

Comments

Manchester's Core Strategy Publication (10/02/11 to 24/03/11)

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by | Sport England (Mr Paul Daly) |
| Comment ID | 227 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 14:13 |
| Consultation Point | Green Infrastructure and Environmental Protection (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.8 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Re. 12.7: Table 12.7 does not include standards for indoor sports. Whilst the reasons for this are evident within the open space, sport and recreation study, the reasons for the omission from the table are not clear from examining the table alone. Whilst I do not consider the content of the table to render the core strategy unsound, I would recommend changing the table. The table could be improved by including a row for indoor sports along with a statement explaining why there are no standards shown for this type of facility.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Comment by | Blackley Mere Developments Ltd () |
| Comment ID | 83 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 18:41 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 9 Green Infrastructure (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.5 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? No

Soundness

No

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

- . (1) Justified
- . (3) Consistent with national policy

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

As above.

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Powered by Objective Online 4.0 - page 3

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We welcome that the policy includes canals within the broad definition of Green Infrastructure and fully recognises the multi-functional role of both green infrastructure and the canal network, which includes mitigating climate change, health benefits from leisure and recreation, sustainable transport routes and contributing to the economic prosperity of the area.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited (Mr David Thompson) |
| Comment ID | 287 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 15:15 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 9 Green Infrastructure (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.6 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Bridgewater Canal Company Ltd (BWCC) is part of the Peel Group of companies. The BWCC is the owner of a significant piece of transport infrastructure - the Bridgewater Canal which stretches 39 miles from Runcorn to Leigh, via Castelfield, Manchester. Due to its length and routing, the Canal straddles seven Local Authorities which include Halton, Warrington, Cheshire East, Wigan, Trafford, Salford and Manchester City Council. The latter four Local Authorities are part of the Greater Manchester City Region. Approximately a quarter of the conurbation in the Greater Manchester area is accessible from the Canal by only 10-15 minutes of travel by walking or cycling. Therefore, the Canal towpath is an extremely important off-road piece of travel infrastructure and its enhancement as a shared path pedestrian / cycle facility presents major sustainable transport and also green infrastructure opportunities. The BWCC recognise the potential of the Canal as a multi-functionality green infrastructure. The Bridgewater Canal Trust (BCT) was setup in 1975 in partnership between BWCC and the above-mentioned seven Local Authorities. One of the Trust's visions is to maximise the potential of the Bridgewater Canal as an integrated shared strategic cycle and pedestrian network, through the implementation of the Bridgewater Way initiative and improvements to existing routes and public transport facilities in its vicinity. The Bridgewater Way would enhance Greater Manchester's green credentials, can be expected to reduce the region's carbon footprint and support economic growth and regeneration. The Canal also offers excellent recreational and leisure opportunities along its green and blue corridor. BWCC support the statement on paragraph 12.56 where it recognises that 'canals, towpaths and walkways provide an invaluable network of green/blue corridors. This network ensures that residents are able to access open spaces outside of the City Centre through the use of these linkages'. However, BWCC are disappointed that the draft Core Strategy does not identify any specific implementation strategy to deliver this aspiration.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

BWCC request that Bridgewater Way initiative is integrated as part of the delivery strategy and within the Green Infrastructure Strategy for Manchester. We would suggest the following amendments to be made to paragraph 12.56. '12.56 The City Centre in particular has lower levels of open space and tree cover than other parts of the City, but here canals, towpaths and walkways provide an invaluable network of green/blue corridors. This network ensures that residents are able to access open spaces outside of the City Centre through the use of these linkages. Therefore, multi functionality schemes such the Bridgewater Way, which creates pedestrian and cycling paths along its blue and green corridor will be part of the strategy to provide access and link open spaces outside of the City Centre. It is recognised that the provision of new green infrastructure in the form of open space will be challenging in some parts of the City Centre. In all parts of the City which have a more heavily urbanised environment, a key priority will be to deliver new urban features such as green roofs and living walls and other innovative solutions, together with more street trees, to increase and enhance green infrastructure, encouraging urban cooling, mitigating and adapting to climate change.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Reasons for participation at oral part of examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

If MCC put forward a proposed change to the CS to address this issue there will no need for BWCC to appear in relation to this matter. However if no change is proposed, BWCC would wish to have the opportunity to expand upon this submission.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited (Mr David Thompson) |
| Comment ID | 146 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 15:20 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 9 Green Infrastructure (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.8 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Bridgewater Canal Company Ltd (BWCC) is part of the Peel Group of companies. The BWCC is the owner of a significant piece of transport infrastructure - the Bridgewater Canal which stretches 39 miles from Runcorn to Leigh, via Castelfield, Manchester. Due to its length and routing, the Canal straddles seven Local Authorities which include Halton, Warrington, Cheshire East, Wigan, Trafford, Salford and Manchester City Council. The latter four Local Authorities are part of the Greater Manchester City Region. Approximately a quarter of the conurbation in the Greater Manchester area is accessible from the Canal by only 10-15 minutes of travel by walking or cycling. Therefore, the Canal towpath is an extremely important off-road piece of travel infrastructure and its enhancement as a shared path pedestrian / cycle facility presents major sustainable transport and also green infrastructure opportunities. The BWCC recognise the potential of the Canal as a multi-functionality green infrastructure. Bridgewater Canal Trust (BCT) was setup in 1975 in partnership between BWCC and the abovementioned seven Local Authorities. One of the Trust's visions is to maximise the potential of the Bridgewater Canal as an integrated shared strategic cycle and pedestrian network, through the implementation of the Bridgewater Way initiative and improvements to existing routes and public transport facilities in its vicinity. The Bridgewater Way would enhance Greater Manchester's green credentials, can be expected to reduce the region's carbon footprint and support economic growth and regeneration. The Canal also offers excellent recreational and leisure opportunities along its green and blue corridor. BWCC welcomes the stated vision and ambitions at paragraph 12.54 in particular the objective of "The multi-functionality of these key open spaces and linkages [including the Bridgewater Canal], including biodiversity and recreational value, will be supported and enhanced and connection between them reinforced". However, BWCC note that the Draft Core Strategy makes no reference to the Bridgewater Way initiative. This is disappointing, as together with the above-mentioned Local Authorities and other charitable organisations, BWCC have been actively promoting and constructing The Bridgewater Way (also known as Regional Route 82) for the last 5 years. The project aims to turn the Canal and towpaths into a green and blue corridor which is accessible by all. To date, 13 miles of the route have been completed in Halton, Wigan, Salford and Trafford. This is a project to improve the Canal to make it more accessible for people and turn it into improved Green Infrastructure that forms part of Manchester's enhanced landscape character.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

BWCC therefore request the inclusion of appropriate references to the Bridgewater Way RR82 in Core Strategy Development Plan Document. Paragraph 12.54 should be amended as follows to reflect this. '12.54 Green infrastructure forms part of Manchester's landscape character. Existing strategic green infrastructure assets include the Mersey Valley, River Irwell, Medlock Valley, Chorlton Water Park, the Ashton, Rochdale and Bridgewater canal corridors, Alexandra Park, Heaton Park, Phillips Park and Wythenshawe Park. The multi functionality of these key open spaces and linkages, including biodiversity and recreational value and schemes such as the Bridgewater Way along the Bridgewater Canal corridor will be supported and enhanced and connections between them reinforced'.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Reasons for participation at oral part of examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination. If MCC put forward a proposed change to the CS to address this issue there will no need for BWCC to appear in relation to this matter. However if no change is proposed, BWCC would wish to have the opportunity to expand upon this submission.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by | Sport England (Mr Paul Daly) |
| Comment ID | 223 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 14:03 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 9 Green Infrastructure (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Sport England has previously made representations in relation to this policy at previous stages of consultation. These matters have now been largely addressed through revisions of the text of the core strategy. I would point out, though, that there could be difficulties in terms of applying the definition of Green Infrastructure to some sports facilities. For example, some cricket pitches comprise of a relatively small wicket with a synthetic surface and a large grass outfield. Some football pitches comprise of a mix of natural grass reinforced by synthetic fibres inserted into the soil. Would such pitches be seen as green infrastructure? That said, Sport England is broadly supportive of policy EN9. Green Infrastructure provides opportunities for a wide range of sports including not only pitch based sports such as football and hockey, but also sports such as orienteering, cycling, canoeing, rowing, sailing, motorsports etc. It is therefore important to seek to maintain green infrastructure (which the policy would do) as it provides a natural resource for sporting activities. The policy would also appear to allow for the loss of green infrastructure in certain circumstances. This is also important, as from a sporting perspective, there will be occasions where it is beneficial say to provide changing facilities on a playing field or replace a natural turf playing pitch with a synthetic turf playing pitch.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by | Withington Civic Society (Mr James Bromfield) |
| Comment ID | 148 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 15:24 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 9 Green Infrastructure (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |

Version 0.3

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Effective policy, procedures and co-ordinated action are required to reverse the retreat of the city's green environment.

Comment by Natural England (Janet Baguley)

Comment ID 63

Response Date 24/03/11 11:45

Consultation Point Table 12.7 ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.7

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

As we have previously commented (January 2010) the accessibility standards for open space set out in Table 12.7 do not meet Natural England's accessibility standards of an accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 hectares in size being no more than 300m (5 minutes walk) away. The standards set out here fall some way short of this, and we are disappointed that our previous comments to this effect have not resulted in amendments to this part of the Core Strategy. As we previously stated, clear justification should be given for the reasoning given in the City Wide Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study that the nature of the city restricts opportunities to meet Natural England's standards, and we would welcome an opportunity to engage in discussions about how improved standards may be achieved.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by | Sport England (Mr Paul Daly) |
| Comment ID | 228 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 14:19 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 10 Safeguarding Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.11 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it . (1) Justified
is not: . (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The broad aim of the policy (ie to retain and improve open spaces, sport and recreation facilities) is fully supported. However, it is considered that the policy wording would not be effective in terms of meeting this aim, and that there are weaknesses in the evidence base which would also impact on the effectiveness of the policy, and also question whether the policy is fully justified. The concern with the policy wording centres on the text which sets out the criteria which would allow development on existing open space, sport and recreation facilities. Specifically, the policy would allow development where "The site is identified as surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function based on the standards above and the area priorities...". In the case of outdoor sports, it is not appropriate to use the standards to determine if an individual site is surplus. This is because the quantity standard is a crude standard in that it simply reflects existing levels of provision and is actually a combination of different types of outdoor sports provision. Indeed the study from which the standard is extracted recognises this very point. Paragraph 8.3 of the open space, sport and recreation study refers to the quantity standard for outdoor sports and states that "This standard represents a broad standard only. The provision of specific facilities and the adequacy of those facilities to meet local needs will need to be interpreted through specific studies, such as a playing pitch strategy." This point is reiterated elsewhere. For example, paragraph 8.162 states that "... the demand led nature of outdoor sports facilities, means that specific studies (such as a playing pitch strategy) should be undertaken in order to accurately define shortfalls and surpluses." Likewise, paragraph 8.130 states that "Playing pitch strategies evaluate the adequacy of pitches in significant detail and it is these documents that should be used to determine the requirement for additional pitches, priorities for investment and any sites which are suitable for disposal". It is clear, therefore, that the local standards are not intended to be used to determine if sites are surplus to requirement and suitable for development. I would also add

that one of the key priorities recommended in the open space, sport and recreation study (paragraph 8.165) is to “protect all outdoor sports facilities from development in line with Sport England policies and exception criteria”. The wording of EN10 as it stands is not in line with this recommendation. Turning to the evidence base, consideration of playing pitches within the open space, sport and recreation study is based on the Manchester City Council Playing Pitch Strategy (2004). Although published in 2004, the study was actually undertaken in 2003 and is considered by Sport England as being out of date. Sport England only regards playing pitch strategies (PPS) to be up to date where they have been produced and adopted, or substantially reviewed and updated, within the last 3 years. The guidance in Towards A Level Playing Field (which sets out the methodology for playing pitch strategies) actually recommends that a review of demand data should be undertaken every 2 years to account for the constantly changing number of teams playing pitch team sports. The supply of pitches is also subject to change. By way of example Sport England has been consulted on over 50 planning applications affecting playing fields in Manchester since 2004. The Manchester PPS itself only looks forward to 2008 and actually states that the analysis underpinning the assessment should be updated every two years (page 7, last paragraph). The need to update the strategy is also recognised in the open space, sport and recreation study. Paragraph 8.130 states “In light of the age of the strategy, it is recommended that this is updated to reflect changes that have taken place to pitch stock and the demand and conclusions should therefore be treated as indicative only.” Playing pitches account for the majority of land within the outdoor sports typology. As it stands, however, the assessment of supply and demand is considerably out of date. However, the outdoor sports standard in the core strategy is, in part, based on the findings of the 2004 playing pitch strategy which found that 2004 levels of pitch provision were broadly adequate subject to quality improvements being undertaken to improve capacity. The appropriateness of the standard is therefore questionable. Finally, in relation to potential funding sources for playing field improvements, I would also like to make you aware of ‘Places People Play’, the mass participation legacy from the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. As part of the legacy programme, £10 million of National Lottery funding will be made available to protect and improve playing fields. Sport England will launch the first of five £2 million funding rounds in 2011. Further details will be made available on the Sport England website (www.sportengland.org). Whilst eligibility criteria remain to be finalised, it is likely that an up to date playing pitch strategy will be required.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Two changes are considered necessary to make the core strategy sound. The first is to change the text of policy EN 10 from: “The site is identified as surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function based on the standards above and the area priorities...”. To ... “The site has been demonstrated to be surplus for its current open space, sport or recreation function and the city wide standards set out above are maintained...”. The second change is to include a commitment to undertake and complete an update of the existing Playing Pitch Strategy, or produce a new Playing Pitch Strategy, within a specified timescale. This is an approach which has been found acceptable elsewhere (eg see Inspector’s Report on the examination into Sevenoaks DC core strategy for the most recent example). In terms of timescales, as playing pitch strategies can often take a year or more to prepare and complete, it is recommended that an appropriate timescale would be within 18 months of adoption of the core strategy.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Comment by Sport England (Mr Paul Daly)

Comment ID 270

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Response Date | 24/03/11 11:58 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 11 Quantity of Open Space, Sport and Recreation (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.5 |

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The broad aim of the policy (ie to create new opens spaces, sport and recreation facilities) is fully supported. However, there is concern about the wording of the policy. The policy prioritises provision where the quantitative standards in the Open Space, Sport and Recreation study identify a deficiency or where significant levels of development are proposed. As already mentioned in relation to policy EN10, the broad quantitative standard is not considered appropriate for assessing the local need for specific sport and recreation facilities. The reference to the standards also leaves a question in relation to how areas with existing deficiencies in relation to indoor sport facilities would be handled (as there are no local standards for these). I would recommend changing the second bullet point text from: "...

based on the Open Space, Sport and Recreation standards ..." To: "... based on the findings of the Open Space, Sport and Recreation study and Playing Pitch Strategy ...".

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited (Mr David Thompson) |
| Comment ID | 128 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 14:36 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 14 Flood Risk (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

- . (1) Justified
- . (2) Effective
- . (3) Consistent with national policy

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Peel's concerns with regard to the Level 2 SFRA are set out in a note prepared by consultants HR Wallingford, attached to this submission as Appendix 1, which describes the more detailed assessment of the potential for flooding from the Bridgewater Canal which HR Wallingford have undertaken for Peel in accordance with a specification agreed in advance with Manchester, Salford and Trafford Councils (the 3 Authorities having jointly commissioned the Level 2 SFRA). That more detailed assessment is set out in two recent reports prepared by HR Wallingford which are also attached as Appendices 2 & 3. These reports are: Report EX 6401 - Potential for flooding from the Bridgewater Canal – An assessment of overtopping and breaching Report EX6448 – Potential for flooding from the Bridgewater Canal – Model results for breaching scenarios. The Manchester Ship Canal Company and Peel have commenced proceedings in the High Court seeking a Judicial Review of the decision by the Environment Agency (EA) to classify sluice gates on the Manchester Ship Canal as flood defences for the purposes of preparing flood maps. The proceedings, which the EA are defending, have not been determined but, meanwhile, the Court has ordered that, whilst the EA may publish flood maps prepared on the basis which has been challenged, in doing so, the EA must make users of the flood maps aware that the challenge asserts that the preparation of the maps is flawed in respect of the EA's consideration of the role of sluice gates in preventing flooding.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Peel considers that the Core Strategy should, when adopted, be based on the most up to date evidence base and that the work undertaken by HR Wallingford provides a more detailed and accurate assessment of risk of flooding from the Bridgewater Canal than is set out in the SFRA. Accordingly Peel requests that the three Local Authorities that jointly commissioned the Level 2 SFRA should accept and endorse/ adopt the revised Maps produced by H R Wallingford as representing the most accurate assessment of risk from overtopping and breaching of the Bridgewater Canal.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Reasons for participation at oral part of examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination. If MCC put forward a proposed change to the CS to address this issue there will no need for Peel to appear in relation to this matter. However if no change is proposed Peel would wish to have the opportunity to explain to the Inspector its concerns as to the soundness of the SFRA in relation to the assessment of flood risk from the Bridgewater Canal.

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Comment by | Environment Agency (Mrs Helen Telfer) |
| Comment ID | 207 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 12:05 |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 14 Flood Risk (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.5 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

In conclusion, we feel that the Core Strategy meets the tests of soundness as prescribed in Planning Policy Statement 12 for those issues which lie within our remit. However we feel the plan could be improved by considering the following: Policy EN14 (page 195) Although the second recommendation would ensure that flood risk is duly considered by developers we consider that it would be better to take a risk based approach and only request Flood Risk Assessments for sites greater than 0.5Ha within Critical Drainage Areas. This has been recommended in the SFRA Level 2 report and is how we are currently working in Practice. We support the reference to 'developers having regard' to the surface water run off rates in the SFRA user guide. It is essential that developers meet with the requirements of this guidance in critical drainage areas to ensure that flood risk is reduced where possible on a cumulative basis. We support reference to developments seeking to 'open up' hidden watercourses to reduce associated flood risk and take advantage of the 'opportunities to enhance biodiversity and Green Infrastructure'. The opening up and rehabilitation of existing degraded

watercourse systems would also meet objectives identified in the North West River Basin Management Plan (<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/33106.aspx>) and ensure all our aquatic resources meet good ecological potential by 2027, thereby contributing to the fundamental aims of the Water Framework Directive.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Mr David Bishop |
| Comment ID | 1 |
| Response Date | 10/02/11 12:06 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 15 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: . (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

I am an amateur botanist and have known the Mersey Valley since the early nineteen seventies. On my retirement, around five years ago, I decided to make an intensive study of the area's flora. To be honest I am shocked by the deterioration in the quality of this area and the continuing loss of its, formerly rich, biodiversity. Although much 'lip service' is made to 'biodiversity' in actual fact most agencies, who have responsibility for the Mersey Valley, still seem to regard its wildlife as irrelevant and expendable. SBIs and LNRs are steadily deteriorating in quality as a result of inappropriate management techniques, neglect and recreational pressure. The fact that the Metrolink to the airport line will be driven through the Hardy Farm SBI (the richest in the Central Mersey Valley) suggests that the designations 'SBI' and 'LNR' carry little weight and are ultimately expendable.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

- Develop a 'joined-up' approach to local biodiversity - one in which all agencies are involved. - Ensure that the designations SBI and LNR carry more weight and that the areas that are assigned these designations are protected from development. - Review, as a matter of urgency, all management techniques employed and ensure that they have the effect of maximising biodiversity - rather than destroying it as at present. - Review, as a matter of urgency, the balance between recreation and biodiversity. Note that the Chorlton Ees and Ivy Green LNR is currently experiencing very heavy use and is deteriorating badly as a result of trampling, dog fouling, vandalism and litter.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Reasons for participation at oral part of examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Because my experience is that consultations such as this are a 'popularity contest' and when commenting on biodiversity matters I am often a lone voice. This is because biodiversity has been considered as irrelevant for so long - but, after the Nagoya Conference last year it can only grow in importance.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Blackley Mere Developments Ltd () |
| Comment ID | 84 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 18:44 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 15 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (View) |
| Status | Processed |

Submission Type Web

Version 0.4

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

- . (1) Justified
- . (3) Consistent with national policy

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Objection: The policy should be amended to reflect a hierarchy of biodiversity conservation importance, and specifically the fact SBI's are not statutorily protected and are graded A to C (C being the least important). The policy should also place an onus upon the LPA (and GMEU) to annually review the eligibility of sites which have been so designated as environmental circumstances and other factors may occur over time which negate the reasons why they were so designated in the first instance. It would be completely unreasonable to require developers to pay special regard to a designated SBI which no longer functioned as an SBI.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

As above.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Natural England (Janet Baguley) |
| Comment ID | 32 |
| Response Date | 23/03/11 15:01 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 15 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.5 |

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We welcome the aims of this policy; however we have some concerns about the wording of the second to last paragraph which states that 'where adverse impacts are unavoidable, developers will be required to demonstrate that these will be minimal'. We would like to see this amended to require that where adverse impacts are unavoidable, developers will be required to compensate through the creation of equivalent habitat elsewhere.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | mr martyn coy |
| Comment ID | 62 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 11:46 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 15 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.5 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We welcome that policy EN15 clearly identifies the ecological importance of the canal network, including the Rochdale and Ashton Canals.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Environment Agency (Mrs Helen Telfer) |
| Comment ID | 209 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 12:12 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 15 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Policy EN15 (page 198) We support reference to the North West River Basin Management Plan within this policy and particularly justification paragraph 12.78 which reflects some of the key aims from this plan.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by | Environment Agency (Mrs Helen Telfer) |
| Comment ID | 211 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 12:15 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 17 Water Quality (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Policy EN17 (page 203) We welcome the wording of this policy and the direct use of the Water Framework Directive within the justification text.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Coal Authority (Miss Rachael Bust) |
| Comment ID | 5 |
| Response Date | 08/03/11 11:39 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 18 Contaminated Land and Ground Stability (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.3 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read. . Soundness

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound?

Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Coal Authority is a Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues and provide information on coal mining. The Coal Authority set up a new Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department in 2008 to re-engage with the three planning systems across England, Scotland and Wales. The main areas of planning interest to the Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to: • the safeguarding of coal as a mineral in accordance with the advice contained in MPS1 and MPG3 in England; and • ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduce the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in PPG14 and MPG3 in England. Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction As you will be aware, parts of the Manchester area contain coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. Information on the extent of these resources is available to Mineral Planning Authorities free of charge from the Coal Authority and was provided to Manchester City Council in October 2009. In broad terms, the area to the north east of the City Centre contains surface coal resources, as does the northern fringe of the City in the wards of Higher Blackley, Charlestown and Moston. The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In instances where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. Contact details for individual operators that may be able to assist with coal extraction in advance of development can be obtained from the Confederation of Coal Producers' website at www.coalpro.co.uk/members.shtml. As The Coal Authority owns the coal on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of the Coal Authority may be required. Coal Mining Legacy As you will be aware, the Manchester area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. The principal source of guidance is PPG14, which despite its age still contains the science and best practice on how to safely treat unstable ground. Within the Manchester area there are approximately 125 recorded mine entries. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by the Local Planning Authority to ensure site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development delivered through the Local Development Framework recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. Support – The Coal Authority fully supports the amended version of Policy EN18 and the accompanying text in paragraph 12.86 which adequately addresses the issues of mining legacy and the ground stability that are known to be present within the City. The amended policy fully addresses the comments The Coal Authority had previously made on this issue.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Manchester Friends of the Earth (Dr Ali Abbas) |
| Comment ID | 231 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 11:47 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 19 Waste (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.6 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The final clause in policy EN 19 should be extended to read 'Encourage communities to take responsibility for the waste they create and provide accessible facilities for this'.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

as above

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Comment by | Mrs Philippa Lane |
| Comment ID | 12 |
| Response Date | 17/03/11 16:32 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 19 Waste (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.5 |

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: . (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The proposed policy seems to be in line with the approach set out within national planning policy however, to ensure conformity between the Manchester Core Strategy and the submitted Greater Manchester Waste Plan, the following comments are provided: Bullet point 2 of Policy EN19 states that Manchester Council will, "Promote the principles of the waste hierarchy to prevent, reduce, re-use,

recycle, recover energy from and finally dispose of waste". This is consistent with the objectives of the Waste Plan, but in terms of new development it will be difficult to implement and monitor through the Core Strategy. However it would be appropriate for Manchester to require new proposals to follow the principles of the waste hierarchy, and this could be implemented and monitored through planning applications. Suggested new wording: Require all developers of new waste management facilities within the Borough to demonstrate the proposal's consistency with the principles of the waste hierarchy (reduction, re-use, recycling/composting, energy recovery, final disposal); Bullet point 3 of Policy EN19 states that Manchester Council will, "Minimise need for transportation of waste and encourage and safeguard the sustainable transport of waste, including by use of rail or water, wherever possible." This consistent with the objectives of the Waste Plan, but in order to ensure sustainable transport of waste is implemented across Greater Manchester it is suggested that Core Strategies require developers to use sustainable transport methods, where possible. Whilst Manchester Core Strategy includes a suite of three policies (T1, T2 and T3) these do not seem to require the use of alternative modes of transport such as rail or canal; in terms of waste movements these can be realistic alternatives to road movement, especially for large quantities of waste. Therefore it is suggested that additional wording be added to policy EN19 as follows. Suggested new wording: Require all developers of new waste management facilities within the Borough to plan for and, where appropriate, use sustainable modes for waste transport, including use of modes such as rail and the Manchester Ship Canal. Bullet point 6 of Policy EN19 states that Manchester Council will, "Promote the development of innovation and technological advancement within the sustainable waste management industry, aiming to achieve a close-loop waste management system." The term 'close-loop' is not explained within the policy or in the justification text below, it would be helpful if this was set out for the avoidance of doubt. Bullet point 7 of Policy EN19 states that Manchester Council will, "Encourage waste management practices that do not incur unacceptable adverse impact on the environment or endanger human health". Some waste management developments may seem to have adverse impacts on the environment but, through the introduction of mitigation measures, could be made acceptable. In addition, waste management developments can bring improvements to a local area and the economy through regeneration and jobs. Therefore it would be useful if this policy could include reference to mitigation of adverse impacts. Suggested new wording: Require waste management practices to have full regard to the environmental, social and economic impacts of such development and encourage long-term benefits in improving the environment, the regeneration of areas in need of investment and co-location with other employment uses where appropriate. The final bullet point of Policy EN19 states that Manchester Council will, "Encourage communities to take responsibility for the waste they create." The Waste Plan does not include a policy on waste minimisation or methods to bring about behavioral change with regards to waste creation, but is certainly supported by the overall strategy of the Plan, therefore the inclusion of such a point within the Manchester Core Strategy is welcomed but it is not clear how this point would be implemented or monitored through the Core Strategy. It is recommended that the additional detail on waste minimisation be added to the delivery strategy. Where the Core Strategy cannot deliver waste minimisation and behaviour change it will be necessary to carry out further work, through the development of a Waste Minimisation Supplementary Planning Document. Overall Policy EN19 fits well with the Greater Manchester Joint Waste DPD and, subject to the suggested amendments, it is considered sound on these grounds.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(revised wording in box above)

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by | Mrs Philippa Lane |
| Comment ID | 13 |
| Response Date | 17/03/11 16:34 |
| Consultation Point | Policy EN 20 Minerals (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.6 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The proposed policy seems to meet the key requirements of MPS1. As a result the policy direction fits well with the current direction of the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals DPD and is therefore considered sound on these grounds. However, it is not clear how the third bullet point under Policy EN20 'encourage the use of alternatives to peat-based products in landscaping/gardens within development schemes' fits into Policy EM 20 and it would be more appropriate to include this point in policy DM 1 Development Management. This point is relevant to developers of schemes that will require landscaping, such as

housing developments. Such developers may not consider Policy EN20 relevant to them and this point may be lost. In addition, it is not clear how this point would be monitored as it is not an indicator in the Minerals Plan.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Comment by Coal Authority (Miss Rachael Bust)

Comment ID 6

Response Date 08/03/11 11:42

Consultation Point Policy EN 20 Minerals ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.2

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read. . Soundness

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Support – The Coal Authority supports the amended version of Policy EN20 on Minerals, along with the accompanying text in paragraphs 12.94 and 12.97. This policy now reflects the presence of surface coal resources, together with a commitment to work with the other Greater Manchester Authorities on mineral safeguarding through the Joint Minerals DPD. The amended policy fully addresses the comments The Coal Authority had previously made on this issue. The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these supporting comments.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited (Mr David Thompson) |
| Comment ID | 130 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 14:48 |
| Consultation Point | Policy PA 1 Developer Contributions (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.6 |

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Bridgewater Canal Company Ltd (BWCC) is part of the Peel Group of companies. The BWCC is the owner of a significant piece of transport infrastructure - the Bridgewater Canal which stretches 39 miles from Runcorn to Leigh, via Castelfield, Manchester. Due to its length and routing, the Canal straddles seven Local Authorities which include Halton, Warrington, Cheshire East, Wigan, Trafford, Salford and Manchester City Council. The latter four Local Authorities are part of the Greater Manchester City Region. Approximately a quarter of the conurbation in the Greater Manchester area is accessible from the Canal by only 10-15 minutes of travel by walking or cycling. Therefore, the Canal towpath is an extremely important off-road piece of travel infrastructure and its enhancement as a shared path pedestrian / cycle facility presents major sustainable transport and also green infrastructure opportunities. The BWCC recognise the potential of the Canal as a multi-functionality green infrastructure. The Bridgewater Canal Trust (BCT) was setup in 1975 in partnership between BWCC and the above mentioned seven Local Authorities. One of the Trust's visions is to maximise the potential of the Bridgewater Canal as an integrated shared strategic cycle and pedestrian network, through the implementation of the Bridgewater Way initiative and improvements to existing routes and public transport facilities in its vicinity. The Bridgewater Way would enhance Greater Manchester's green credentials, can be expected to reduce the region's carbon footprint and support economic growth and regeneration. The Canal also offers excellent recreational and leisure opportunities along its green and blue corridor. Peel welcomes the inclusion of Green Infrastructure within the list of items for which the Council may seek developer contributions. As detailed above the Bridgewater Way initiative would be a suitable and worthy beneficiary of such support.

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Sport England (Mr Paul Daly) |
| Comment ID | 272 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 12:07 |
| Consultation Point | Policy PA 1 Developer Contributions (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Policy PA1 is supported by Sport England in so far as it would allow developer contributions to be captured for open space, sport and recreation facilities. This is regarded as consistent with PPG17 which states that Local Authorities will be justified in seeking planning obligations where the quantity or quality of provision is inadequate or under threat, or where new development increases local needs (paragraph 33).

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by | DPP (Mr Mark Aylward) |
| Comment ID | 245 |
| Response Date | 23/03/11 16:42 |
| Consultation Point | Policy PA 1 Developer Contributions (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Letter |
| Version | 0.4 |

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

On behalf of Tesco Stores Ltd: We encourage the Council to publish a charging schedule in accord with the requirements of the CIL regulations as soon as is practical. If this were to be taken forward, then the bulleted obligations set out with Policy PA 1 could be implemented on a commensurate basis in accord with Circular 05/05. It is noted that the policy refers to viability, but it is unclear how this will be implemented in practice and the weight to be afforded to the conclusions drawn. If a prescriptive approach were taken, there is a significant risk that commercial developments will be impeded by hugely onerous requirements for developer contributions. Without this further clarification, it could be considered that this policy is not deliverable.

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Comment by | Ballymore Group (Mr Daniel Osborne) |
| Comment ID | 208 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 12:09 |
| Consultation Point | Policy PA 1 Developer Contributions (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |

Guidance notes

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

BG recognises that MCC will require developer contributions in order to mitigate any impact that a development may bring. Any contributions required by the Council should be tested against a proposed development to determine whether it is viable to provide such a contribution. In negotiating S.106 Agreements, MCC should also be aware of the qualitative contribution a new development may bring to a local area, which should offset by any quantitative requirements.

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Comment by | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited (Mr David Thompson) |
| Comment ID | 133 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 14:54 |
| Consultation Point | Policy DM 1 Development Management (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.7 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

- . (1) Justified
- . (2) Effective
- . (3) Consistent with national policy

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Peel objects to the wording of the final bullet point of Policy DM1 insofar as this refers to the requirements of Policy EN6 to which Peel has submitted a separate objection in particular to the higher energy targets included in EN6.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The text in brackets within the first part of the final bullet point to DM1 should be deleted.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Reasons for participation at oral part of examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination. Peel acknowledge that this proposed change is related to the objection to Policy EN6 and does not need to be discussed separately at the Hearing if MCC accept that EN6 is in need of substantial revision.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Comment by | Mrs Philippa Lane |
| Comment ID | 14 |
| Response Date | 17/03/11 16:36 |
| Consultation Point | Policy DM 1 Development Management (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.7 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

It is expected that the Waste Plan will include development management policies on the following subjects: - Requirement for Combined Heat and Power - Restoration and Aftercare - Unallocated sites - Safeguarding The Preferred Option Report stated that "the Waste Plan would not contain a development management policy on Airfield Safeguarding Zones as other guidance exists on this matter (e.g. Civil Aviation Policy). However, the Waste Plan will contain text on the subject to provide information regarding airfield safeguarding zones and waste management facilities." The Publication Report also states that "protection of aerodromes is achieved through individual district's policies and therefore should not be replicated in the Waste Plan. However, applications for waste management facilities that manage biodegradable waste should be aware of the potential implications of that facility on the aerodrome." It is expected that District Core Strategies/ other relevant DPDs will include development management policies on the following subjects: - Protection of controlled waters - Visual impact - Nature conservation - Historic Environment and built heritage - Traffic and access - Air emissions - Odours - Vermin and birds - Noise and vibration - Litter - Design - Aviation safety (only applies to Manchester, Salford, Stockport, Tameside and Trafford) - Amenity - Impact on infrastructure A review of Manchester's Core Strategy (Publication) has been undertaken and there appears to be no reference to visual impact, odours, litter, or vermin and birds. You may consider that visual impact is already covered by the following reference to 'design, scale and appearance of the proposed development' within bullet point 2 of Policy DM 1 of the Core Strategy (Publication) document. The other omitted aspects of; odours, litter, or vermin and birds, could be added to the list of amenity consideration within Policy DM 1, bullet point 3.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Planning Potential (Mr Stuart Slatter) |
| Comment ID | 286 |
| Response Date | 24/03/11 15:10 |
| Consultation Point | 14 Appendix A Energy Target Explanation (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.5 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Comments on behalf of Wrengate Limited:- In relation to our previous request for information to further explain the energy targets set out in the Core Strategy, we welcome the inclusion of Appendix A, and the reiteration that where energy statements will be required the level of detail should commensurate with the scale and nature of the development proposed.

| | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Comment by | The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman) |
| Comment ID | 97 |
| Response Date | 23/03/11 11:51 |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Consultation Point | 15 Appendix B Parking Standards (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Email |
| Version | 0.4 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? Yes

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Appendix B Parking Standards Omission - We note there are entries for cinemas in D2 on page 228 but only 'stadia' for Miscellaneous on page 229. We strongly suggest that the document includes theatres under Miscellaneous (or sui generis). As an example, Trafford MBC includes the following information for theatres in its Core Strategy: 1 per 10 seats in town centres or 1 per 5 seats in other areas, 1 cycle space per 20 seats, min 2 spaces, Disabled = 3 bays or 6% of total capacity

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Comment by | Greater Manchester Cycling Campaign (Mr Richard Venes) |
| Comment ID | 4 |
| Response Date | 07/03/11 15:57 |
| Consultation Point | 15 Appendix B Parking Standards (View) |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.2 |
| Guidance notes | |

Please tick the sections of the guidance that you wish to read.

Introduction

Legal Compliance

Soundness

General advice

Legal compliance

Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant? Yes

Soundness

Do you consider the DPD is sound? No

Unsound

Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not: . (2) Effective

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

I would like to challenge the parking standards appendix on the grounds that it is unsound and ineffective. Specifically this section does not cover Residential Medical and Health Facilities. Large medical facilities such as general hospitals are major contributors to traffic flows in their areas and provide large amounts of car parking facilities for staff and patients and it is illogical not to include them in this section. However, there are considerable differences in the cycle parking provision at different

hospitals within the Manchester City Council jurisdiction, with some hospitals providing both insufficient and/or poor quality cycle parking. These establishments should be included in this appendix, so that individual sites can be brought up to a best practice standard.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Alter table 5.1 to include residential medical institutions with appropriate entries in all sections. I would prefer to see the cycle parking provision based on the number of staff employed at these locations but am prepared to accept some other measure, provided information on the metric used is easily obtainable by members of the general public.

Participation at oral part of examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? NO, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination