended phasing for delivery is realistic.
- 6.2 Does the most up-to-date evidence support the intended scale of housing provision?
- 6.3 What is the evidence to demonstrate that there is a five year deliverable supply of housing, as required by PPS3?
- 6.4 With reference to L1.3 what is the current position regarding funding for the Housing Growth Point uplift? To what extent is this funding necessary to provide the infrastructure for this uplift? Why is the uplift dependant upon such funding being forthcoming?
- 6.5 Is the indicative 80% pdl target the most appropriate? Is it justified by evidence? Have alternative targets been considered and if so, why were they rejected?
- 6.6 Is the sequential approach to housing land release consistent with PPS3 which takes account of the possibility of some greenfield sites being more sustainable than some brownfield (pdl) sites? Should the policy be less prescriptive in this regard?
- 6.7 To what does 'Section B' in the third bullet point of L1.7 refer?
- 6.8 Does the intended housing distribution set out in policy L1 and Table L1 accord with Core Strategy vision, which says that the focus of development will be within the urban area, whereas the housing strategy intends to direct 70% to the South City Region.
- 6.9 With reference to L1.6 clarification is required if the 'half to support key regeneration priorities' refers to the 70% housing to be provided in the South City Region.
- 6.10 What is the evidence to justify the intended housing distribution split? What others have been considered and consulted upon? Why were those alternatives rejected?

- 6.11 What is the evidence to demonstrate that the intended distribution will be deliverable?
- 6.12 What is the evidence to demonstrate the feasibility of re-assigning housing at SL1 to SL4 and SL5 if consistency PPS25 indicates that new planning permissions for housing at Pomona Island should not be granted?
- 6.13 Is Table L1 too prescriptive? Is it sufficiently flexible to allow a greater/lesser number of units to be provided at the SLs if detailed proposals and evidence show such deviation to be necessary to enable overall housing delivery?
- 6.14 Is L1.8 necessary and justified? Is it consistent with PPS3?
- 6.15 Are the intended contingency proposals referred to in paragraph 10.16 appropriate? Should the housing strategy have greater flexibility to ensure that early review of the Core Strategy housing strategy will not be triggered by under delivery of new housing?
- 6.16 With reference to the last paragraph of the implementation mechanisms for policy L1 which follow the policy text, clarification is required that this is not a reference to an intended reliance on windfalls to contribute to the housing supply. If it is justification is required.

## **Policy L2**

- 6.17 What is the evidence to support and justify each of the thresholds specified in the policy? Are they the most appropriate? What others were considered, consulted upon and subjected to Sustainability Appraisal? Why were such alternatives rejected? Is the evidence that is relied upon sufficiently up-to-date and robust?
- 6.18 With regards to dwelling mix, is Table L2 too prescriptive?
- 6.19 With reference to requirements for affordable housing provision, how are each of the requirements of paragraph 29 of PPS3 met in policy L2 and its associated supporting text?
- 6.20 What is the evidence to justify the market locations defined in L2.9 and the places listed within them? Is that evidence sufficiently robust? For example, what is the evidence to demonstrate that 40% is a justified and viable target for affordable housing provision in Altringham?
- 6.21 Clarity is required regarding the affordable housing requirements for housing development at the Trafford Centre Rectangle by adding reference to an appropriately justified market location for this SL.
- 6.22 When will the intended Affordable Housing SPD be produced? How will the policy be implemented prior to its adoption?
- 6.23 In the context of L2.12 how are 'normal market conditions' defined? Is this the most appropriate benchmark?

- 6.24 Paragraph 11.11 states that the policy is based on assumption. However, national policy requires affordable housing provision to be based on robust evidence. Clarification of the intended meaning of this supporting text is required.
- 6.25 With reference to the required provision for the 'frail elderly' is there sufficient evidence to justify the inclusion of the 4% target in L2.17?
- 6.26 Should reference to the revocation of the RSS in paragraph 11.24 be deleted?

## **MAIN MATTER 7**

### **The Historic and Natural Environments and Green Infrastructure Policies R1, R2 and R3**

*Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy will ensure that development respects the historic and natural environment of Trafford, make satisfactory provision for green infrastructure, and are justified by the evidence, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.*

#### **Policy R1**

#### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

- 7.1 What is the justification for policy R1.6 bullet point six, which seeks to protect, preserve and enhance the wide range of heritage assets listed in Trafford's Urban Historic Environment Characterisation Report? Is this an unduly onerous requirement?

#### **Policy R2**

- 7.2 Does the requirement of policy R2 for development to protect and enhance the natural environment of the Borough exceed the requirements of PPS5 and legislation? If so what is the justification?
- 7.3 Clarification is necessary as to whether policy R2.1 will apply to all planning applications. If so, this may be an unnecessary and unreasonable requirement of some proposals due to their likely negligible impact having regard to their location/scale.

#### **Policy R3**

- 7.4 No questions.

## **MAIN MATTER 8**

### ***Achieving Sustainable/ Inclusive Communities***

#### ***Policies L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, W3, R5 and Appendix 1***

*Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy that seek to achieve sustainable, inclusive communities and to address the impact of climate change, are justified by the evidence, are effective and deliverable, and are consistent with national policy.*

#### **Policy L3**

##### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

- 8.1 What is the evidence to justify all of the place-making requirements of this policy? What certainty is there that they will be delivered?
- 8.2 Should a further bullet point be added to L3.1 which highlights the desirability of improving accessibility by walking and cycling?
- 8.3 What is the justification for reference to provision of 850 new dwellings at Partington? Have higher or lower figures been considered and, if so, why were they rejected?
- 8.4 Has a viability appraisal been undertaken that demonstrates that 850 residential units are sufficient to meet the regeneration needs of Partington?
- 8.5 With specific reference to the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> bullet points of L3.4 what is their justification regarding their requirements for open space provision?
- 8.6 For clarity should the last bullet point of L3.4 be amended to simply refer to the tests of PPS25, rather than paraphrasing them?
- 8.7 What is the commitment referred to in the first sentence of L3.5? Is this a planning application? Clarification is required.
- 8.8 As an additional bullet point to L3.5 should the protection and enhancement of the wildlife corridor at Partington canal-side be highlighted?
- 8.9 What is the justification for the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> bullet points of L3.5, which require developer contributions over and above those required by policy R5 in order to fund improvements to the quality of the open space and the provision of public transport infrastructure?
- 8.10 For clarity should the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of L3.5 be amended to simply refer to the tests of PPS25, rather than paraphrasing them?

#### **Policy L4 and Appendix 1**

- 8.11 Should policy L4 be re-ordered to clearly reflect the priority that should be afforded to pedestrians in the movement hierarchy?
- 8.12 What is the evidence to demonstrate that policy L4 is justified, realistic and will be effective in delivering a sustainable, integrated transport network, to ensure that development will be located in sustainable locations?

- 8.13 Is it a reasonable requirement of the last sentence of L4.1 (e) that necessary transportation infrastructure is put in place before first occupation of developments? Or would it be more appropriate for such infrastructure requirements to be phased with development?
- 8.14 Which proposals to the transportation network that are referred to in policy L4 have been costed and have a realistic chance of being funded and delivered during the plan period?
- 8.15 Should the requirements of L4.5 be more flexible in its aim to improve the frequency and reliability of public transport; funding may not be forthcoming and there may be more appropriate, cheaper alternatives?
- 8.16 Should L4.5 include an additional point that informs that the route of the Metrolink light rail network will be protected as a designated transport corridor in the Land Allocations DPD?
- 8.17 What are the ABC area types referred to in Appendix 1? Clarification is required.
- 8.18 What is the justification for the cycle standards set out in Appendix 1, which appear to differ from those for Greater Manchester?
- 8.19 From the wording of L4.11 it is not clear if freight traffic will be permitted on the canal. If it will not, the policy and paragraph 13.15 would be inconsistent. Greater clarity is required.
- 8.20 Which is the 'associated SPD' that is referred to in the last bullet point of L4.12? When will it be produced/adopted?

### **Policy L5**

- 8.21 The form and content of policy L5 has changed significantly since the Preferred Options stage. Is it now too detailed, complicated and onerous, and as a consequence, will it be effective? Does it contain detail that is more appropriately provided in SPD? Should the policy therefore be amended to reflect only the key elements necessary to provide appropriate policy hooks for intended forthcoming SPDs?
- 8.22 Following recent update of part L of the Building Regulations is the policy necessary at all? Does it duplicate other legislative requirements?
- 8.23 What is the local and specific justification in Trafford to make achievement of targets for the Code for Sustainable Homes mandatory rather than voluntary? Has the potential impact of this requirement on the viability of development delivery been tested?
- 8.24 Is the policy sufficiently flexible to take account of individual site viability issues?

### **Policy L6**

- 8.25 No questions

### **Policy L7**

- 8.26 Should policy L7 also include a requirement for development to promote biodiversity and landscape/townscape character?

**Policy W3**

8.27 No questions

**Policy R5**

8.28 Is the Council's approach to the provision of indoor sports and recreation justified and effective?

8.29 Are the quantity standards and accessibility thresholds supported by robust, up-to-date evidence?

8.30 With particular reference to the requirement for development to contribute towards the provision of swimming pools, health and fitness facilities and cemeteries is the method of calculation for these contributions justified and reasonable?

8.31 Was the qualitative section of the need assessment of Trafford's Green and Open Spaces updated in 2010, as referred to in paragraph 25.3? If so, does the policy reflect its findings?

## **MAIN MATTER 9**

### ***Delivery/Planning Obligations/ Implementation/ Monitoring Policy L8, Section 27 and Section 28***

*Whether the policies and proposals of the Core Strategy will enable the provision of all necessary infrastructure in phase with the intended development, and if the mechanisms for their delivery, implementation and monitoring are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.*

## **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

### **Policy L8**

- 9.1 Is the approach to planning obligations set out in policy L8 appropriate and effective given the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy?
- 9.2 Has a viability appraisal been carried out on the likely impact on delivery of the requirements of L8?
- 9.3 Is the approach set out in paragraph 17.8 regarding possible refusal of planning permission justified and reasonable? What consideration has been given to overall delivery of the Core Strategy vision if this approach was applied to several large schemes?
- 9.4 Is the approach towards affordable housing contributions, off-site contributions, maintenance payments and overage clauses consistent with national policy contained in Circular 05/2005?
- 9.5 Has it been calculated if the potential amount of developer contributions will provide the necessary amount of funding for required infrastructure provision? If not, what certainty is there that necessary infrastructure will be provided in line with development? If a shortfall in potential funding has been identified how will this be made good to enable development delivery?

### **Sections 27 and 28 – Implementation and Monitoring**

- 9.6 The ability to deliver is a key element of a sound Core Strategy. Linked with this there should be sound mechanisms to monitor the success of its policies and proposals. In the absence of clear targets and indicators it is not clear how the success of the Core Strategy in achieving its vision will be achieved. Should Table 3 be amended to address this?
- 9.7 Clarification is also required to demonstrate that the Core Strategy is sufficiently flexible to take account of and to respond to unforeseen circumstances that might adversely affect delivery of its proposed development.



## **MAIN MATTER 10**

### **Miscellaneous and Procedural Matters**

#### **Whole Core Strategy**

#### **ISSUES and QUESTIONS**

- 10.1 Any other outstanding matters concerning the merits of the Core Strategy.
- 10.2 Any outstanding procedural matters concerning the Examination.
- 10.3 Anticipated date of Inspector's Report.

**TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY**  
**Summary of Key Actions and Dates**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Date</b>
Submission of Core Strategy DPD for Examination	3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2010
Inspector's Preliminary Note 1 requesting additional information/raising initial concerns sent to Council	13 <sup>th</sup> December 2010
Council's response to Inspector's Preliminary Note 1	31 <sup>st</sup> December 2010
Circulation of Pre-Hearing Meeting (PHM) pack containing Programme Officer's Letter and Examination Participation Questionnaire, Examination Guidance Notes, Hearings Timetable, draft Hearings Programme, Inspector's Matters Issues and Questions Papers (MIQs), PHM Agenda	6 <sup>th</sup> January 2011
Representors to confirm their attendance at the PHM and Hearings Sessions	21 <sup>st</sup> January 2011
PHM	25 <sup>th</sup> January 2011
Circulation of PHM note including; Summary of Council's Responses to the Inspector's Initial Concerns and associated Schedule of Suggested Changes, Summary of Questions and Answers arising from PHM, Final Hearings Programme, Key Dates	27 <sup>th</sup> January 2011
Deadline for Council to submit Topic Papers addressing MIQs and update to Schedule of Suggested Changes	3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2011
Deadline for submission of further statements from Representors addressing MIQs (these should include any comments on the Council's Schedule of Suggested Changes)	3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2011
Council's Topic Papers and further statements of Representors circulated	4 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
Hearing sessions begin	28 <sup>th</sup> February 2011
Submission of Inspector's Report	To be announced on 10 <sup>th</sup> March 2011

**TRAFFORD CORE STRATEGY  
Draft Hearings Programme**

**WEEK ONE**

Date	Session	Time	Dealing with	Participants
Monday 28/2/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Opening Announcements	09.30		
Monday 28/2/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 1	09.45	Main Matter 1 Overview of Soundness of the Core Strategy Vision, Objectives and evidence base Sections 1-7 and Key Diagram	Ali Abbas 1219/102 Rosemary Olle 1041/159, 150,149, 148, 147, 146, 164, 163, 162, 160, 161 Derek Richardson 1066/138, 137 Lindsey Alder 1073/260, 259, 258, 257, 264, 263, 262, 261, 272 L&M Limited c/o agent 1036/112 LCCC&Ask c/o agent 1057/119, 118 John Twigg 1064/118 Janet Belfield 1037/159, 158, 157, 156, 168 Peel Holdings c/o agent 1045/307, 306, 309, 314, 305, 304, 303, 302, 301, 300 Ian McDonald 1211/157, 165, 188, 155, 156, 154, 153, 152, 150, 149, 196, 197, 309, 314, 305, 304, 303, 302, 301, 300, 165, 188, 155, 156, 154, 153, 152, 150, 149, 196, 197, 195, 186, 170, 181, 182, 183, 185, 193, 168, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 184 The Garden Centre Group c/o agent 1217/109, 102, 103, 104 Alan Hubbard 1051/190, 189, 188 The Council
Monday 28/2/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 2	16.00	Main Matter 2 Compliance with the Legal Requirements	The Council
Tuesday 1/3/11	<b>No Session</b>			<b>Inspector Site Visits</b>
Wednesday 2/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 3	09.30	Main Matter 3 The Strategic Locations Section 8 and Policies SL1, SL2, SL3, SL4 and SL5	Ali Abbas 1219/104, 103 Rosemary Olle 1041/153, 165, 152, 151 Derek Richardson 1066/140, 141, 139, 144 Lindsey Alder 1073/269, 276, 274, 270, 268, 267, 266, 267, 268, 265, 271, 275, 273 Laura Edwards 1052/102 Leslie Morris 1097/122 Janet Belfield 1037/162, 160, 161 Beverley Doward 1047/169 Peel Holdings c/o agent 1045/326, 323, 319, 316, 315, 312, 310, 325, 324, 322, 321, 318, 317, 313, 320, 308, 311 Ian McDonald 1211/164, 162, 161, 160, 159, 166 Bob Osbourne 1043/113 Shell Chemicals and Shell Property Co Ltd c/o agent 1026/234, 228, 227 Alan Hubbard 1051/191 The Council

<b>WEEK ONE continued</b>				
<b>Date</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Dealing with</b>	<b>Participants</b>
Thursday 3/3/11 <b>Room 7X</b>	Session 4	09.30	Main Matter 4 The Economy Policies W1, W2 and R6	Ai Abbas 1219/105 Barclays Bank 1082/123 Simon Artis 1040/162 Lindey Alder 1073/277, 280, 281 LCCC & Ask c/o agent 1057/123, 122 John Twigg 1064/119 Janet Belfield 1037/164 Beverley Doward 1047/168 Peel Holdings c/o agent 1045/328, 327, 330, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345 Ian McDonald 1211/175, 163, 151, 176, 174, 171, 158, 173, 179, 169 Sainsbury Supermarkets Ltd c/o agent 1106/105 Bob Osbourne 1043/114 The Garden Centre Group c/o agent 1217/107 Alan Hubbard 1051/200 Rose Freeman 1035/122 The Council
Friday 4/3/11 <b>Room 5</b>	Session 5	09.30	Main Matter 5 The Green Belt and Other Protected Land Policy R4 and Appendix 2	Homestar Investments Ltd c/o agent 1158/107 John Twigg 1064/121 Victoria Murray 1215/104 Ian McDonald 1211/177, 172, 180, 167, 194, 178, Shell Chemical UK and Shell Property Co Ltd c/o agent 1026/230 The Garden Centre Group c/o agent 1217/108 Peter J Thompson 1150/123 Alan Hubbard 1051/198 Mark Priestner 1076/120 Jerry Williams 1146/103 Council

<b>WEEK TWO</b>				
<b>Date</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Dealing with</b>	<b>Participants</b>
Monday 7/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3</b>	Session 6	09.30	Main Matter 6 Land for New Homes/ Meeting Housing Needs Policies L1 and L2	Ali Abbas 1219/109 S J Staines 1077/112 Laura Edwards 1052/103, 104 L&M Ltd c/o agent 1036/113 Peel Holdings c/o agent 1045/329, 331, 332 Neil Tatton 1104/105, 107 Victoria Murray 1215/102 The Garden Centre Group c/o agent 1217/105 Alan Hubbard 1051/192 Mark Priestner 1076/121, 119, 122 The Council
Tuesday 8/3/11 <b>Room 5</b>	Session 7	09.30	Main Matter 7 The Historic and Natural Environments and Green Infrastructure Policies R1, R2 and R3	Judith Nelson 1074/140 Laura Edwards 1052/110 Janet Belfield 1037/165, 166, 167 Peel Holdings c/o agent 1045/346, 347 Alan Hubbard 1051/195, 196 The Council
Wednesday 9/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3 (until 4.30pm)</b>	Session 8	09.30	Main Matter 8 Achieving Sustainable/Inclusive Communities Policies L3, L4, L5, L6, L7, W3, R5 and Appendix 1	Ali Abbas 1219/106, 107, 108 Damien Cross 1182/114, 116 Helen Telfer 1096/166 Alethea Faulkner 1038/109, 108 Rosemary Olle 1041/155, 154, 156, 157, 158, Steve Bowater 1039/102 Derek Richardson 1066/145, 142, 143 Mark Rogers 1016/102, 103 Lindsey Alder 1073/278 Laura Edwards 1052/108 John Twigg 1064/120 Janet Belfield 1037/163 Peel Holdings c/o agent 1045/333, 334, 336, 335, 348, 349, 340 Neil Tatton 1104/106, 104 Victoria Murray 1215/103 Shell Chemicals UK and Shell Property Co Ltd c/o agent 1026/231, 229, 232 The Garden Centre Group c/o agent 1217/106 Alan Hubbard 1051/194, 193, 199 Peter J Thompson 1150/124 The Council
Thursday 10/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3 (until 3pm)</b>	Session 9	09.30	Main Matter 9 Delivery/Planning Obligations/Implementati on/Monitoring Policy L8 and Sections 27 and 28	Simon Artiss 1040/163 Lindsey Alder 1073/279 Laura Edwards 1052/106, 107, 109 Shell Chemicals UK and Shell Property Co Ltd c/o agent 1026/233 The Council
Thursday 10/3/11 <b>Room 2&amp;3 (until 3pm)</b>	Session 10	14.00	Main Matter 10 Miscellaneous Matters	The Council