

Question No 59 - Transport Principles

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (10) In Part (6) No (0)

Yes (LP404-22, LP349-7, LP321-58, LP320-6, LP309-55, LP305-24, LP284-24, LP28-59, LP17-1, LP9-9)

In part (LP315-23, LP290-21, LP272-21, LP 27-22, LP25-17, LP5-2)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	I agree especially with the transport hierarchy of active travel first.	Support noted	LP404-22 LP17-1 LP286-59 LP309-55 LP284-24
2	Network Rail supports the principle of the policy, including the principle of improving and development of new rail facilities.	Support noted	LP268-6
3	The Trust welcomes that proposals should promote reduced carbon emissions. The Trust agrees that the location and design and internal site layout should follow the hierarchy promoting pedestrian use/access as a priority, followed by cyclists with personal motorised vehicles being the lowest priority.	Support noted	LP291-39
4	MA welcomes the transport principles set out at Policy T 1 (Transport Principles) and the range of integrated transport measures, public transport improvements and active travel networks that are promoted, as well as the approach to ensuring the	Support noted.	LP305-24

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	sustainable location of development set out at Policy T 2 (Sustainable location of development). As a key transport hub and international gateway, Manchester Airport plays a major role in boosting the North West's connectivity and meeting the economic and social needs of Manchester's residents. Manchester Airport is also a major employment site, and together with the adjacent MIX Manchester and Davenport Green (in Trafford) and developments at MediPark and Wythenshawe Hospital offers a highly connected business destination that includes office, advanced manufacturing and logistics facilities, thereby providing further opportunities to stimulate economic growth and employment. Ensuring that there are effective transport links across Manchester and supporting improvements to the public transport and strategic transport network between Manchester and the airport is therefore important. Supporting such improvements will enable the City to fully capitalise on the region's international connections and unlock the economic benefits that can help to deliver further growth and development. Manchester Airport has a long-standing commitment to improving connectivity and		

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	sustainable travel and, through our partnership working, to support the delivery of the region's economic and transport priorities. At the heart of our growth strategy is the need to provide a transport network that is efficient, convenient, reliable and safe. Our policies, targets and objectives are set out in our Economy and Surface Access Plan, which is part of the Manchester Airport Sustainable Development Plan (2016), and in our Staff Travel Plan (2019).		
5	For district centres and to support the concept of short local trips, areas such as Miles Platting should be planned to enable residents to move safely around their neighbourhoods. This includes provision of safe pavements, crossings, and rest areas. In line with Policy T1, the Plan should ensure that pedestrian and mobility priorities apply not only to new developments but also to improvements in existing areas, so that the everyday environment is safe, accessible, and supportive for all users.	The plan should be read as a whole and in particular policies SP2 and DM1 that cover these points.	LP379-24 LP296-19
6	Some elements of transport, including access to and facilities in many local rail stations are not accessible and need to be prioritised for improvements according to national standards for rail and general access standards. Some Metrolink stations have inaccessible routes to the platforms and unsafe crossing areas over tram tracks.	These are not matters the Council can pursue through the Local Plan, but we do pick up Network Rail and TfGM, who own and operate Metrolink stations.	LP385-48

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
7	This policy sets out the framework for sustainable transport, modal shift and active travel. As such, development proposals should safeguard and enhance the TPT/NCN as strategic sustainable transport corridors and recreational routes, ensuring connectivity to and from new developments where in close proximity and supporting Manchester's modal shift targets.	The TPT/NCN is identified as a strategic recreational route within the Local Plan and policies seek to maintain and enhance the routes.	LP365-18
8	There should be a transport principle that applies to out of date existing transport infrastructure where new developments in an area have rendered that infrastructure inappropriate for the planned residential base. A good example of this is the design and use of Ellesmere Street as a high speed through road bypass for the A56 in Hulme at peak times. The area is subject to a large number of planned developments (most without car parking provision) for an additional 3000 residents over the plan period, and the old infrastructure should be upgraded with MATSIP principles in mind. This should be a generic policy for all old infrastructure where new developments are planned or in hand.	Policy T1 sets out that the council will support developments which “are located and designed, through their internal and site layout, public realm and transport infrastructure, to prioritise users according to the following hierarchy [... transport hierarchy from PfE policy JP-C1). In addition, PfE policies JP-C1 (An Integrated Network), JP-C5 (Streets for All), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments) set out a clear policy framework which form part of the Council’s Development Plan alongside this Local Plan, for ensuring new developments take the Streets for All approach and deliver good sustainable transport outcomes for residents and users. We will consider revising the supporting text of policy T1 to make this clearer and set out how the Council seeks to ensure new development delivers the supporting highway and	LP358-12

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		transport infrastructure necessary to deliver benefits.	
9	T1 Transport. Agree with the strategy but it needs more on integrated transport - bikes on trams.	Bikes on trams is a matter for Transport for Greater Manchester, who operate the Metrolink network.	LP349-7
10	Concerned about the negative impacts of parking, in particular on pavements and the air pollution generated. Believes this should be banned and enforcement action taken, with the exception of emergency services. Concerned for pedestrians around Central Library and Oxford Road area due to cyclists, skateboarders and vehicles. Would like to see barriers in place to limit access and more enforcement. Would like to see an express bus service from South Manchester into town with limited commuters so as to accommodate people getting to work or appointments. Would also like buses to be redesigned so people do not have to face one another but can still accommodate disabled commuters. Would like to see further bus shelters at the junction of Oxford Road and Portland Street. Would like to see smaller buses. Requests the trams be removed from Cross Street to ease congestion.	Pavement parking, highways interventions, and various bus and tram issues are not in the remit of the Local Plan.	LP344-5
11	Transport proposals also offer opportunities such as new habitats/connect habitats, e.g., railway embankments and highway verges and should be	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and in particular biodiversity net gain is covered in Policy EN5.	LP325-15

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	recognised as an opportunity. The green infrastructure associated with the transport network can play an important role in ecological connectivity contributing to wildlife corridors and stepping stones as referred to in paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Transport networks should be designed and managed to maximise ecological connectivity and reduce severance impacts.		
12	Policy T1 sets out a framework for promoting sustainable and active travel, which is welcome and aligns with national and regional objectives to reduce reliance on private vehicles and improve connectivity. However, the Integrated Assessment (IA) identifies uncertain negative effects on water quality, primarily due to the potential for increased surface water runoff and associated pollutants from transport infrastructure if robust mitigation is not embedded. The IA also notes risks linked to implementation uncertainty, as the policy does not guarantee delivery of major transport improvements or link development to specific infrastructure commitments. This policy should explicitly require measures to prevent water pollution from transport[1]related development. These should align with national guidance and local best practice, including the	No change proposed to the plan . The plan should be read as a whole and in particular policies EN8 and EN9 which cover the matters raised.	LP324-12

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Streets for All Framework developed by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), which promotes the integration of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into street design to manage runoff and improve water quality. This can include: Water quality protection: Incorporation of SuDS designed in accordance with the SuDS hierarchy, notably prioritising infiltration before discharge to watercourses or sewers). Pollution prevention measures for highways and transport infrastructure (e.g. oil interceptors, sediment control). It should be noted that highways can pose a concern with pollution runoff entering the nearby environment and vulnerable receptors and so would encourage sections 1.7 and 1.8 of the latest National Sustainable Drainage Standards guidance to be added into any policy wording Compliance with the WFD to ensure no deterioration in waterbody status Require Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) for transport projects, detailing sediment control, spill prevention, and emergency response protocols to protect surface and groundwater. Integration with Climate and Air Quality Objectives: Strengthen links between transport and environmental policies by requiring active travel infrastructure and green		

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	corridors that deliver co-benefits for air quality, biodiversity, and climate resilience. Phasing and Delivery: To address IA concerns about implementation uncertainty, the policy should include provisions for phasing development alongside transport upgrades, ensuring sustainable travel options are available when new growth comes forward. Therefore, suggested wording could be: Transport-related development must incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) designed in accordance with the SuDS hierarchy, prioritising infiltration before discharge to watercourses or sewers. SuDS must deliver multiple benefits, including water quality improvement, biodiversity enhancement, and amenity value, and be supported by long-term maintenance arrangements. In line with national SuDS guidance: The runoff from development shall not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere from any source. The runoff from the development shall not cause a risk of pollution of groundwater or surface water bodies. Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMPs) will be required to safeguard water quality during works, including sediment control and spill prevention measures. Development proposals		

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	should also integrate active travel infrastructure and green corridors to support climate resilience and air quality improvements.		
13	The approach aligns with Places for Everyone and TfGM's Right Mix, aiming to enable only the necessary quantum of private-vehicle trips and encourage modal shift potentially reducing SRN impacts. MCC should liaise with National Highways to ensure large sites adhere to the policy in line with Circular 01/2022. Freight consolidation elements may be particularly relevant to SRN resilience along the M56 corridor given projected economic development (see Policy EC1).	Liaison with National Highways is picked up via Duty to Cooperate (Statement of Collaboration) and ongoing work to develop a Statement of Common Ground.	LP321-58
14	The Christie agree with draft Policy T1 Transport Principles, and shares in the aspirations to achieve modal shift from private vehicles to public transport, shared mobility and active travel and contribute to zero carbon, road danger reduction and sustainable economic growth. The Christie has a comprehensive Green Travel Plan (2014-2030), which is integral to its Strategic Planning Framework. We have been recognised by Transportation for Greater Manchester as a regional leader in reducing impact on the environment, and we maintain a robust commitment to fostering sustainable transport. The Christie actively	Support noted. The policy wording is intended to offer the appropriate level of flexibility to accommodate specific circumstances such as The Christie.	LP320-6

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	implements a multi-faceted strategy to reduce single-occupancy vehicle use among our staff, which assists in delivering our overarching aim for a 60% modal shift towards greener travel methods by 2030. This commitment is realised through a wide array of initiatives, including extensive promotion of walking, cycling (supported by dedicated infrastructure and incentives), public transport (with discounted tickets and improved access), car sharing, and park and ride schemes, all underpinned by monitoring and dedicated Developments across The Christie Withington Campus will seek to retain the existing level and quality of active travel infrastructure and will be subject to measures identified within the Green Travel Plan (2014-2030) which encourage greater take-up of active modes. Therefore, development across The Christie Withington Campus should be supported through the policies of draft Local Plan as it will be able to capitalise on its highly sustainable location with frequent public transport services and a high standard of walking and cycling infrastructure. This will assist in meeting the aims and objectives as set out within the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy (2040) ultimately supporting the city's transition to net zero.		

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
15	We agree with the policy in part and ask that the following minor change is made to the policy wording and supporting text as set out below. There is potential for our waterways to contribute to a wider network, in recognition that there is need for investment in infrastructure for uplift in footfall (including water safety measures). T1 mentions enabling and removing barriers for active travel, this should also include investment in behaviour change and engagement, which are areas the Trust could contribute to with partners. We welcome reference to new development including provision for sustainable transport and would ask that future policy also considers the need for new development to contribute towards improvements to existing sustainable transport routes such as canal corridors to both to encourage and facilitate increased use by pedestrians and cyclists, including for example, improved access, lighting legibility and signage for route finding. We would ask that specific mention is made to the canal towpath and enhancing access and wayfinding to these. We would ask that both policy T1 and T2 are amended to include the following: Promote and enhance sustainable transport routes, including the canal towpaths and access and wayfinding to these.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. Behaviour change and engagement isn't something that the Local Plan can deliver per se.	LP315-23

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
16	Policy T1 Transport principles There should be a transport principle that applies to out of date existing transport infrastructure where new developments in an area have rendered that infrastructure inappropriate for the planned residential base. A good example of this is the design and use of Ellesmere Street as a high speed through road bypass for the A56 in Hulme at peak times. The area is subject to a large number of planned developments (most without car parking provision) for an additional 3000 residents over the plan period, and the old infrastructure should be upgraded with MATSIP principles in mind. This should be a generic policy for all old infrastructure where new developments are planned or in hand.	No change proposed to the plan. The points raised are a matter for development proposals to take account of the existing infrastructure and how this may need to be improved/replaced. Information on key changes to the transport infrastructure are set out in Policy T3 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	LP311-13 LP290-21
17	Policy T1 (Transport principles): For district centres and to encourage the local area of short distances, places like Miles Platting should be planned to support local people to move around the area safely with rest spots, safe pavements and crossings, so that as in policy T1, it is not just new developments that prioritise pedestrians and mobility, but that existing places are also transformed.	The plan should be read as a whole and in particular policies SP2 and DM1 that cover these points.	LP308-37
18	TfGM welcomes the focus of Transport Principles that seeks to remove barriers to travel and access to public transport and active travel.	Support noted. Change agreed. Additional wording refers to points on Rapid Transit Network.	LP298-15

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	TfGM would seek further principles to be added, which include: Manchester City Council will encourage and support proposals which improve the quality, capacity, and extent of the Rapid Transit network within Manchester and across the City Region where these are within and/or interface with Manchester's administrative boundary, such as: Improvements to Metrolink connections between Salford Crescent, Inner Salford and Manchester City Centre. The development of the Tram-Train network to provide improved rapid transit links, in line with the most up-to-date Greater Manchester Transport Strategy Delivery Plan (or equivalent document). The Council will work with TfGM in their commitment to develop the tram-train pathfinder project to pilot the technology in Greater Manchester and to unlock future schemes. The broader study of the transport issues and opportunities in the corridor connecting North Manchester with Middleton, the Northern Gateway development and This work is considering also the areas of Victoria North, North Manchester General Hospital and Harpurhey, Blackley and Langley, as well as considering integration with potential future	Support for Metrolink and tram-train picked up in policy T3. Early stage development work on tram-train and wider city-region transport links noted – can be picked up by reference to the LTP.	

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	bus services to Northern Gateway from Bury and Oldham. The role of the Calder Valley line is a further consideration at the edge of this corridor.		
19	Policy T 1 should refer to clean air - for example, we propose the following insertions (highlighted in bold): In the first paragraph: ...and contribute to zero carbon, minimising air pollution, road danger reduction. In the second bullet point: ...a reduction in carbon emissions and air pollution, improve equitable access. The draft Local Plan makes reference to the Right Mix vision contained in the GM 2040 Transport Strategy. Our Local Transport Plan is the GM2040 Transport Strategy, which aims to enable the Right Mix Vision, where 50% of all trips in Greater Manchester will be made by public transport and active modes by 2040, resulting in no net growth in motor vehicle traffic. We would argue that this level of modal shift is insufficient for Manchester to meet its target to be zero carbon by 2038, and that the Local Plan should therefore set a more ambitious modal shift target to deliver our climate emissions challenge.	No change proposed to the plan. The Council has endorsed and adopted the Right Mix target in the GM Transport Strategy 2040, GM's statutory Local Transport Plan. A new LTP (GMTS 2050) was consulted on from December 2025 – March 2026. The Right Mix target remains the same, with a 2040 timeframe. The Carbon assessment of the Right Mix is a matter for the LTP.	LP290-21
20	This policy should aim for a more ambitious modal shift than current local and regional strategies - these still envisage a 50% modal share of private car use in 2040, which is incompatible with Manchester's target to be zero carbon by 2038.	No change proposed to the plan. The Council has endorsed and adopted the Right Mix target in the GM Transport Strategy 2040, GM's statutory Local Transport Plan. A new LTP (GMTS 2050) was consulted on from December 2025 – March 2026.	LP27-22

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		The Right Mix target remains the same, with a 2040 timeframe. The Carbon assessment of the Right Mix is a matter for the LTP.	
21	We recognise the importance given to active travel and the Network Plan set out in the MATSIP. It would be useful to add into TP 1 or 2 a specific requirement for developments to use as a key component in creating a sense of place existing PROWs and other walking routes early in the design stage.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and Policy D1 provides guidance on sense of place.	LP25-17
22	Sport England's would strongly recommend the inclusion of reference (with the possible inclusion of the website link as a footnote) to the principles of our Active Design guidance to promote activity, health and stronger communities through the way we design and build our towns and cities and encourages the integration of green and blue assets within developments to promote this.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and the supporting text to Policy D1 provides information on proposals to update the current Residential Quality Guidance.	LP9-9
23	We need a clean air zone to protect the health of our residents. Substantial evidence shows these zones have been proven to work in other cities, significantly reducing air pollution and thus reducing health risks such as lung and heart disease.	Proposals for a Clean Air Zone are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.	LP5-2

Question No 60 - Sustainable Location of development**Do you agree with this policy? Yes (10) In Part (2) No (1)****Yes (LP404-23, LP321-59, LP320-7, LP305-25, LP299-20, LP290-22, LP284-25, LP28-60, LP27-33, LP9-7)****In part (LP385-49, LP25-5)****No (LP267-40)**

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Support the policy.	Support noted.	LP299-20 LP27-33 LP286-60
2	Manchester Airport welcomes the transport principles set out at Policy T 1 (Transport Principles) and the range of integrated transport measures, public transport improvements and active travel networks that are promoted, as well as the approach to ensuring the sustainable location of development set out at Policy T 2 (Sustainable location of development).	Support noted.	LP305-25
3	Policy T1 Transport Principles and Policy T2 Sustainable Location of Development. These policies are strongly supported.	Support noted.	LP284-25
4	I agree with the policy but provision of safe cycle lanes on all road commuter routes needs to be a	Support noted. The Council will be publishing its plans for transport investment including cycle lanes	LP404-23

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	priority. It is still hazardous cycling in central Manchester and other local centres.	in the Local Implementation Plan, part of the new GM LTP in December 2026.	
5	Object to the policy.	Objection noted.	LP290-20
6	it is important to require the provision of designated accessible parking spaces for disabled people to meet the standards in BS:8300. Section 7.5, to normally be within 50m of the accessible entrance. This should be added to the section starting cycle parking and disabled parking base at new developments Cycle parking and disabled parking bays at new developments and at existing developments should be located prominently and as close as possible should include to the primary entrance of buildings. In the case of disabled bays, there should be level or ramped direct access between the bays to the primary building entrance. BS 8300 Section 7.5 states that designated accessible parking spaces should normally be within 50 m of an accessible entrance€ Further information on the design of parking spaces is provided in BS:8300 2018.	Change agreed, Reference to disabled parking standards is included in the supporting text.	LP385-49
7	Safe, resident-focussed transport and active travel The Local Plan should: Include enhanced traffic management including calming measures on Liverpool Road, Chester Road, and Ellesmere St as suggested targets.	No change proposed to the plan. This is something to pick up in the Local Transport Plan and our Local Implementation Plan pipeline.	LP374-23

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
8	This policy sets out the framework for sustainable transport, modal shift and active travel. As such, development proposals should safeguard and enhance the TPT/NCN as strategic sustainable transport corridors and recreational routes, ensuring connectivity to and from new developments where in close proximity and supporting Manchester's modal shift targets.	The TPT/NCN is identified as a strategic recreational route within the Local Plan and policies seek to maintain and enhance the routes.	LP365-19
9	Car Parking on and off street should be supported to ensure freedom of choice for everyone, accessibility and connectedness.	No change proposed to the plan. The approach to car parking standards is a pragmatic solution for managing car parking demand.	LP345-6
10	Concerned about the negative impacts of parking, in particular on pavements and the air pollution generated. Believes this should be banned and enforcement action taken, with the exception of emergency services.	Policy T2 sets out our approach to parking provision. Pavement parking not a matter for the Local Plan. Government has announced regulations will be made to assist local authorities in enforcing against inappropriate pavement parking later in 2026.	LP344-6
11	Considering parking provision in relation to active travel/public transport is supported. Where parking is consolidated at development edges, early scoping with National Highways is recommended to identify impacts and, if SRN impacts arise, appropriate mitigations are included. This is particularly important outside the City Centre where non-car mode provision may be reduced.	Comment noted and engagement will be carried out at the appropriate time.	LP321-59

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
12	The Christie agree with draft Policy T2 - Sustainable Location of Development, and considers that The Christie Withington Campus aligns with the aspiration to ensure new development is located to ensure access by convenient, frequent and high-quality public transport and active travel and is easily accessible by walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport. We therefore request that draft Policy T2 acknowledges this unique operational necessity by allowing appropriate flexibility, rather than strictly seeking to minimise associated vehicle parking" in areas beyond the City Centre. While The Christie fully supports the requirement to provide evidence to justify parking provision associated with development proposals in a reasonable and proportionate Transport Assessment.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy is sufficiently worded to manage all development proposals and specific circumstances will be dealt with through the normal development management process.	LP320-7
13	Policy T2: Sustainable location of development. Renaker support the Council's ambition to promote sustainable transport and increase modal shift towards active travel and public transport options, particularly reducing car dependency in the city. However, Renaker note the Policy permits the development of parking spaces for persons with disabilities, emergency vehicles and service vehicles but does not appear to support additional parking beyond these categories.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy does include the following wording which allows for other situations to be considered. “Additional parking required beyond these categories will be considered in relation to how it will complement the Council's approach to sustainable transport within the City Centre.”	LP284-24

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Renaker's experience of the market within the City Centre is that there remains considerable demand for resident parking spaces. Renaker request that this is a requirement of future developments that include standard on-site parking provision and therefore the Draft Local Plan could explicitly treat basement level car parking differently than surface level car parking as the burden on outdoor space and amenity is mitigated by the provision of a basement level car park. Renaker note that the EV charging provision within residential developments does already assist in mitigating the environmental impacts of car use and aligns with the City's net zero ambitions. This could be subject to an overall percentage cap of parking provision per development to strike an appropriate balance of reducing parking spaces and dependency on car ownership, whilst ensuring that there is flexibility to allow for the provision of car parking for residents that genuinely need a car or van for work or other reasons. This balanced approach could allow an evidence-based level of resident car parking to reflect market demand, which could also be supplemented by a reasonable proportion of EV charging bays (subject to other constraints such as		

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	availability of power) to support the city's sustainable travel objectives.		
14	Policy T2 (Sustainable Location of Development) Strengths - Accessibility and Inclusion, Prioritising locations with high-quality public transport and active travel supports low-income households who often rely on these modes. This reduces transport poverty and improves access to jobs, education, and healthcare. Health and Well-being. Emphasis on walking, cycling, and wheeling promotes active lifestyles, which can benefit affordable housing residents disproportionately affected by health inequalities. Reduced Car Dependency. Minimizing car parking outside the city centre aligns with climate goals and can lower development costs if managed well, freeing resources for affordable housing. Integration with Transport Strategies - Links to Manchester's Local Implementation Plan and Parking Strategy ensure consistency with wider mobility objectives. Challenges and Risks - Risk of Exclusion If developments are concentrated near premium transport corridors, land values may rise, making it harder to deliver genuinely affordable housing in these areas.	Comments noted. The aim of policy T2 is to appraise public transport provision in the vicinity of each development and agree an approach to parking which is appropriate for the location and existing provision. It is not the role of transport policies to set differential affordable housing provision according to location – this is picked up elsewhere in the Plan. The LTP sets out the pipeline of transport infrastructure projects which aim to improve connectivity across the city including in neighbourhoods away from the city centre. Policy T2 is worded flexibly to take into account site and location specific circumstances, whilst setting out the Council's expectations and starting point.	LP278-25

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Parking Reduction vs. Resident Needs Minimizing parking provision could disadvantage affordable housing residents who need vehicles for work or care responsibilities, especially in areas with limited public transport coverage. Infrastructure Gaps Policy assumes high-quality public transport and active travel networks exist. In reality, some areas lack reliable services, which could isolate residents if housing is built without adequate connectivity. Cost of Compliance Requirements for cycle parking and transport assessments add costs for affordable housing providers, potentially reducing unit numbers. Opportunities for Strengthening Policy - Affordable Housing Near Transport Hubs: Introduce safeguards or quotas to ensure affordable housing is prioritised in well-connected areas. Flexible Parking Standards: Allow exceptions for developments serving residents with specific needs or in areas with poor transport coverage. Investment in Infrastructure: Pair policy with commitments to improve public transport and active travel routes in underserved areas.		

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Community Transport Solutions: Encourage shared mobility schemes for affordable housing residents.		
15	Policy T2: Sustainable Location of Development (Question 60) This policy outlines a number of criteria which inter alia includes that in all parts of Manchester, proposals will need to provide cycle parking in line with national guidance (LTN 1/20). The HBF considers that this is an entirely laudable aim and should be encouraged, however it may not be possible in all instances to design cycle parking specifically to LTN 1/20 stand-bards owing to site constraints, existing highway infrastructure or viability. Furthermore, the wording of the policy seeks to give LTN 1/20 development plan status (in requiring compliance) when it is guidance, not policy. Instead, the HBF would recommend this part of the policy is re-worded so as to encourage the implementation of cycle parking in line with LTN 1/20 where it is practical, feasible and viable.	Change agreed. The policy now highlights that alternative solutions to LTN 1-20 may be available and can be evaluated through the implementation of the policy.	LP269-18
16	The detail seems to be mostly about car parking! The policy states: The Council will actively manage the pattern of development to ensure that new development: - Is located to ensure access by convenient, frequent and high-quality public	The locations for significant development are set out in Places for Everyone and the Growth Location policies in this Local Plan. The transport infrastructure requirements to support development will be set out in the emerging Local Transport Plan	LP267-40

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	transport and active travel. Whilst of course it makes no sense to support development where there are no transport links, this statement seems very short sighted and embodies a short term vision. To prioritise developments with existing good transport links is to concentrate developments - even create over-development - whilst affording no incentive to improve transport connections to other places. This will lead to a distorted pattern of development and liveable neighbourhoods across the City, and far from being a sustainable pattern of development will ultimately be unsustainable.. We think there should be more nuanced consideration of the links between development and existing travel connections.	(GM Transport Strategy 2050) which aim to support and enable the quantum of development set out in this Local Plan.	
17	We recognise the importance given to active travel and the Network Plan set out in the MATSIP. It would be useful to add into TP 1 or 2 a specific requirement for developments to use as a key component in creating a sense of place existing PROWs and other walking routes early in the design stage.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and Policy D1 provides guidance on sense of place.	LP25-5
18	Sport England's would strongly recommend the inclusion of reference (with the possible inclusion of the website link as a footnote) to the principles of our Active Design guidance to promote activity, health and stronger communities through the way we design and build our towns and cities and also	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and the supporting text to Policy D1 provides information on proposals to update the current Residential Quality Guidance.	LP9-7

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	encourages the integration of green and blue assets within developments to promote this.		

Question No 61 – Infrastructure

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (6) In Part (5) No (1)

Yes (LP321-60, LP305-26, LP290-23, LP28-61, LP27-32, LP9-38)

In part (LP404-24, LP385-50, LP292-26, LP280-8, LP267-41)

No (LP12-2)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	General support.	Support noted.	LP404-24
2	Support the policy.	Support noted.	LP286-61 LP27-32
3	We support the transport policy text and are pleased to see that the document will provide some statutory underpinning for continued investment in high quality and higher capacity transport to support growth and improve the city's environment as well as support for further development of walking and cycling infrastructure. We also strongly support the proposals in the plan to strengthen the rail network servicing the city including the delivery of Northern Powerhouse Rail.	Support noted.	LP284-26
4	Regarding Policy T 3 (Transport Infrastructure Investment) MA welcomes the proposed transport investment schemes that are identified. We support the Northern Powerhouse Rail improvements and the potential future rail route and development of the	Support noted.	LP305-26

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	Liverpool to Manchester railway. We also support delivery of the Metrolink Manchester Airport line Western Leg Extension. This will be a valuable sustainable public transport link for airport staff and passengers particularly from Roundthorn, Wythenshawe Hospital and MediPark to the airport, and to the wider network of public transport services (rail, coach, and local buses). Connectivity to the airport via tram can be cost effective when tap and go products are used.		
5	Object to the policy.	Objection noted.	LP290-23
6	There are still significant access barriers at local train stations and to facilities in rail stations.	Comment noted.	LP385-50
7	Landsec partially agrees with the Transport Infrastructure Development policy and would welcome a coordinated and phased infrastructure delivery, flexible planning obligations, and appropriate provision for private vehicles during transitional periods, support the viability of strategic regeneration. PfE Policy JP-C8: Transport Requirements of New Development, provides a comprehensive framework for transport, requiring new development to be located and designed to enable and encourage walking, cycling and public transport use, and to reduce negative effects of car dependency.	General support noted. The suggestion to include additional wording around delivery and funding is noted but this is a matter of detail that would be superfluous in the Local plan. With respect to planning obligations and Policy T2, the policy text in T2 does take this into account in the 4th and 5th bullet points, taking into account proximity to and frequency of public transport.	LP272-21

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	To support alignment with PfE, we recommend that Policy T 3 is reviewed with a point added under "Transport Infrastructure Investment" or within the supporting text to state: The delivery and funding of strategic transport infrastructure required to support major regeneration projects will be clearly articulated and coordinated with the phased development. Planning obligations will be tailored to the specific circumstances of each strategic regeneration project, ensuring they are proportionate to the development's impacts and benefits, and phased in a manner that supports the long-term viability and delivery of the project. In Policy T 2 (Sustainable location of development), wording could further acknowledge that while sustainable transport is prioritised, appropriate provision for private vehicles and parking may be necessary in transitional phases or where public transport alternatives are not yet fully established.		
8	We call for enhanced traffic management including calming measures on Liverpool Road, Chester Road, and Ellesmere St as suggested targets, both to slow down drivers (speed limits broadly are ignored) but also as a way to combat excess pollution including diesel particulates. We also call for the creation of a traffic light crossing to replace the zebra crossing on Liverpool Road; there are multiple near-misses every month and its time that this A road had a proper	Comments noted. Specific measures to address speeding and traffic volume will come forward as part of our LTP pipeline and be contained in the LTP. The Local Plan signposts to transport infrastructure proposals which have a demonstrated case for change, for which options are being developed over the plan period. The	LP374-22

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	crossing. There should be a transport principle that applies to out of date existing transport infrastructure where new developments in an area have rendered that infrastructure inappropriate for the planned residential base. The area is subject to a large number of planned developments (most without car parking provision) for an additional 3000 residents over the plan period, and the old infrastructure should be upgraded with MATSIP principles in mind. This should be a generic policy for all old infrastructure where new developments are planned or in hand. Policy T 3 Transport Infrastructure Investment Northern Powerhouse Rail improvements including an underground station at Manchester Piccadilly Castlefield Corridor heavy rail improvements to improve capacity - it is vitally important that Deansgate railway station is afforded many more trains per hour.	mechanism for proposing new ones is through the LTP – noting that the current LTP pipeline includes early development work on a metro tunnel for GM.	
9	Improvements that increase public transport capacity could enable modal shift and reduce SRN pressure. Where interventions interact with National Highways infrastructure (e.g., Metrolink Airport Western Extension), early consultation with National Highways and TfGM is recommended to coordinate approaches and reduce SRN impacts, including during construction.	Comments noted. Coordination with neighbouring districts, TfGM and NH is being picked up through Duty to Cooperate meetings and an emerging Statement of Common Ground.	LP321-60

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
10	The current policy does not explicitly articulate the Council's commitment to enabling or facilitating the delivery of these initiatives (the current policy just lists potential schemes). TfGM would welcome a more defined policy which sets this out. Whilst we are supportive of the inclusion of a Metrolink Western Leg Extension we would like to see this expanded to align with recent agreements. We would request this is reworded to Metrolink Airport line Western Leg Extension including wider connectivity to Altrincham and Stockport. Whilst we are supportive of the inclusion of a Metrolink extension to Salford Crescent we would like to see this expanded to align with recent agreements. We would request this is reworded to Metrolink extension to Salford Crescent with a north-west focus considering links between Manchester City Centre and Salford, Wigan, Leigh and Bolton.	Changes agreed and added to the policy.	LP298-16
11	There is no mention of cycle infrastructure or a commitment to support walking (through the maintenance of pavements, stopping cars parking on pavements - as in London, provision of benches for less active people to rest). Whilst these might be covered in the Active Travel policy they should also be explicit here.	No change proposed to the plan. The point is sufficiently covered in Policy T2.	LP292-26 LP261-36 LP267-41

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
12	Yes, General Comment: We support requirements for new development to contribute to and integrate with transport infrastructure. NOMA has supported improved pedestrian and cycle provision across the regeneration area, providing better connections between the City Centre and Victoria North. However, more is needed to calm the traffic on the inner ring road and ensure this is not a barrier to the continued inclusive economic growth of the City Centre and beyond. Consideration to reconfiguration of the junction of Miller Street/ Corporation Street would align with the policy ambition outlined to enable and remove barriers to travel and access by public transport and active travel. The Policy should also encourage investment in supporting improvements to existing transport infrastructure, not just addressing this through new proposals. There are significant opportunities to improve the prioritisation of pedestrians and bikes on routes such as at Miller Street, which otherwise hinder connectivity. Recommendation: The following section of the policy should be updated as follows: Are located and designed, through their internal and site layout, public realm and transport infrastructure, to prioritise users according to the following hierarchy, in order of preference, as set out in Places for Everyone policy JP-	Support noted – work on specific city centre locations is contained within the emerging LTP pipeline.	LP280-8

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	C1, this includes proposals to improve existing transport provision in accordance with this hierarchy:		
13	Network Rail requests that additional text to be added to the draft Policy to refer to other rail and transport projects that may be identified for investment over the Plan period. This additional wording is requested to reflect the fact that the projects currently listed in the Policy may be subject to change in the future and that new additional / alternative projects and priorities that may arise over the Plan period.	Change Agreed. Additional wording in the supporting text states, “The projects listed in Policy T3 may be subject to change including the potential for new proposals across all modes of transport. A future review of the Local Plan will enable the policy to be altered to reflect changes in terms of transport investment.”	LP268-7
14	If a policy were implemented to create a rail line into Manchester from the West of the M56 at Davenport Green, the removal of spoil for a twin-bore rail tunnel into Manchester would cause road traffic chaos and nuisance of the sort that was opposed by many in Hale Barns when construction of HS2 was being contemplated.	The specifics of how to construct and mitigate impact of the proposals is not a matter for the Local Plan.	LP12-2
15	Sport England's would strongly recommend the inclusion of reference (with the possible inclusion of the website link as a footnote) to the principles of our Active Design guidance to promote activity, health and stronger communities through the way we design and build our towns and cities and also encourages the integration of green and blue assets within developments to promote this.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and the supporting text to Policy D1 provides information on proposals to update the current Residential Quality Guidance.	LP9-38

Question No 62 - Digital Infrastructure

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (2) In Part (3) No (0)

Yes (LP321-61, LP309-56)

In part (LP385-51, LP267-42, LP28-62)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Policy supported. Comments noted positive impact of digital infrastructure, and need for liaison with telecom providers when equipment is being provided within the SRN boundary (LP321-61). General comment on generational awareness and use of digital technology. (LP309-56)	Support noted.	LP321-61, LP309-56
2	Support in part. Suggests that equipment and software is accessible and adaptable for disabled people with additional financial and other support where needed.	Support in part and comment noted which is a matter for other legislative requirements rather than planning.	LP385-51
3	Support in part. Identifies potential conflict between use of rooftops for digital infrastructure and renewable energy installations.	Support noted. The identified conflict will be managed by considering individual cases and the appropriate delivery of the different technologies.	LP28-62
4	Policy supported. Suggest the policy is split into two elements covering building design and overall need for digital infrastructure across the city respectively.	Support noted. Policy retained as a single policy.	LP284-27
5	Objection. First part of the policy already covered by Building Regulations. Second and third parts of the policy are not delivered by developers so cannot be	No change proposed to the plan.	LP269-19

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	included in policy (delivery undertaken by operators).		
6	Support in part. Policy does not include any specific wording to deal with street infrastructure for digital installations.	No change proposed to the plan.	LP267-42