

## Representations - Exchange Greengate Planning Guidance

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Countryside Agency (Janet Belfield)</b>	Document	General	Other		<p>The area covered by the guidance appears to be largely urban in nature and therefore unlikely to affect any of the Agency's environmental interests. The Agency does not wish to comment on the documents.</p> <p>We should explain that the absence of comment is simply an expression of our remit and priorities, and should not be taken as implying a lack of interest or indicating either support for, or objection to, the plan.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
<b>Mrs Marie Taylor (Salford PCT)</b>	Document	General	Support with conditions		<p>Planning should include responsibilities to ensure that residents tv reception is not adversely affected this, I believe, has caused problems on Ordsall and should therefore be built in to the developers plans and responsibilities before development takes place. This should fully protect existing properties from this problem.</p>	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Include paragraph about responsibility to ensure TV reception
<b>Red Rose Forest (Nigel Blandford)</b>	Policy	Policy EG1	Support		<p>We support the multifunctional approach to the regeneration of this area.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Red Rose Forest (Nigel Blandford) Continued</b>	Policy	Policy EG3	Support with conditions		We strongly support the enhancement of the Irwell River Corridor. We ask that reference is made to part Exchange Greengate has to play in the development of Irwell City Park and links to Croal Irwell Regional Park. We believe minimum standards should be set as to the width and how close development should come to the riverside walkway.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to ICP and links to be strengthened  Walkway width set out in 6.49
	Policy	Policy EG5	Support		Strongly support.	<b>NOTED</b>
	Policy	Policy EG7	Object		There is some confusion between public realm and development. Do you mean areas for development with public realm improvements? I note this as we would see the immediate River Irwell Corridor as a priority area for Public realm improvements but not development.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Wording to be clarified River Irwell Corridor is <b>not</b> priority area for development
	Policy	Policy EG9	Support with conditions		While we support the principles of the City's urban design heritage we note that part of this was to turn it's back on the River Irwell. This is one part of the design heritage we would not like to see continued.	<b>NOTED</b>
	Policy	Policy EG11	Support			<b>NOTED</b>
	Policy	Policy EG13	Support with conditions		We strongly support the essence of this policy but ask that other points are noted in the supporting text. These are; Green roofs and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs). Also we would object to the use of the River Irwell as a low energy cooling source, not on principle but in practice as it will raise the water temperate thus decreasing the dissolved oxygen levels. This is really	<b>ACCEPTED</b> These points to be included in text Reference to River Irwell to be removed

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Red Rose Forest (Nigel Blandford) Continued					<p>something you really do not want to do. Mention ground source heat/cooling pumps for instead. We strongly support the adoption of a fixed minimum BREEAM standard. We note however that Manchester CC use "Excellent" in their city centre locations as access to public transport and local amenities makes this easily achievable. I would hope that Salford can at least match this policy.</p> <p>Whether it goes in this section or a new one there is little on biodiversity. New development has great potential for enhancing biodiversity. The inclusion of nest bricks for birds such as swifts, swallows and the rapidly decreasing but readily identifiable house sparrow is easy and cheap to achieve. There are also two key species the Peregrine and Black Redstart that could also be assisted. I would hope that at least one if not two of the taller new buildings had Peregrine nest sites integrated into them from the start of the design process.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Text to be amended to say 'excellent' as ideal and 'very good' as minimum</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Paragraph on biodiversity to be added</p>
	Policy	Policy EG15	Support with conditions		Strongly support the inclusion of a minimum Irwell walkway/cycleway width but with a link back to secure by design it should also provide adequate defensible space. It is hemmed in on the river side but should allow plenty of permeability on the other side	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Statement about adequate access and defensible space to be added

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>Sport England (Henryk Peterson)</b></p>	<p>Document</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Observations</p>		<p>Sport England is pleased to note the draft seeks to: encourage a riverside walk, the creation of new public spaces with pedestrian links and mixed use development schemes.</p> <p>New spaces and cycle/ pedestrian links can help increase participation in physical activity, whilst mixed use developments can provide the opportunity for additional resource provision for built and open sport and recreation facilities. These matters could be more explicitly referred to in the document to inform that this is a key element in seeking to improve the quality of life of existing and future residents/ workers in the area.</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Explicit reference to be made to these observations in para. 6.48</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>The Theatres Trust (Rose Freeman)</b>	Document	General	Other		<p>The Theatres Trust is an advisory Non-Departmental Public Body and a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect land on which there is a theatre and was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres'. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies.</p> <p>Local authorities are required by Government Order to consult the Trust when considering planning applications affecting land on which there is a theatre. This applies to all theatre buildings, old or new, and regardless of whether or not they are still in use as theatres, in other uses, or disused.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
	Chapter	Planning Guidance	Observations		<p>It is important to assess the need and impact of existing and additional theatrical provision within the area although as Salford is well served with theatres and a new arts centre it is unlikely to need any more but might well have demand for other cultural activities as suggested at 6.11 on page 13.</p> <p>Culture includes visual arts and music, the performing arts, crafts, museums, libraries, theatre, cinema, tourism, the natural and build environment.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>The Theatres Trust (Rose Freeman) Continued</b>	Policy	Policy EG1	Support		We are pleased to see in Policy EG 1 on page 12 that cultural uses have been included as one of a range of functions which will contribute to the regeneration of Greengate as a new and vibrant part of the city centre	<b>NOTED</b>
	Chapter	Planning Obligations	Observations		It is important that the need for developer contributions for cultural activities is identified and although planning obligations contributions are mentioned at section 8 on page 27 we feel further explanation is required, and you may want to develop this in the form of a supplementary planning document. The document should develop detailed policies setting out what achievements are expected from section 106 deals. Investing time and resources in such a document will set down clearly what is required of the developer and other funding partners. We recommend Securing Community Benefits through the Planning Process available at <a href="http://PlanningResource.co.uk">PlanningResource.co.uk</a> .	<b>NOTED</b> To be considered as part of Planning Obligations SPD
<b>English Heritage (Judith Nelson)</b>	Chapter	Planning Guidance	Observations		The section on Urban Form, Density and Massing discusses tall buildings and you should be aware that English Heritage and CABE are currently revising their Guidance on Tall Buildings due for publication in November / December 2006. Of particular interest to English Heritage will be safeguarding important views of Manchester Cathedral and it is noted that this and Collier Street Baths are identified as views of special significance in paragraph 6.37.	<b>NOTED</b> Reference to be updated  <b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>English Heritage (Judith Nelson) Continued</b>	Chapter	Planning Guidance	Support		We support the development framework's aim to build upon the area's "historic waterfront and urban environment" and particularly note policies EG 19 and EG 20. It is suggested that the Flat Iron and Cathedral conservation area appraisals are carried at the earliest opportunity in order that they can inform and influence development proposals in the area	<b>NOTED</b>  Undertaking these Conservation Area Appraisals as soon as possible to be considered by City Council.
	Chapter	Plans	Observations		English Heritage welcomes the opportunity for early pre-application discussion on relevant development proposals in this area. The Design Statements now required to accompany planning applications discussed in paragraph 9.1 should cover how the design relates to the historic environment of the area.	<b>NOTED</b>  <b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to be included
<b>Martin Lee (Lees Motors)</b>	Document	General	Observations		Having received your letter of notification, we acquired and inspected the above draft, and notice that your re-development/regeneration plans appear to take in the areas from which we have operated our business for some thirty plus years now. Whilst we have no objections to the plan in general as we believe the area does need a facelift, we also have concerns about the future of our business and obligation to our staff, we therefore need some clarity of how we will be affected and what sort of redress	<b>NOTED</b>  <b>NOTED</b> Survey of Greengate businesses and relocation requirements to be undertaken by

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Martin Lee (Lee Motors) Continued</b>					<p>we can expect. We understand from press releases and from the frequency of activities by surveyors and other officials that things are beginning to happen with no communication to ourselves which is causing some concerns and anxiety to our staff members regarding their position, we also have concerns for the business. Please keep us fully informed of any progress as and when they occur.</p>	<p>undertaken by CSURC</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>
<b>Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (Norman Redhead)</b>	Document	General	Observations		<p>General Points - 1. GMAU suggests that it should be made clear to applicants that they will be expected to commission an archaeological desk based assessment for their proposal sites, and that this will lead to evaluation by trial trenching followed by further more detailed excavation of archaeological remains that will be destroyed by development ground works, followed by a programme of post-evacuation analysis, report writing, archive deposition and publications. This work will be undertaken by archaeological contractors funded by the developer, working to project designs validated by GMAU on behalf of Salford CC. With regards to publication GMAU would like to see each development site contribute funds towards an overall publication as well as producing an article for the individual site's archaeology, the reason for this being that several different archaeological contractors are already operating in the area with the work</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Paragraph to be added to reflect these comments</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (Norman Redhead) Continued</b></p>					<p>being done in piecemeal fashion; and there is a need to tie all this work together and provide an overview of medieval early industrial Salford.</p> <p>2. GMAU understand that a planning proposal for the public realm areas will be submitted in a few weeks time. It should be pointed out that one of the main reasons for the archaeological desk based assessment being undertaken by UMAU (commissioned by Salford CC in May and not due to be completed until the 12th October) was to inform the design of features such as the Court House, medieval cross and conduit, but it seems that the architects are already well advanced with their modern designs for these features. The timing of this is a concern and I trust that there is scope for flexibility in design terms. The other reasons for the archaeological study are to inform where potential archaeological remains may lie that could be affected by public realm ground works, to inform a programme of community archaeology, and to provide information for schools packs, websites, museum displays, books and booklets, information boards and exhibitions on the area's history, as well as interactive virtual environments prepared by Salford university.</p> <p>The desk based assessment is just the first stage of a logical process of archaeological works, as set out in general point 1 above. There could be a considerable cost for follow-on archaeological works within the public realm as mitigation against destruction</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b></p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (Norman Redhead) Continued</b></p>					<p>realm as mitigation against destruction of archaeological remains affected by ground works, and this should be borne in mind in identifying costs. In terms of community archaeology it is highly probable that Heritage Lottery Funds would be available for this, but the grant application process is quite difficult and will take time to put together and wait for a decision. There should also be early discussion with major stakeholders in the area such as Danara with regards to partnership funding for such a scheme. Community archaeology has already been a great success with the £431,000 HLF grant supported Dig Manchester project and I am pleased to announce that Ordsall Hall has a small community excavation running in October. There is potential for linking the Ordsall Hall scheme with Salford Greengate so that a medieval seigneurial lifestyle can be compared with that of a medieval town dweller.</p> <p>3. With the formation of the URC I am not sure of the lines of communication, nor who are the key personnel to discuss these matters. I would be happy to discuss the above points in more detail or do a presentation to address archaeological issues and opportunities and re-iterate points on the re-establishment of the medieval market place. I am concerned that GMAU and other stakeholders, such as the Conservation Officer, Salford Museum and the Virtual Environment Centre at</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b> GMAU to be informed of new contacts in City Council and CSURC</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit (Norman Redhead) Continued</b>					Salford University are kept in the communication loop.	
	Chapter	General	Observations		Section 4.9 - the "historic waterfront" and the railway viaducts are flagged up but there is no mention of restoring the medieval market place and Collier Street Baths, and linking these with a boulevard, thereby recapturing Salford's sense of history and place, which will make Greengate a unique and distinctive place in which to live and work.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Paragraph to be added to reflect this comment
	Chapter	Planning Applications	Observations		Section 9.1 - All planning applications should be accompanied by...an archaeological desk based assessment identifying the character of potential archaeological remains and how the development ground works are likely to impact on them.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Statement to be added
<b>David Hardman (United Utilities)</b>	Policy	Policy EG11	Object	When placing artwork, avoid utility services	Please note that in placing artwork developer's (sic) should take note of the position of underground/overhead utility services and avoid placing artwork in their proximity.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Statement to be added
	Policy	Policy EG13	Support	United Utilities would like more emphasis placed on potable water saving	We note the encouragement for resource demand management on page 19 of the Consultation Draft. In relation to energy demand management, as the Electricity Distribution Network Operator for your area we endorse this.  However, also linked to the environment and climate change is management of demand for other natural resources and	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Paragraph to be added to reflect these comments

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
David Hardman (United Utilities) Continued					<p>in particular potable water. Whilst we are currently well resources with potable water in the north west of England we should not be complacent as climate change predictions indicate this could become a problem.</p> <p>United Utilities is aware that some local authorities are utilizing a national scheme “EcoHomes” and are adopting this as a means of encouraging developers towards environmental sustainability. Indeed the former Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), now the Department for Communities and Local Government is likely to require its application in future development. Water efficiency is part of the scheme. For information the web link is –  <a href="http://www.breeam.org/ecohomes.html">http://www.breeam.org/ecohomes.html</a>.</p> <p>Whilst water meters encourage responsible use of potable water, we would also advise attention to building design to conserve potable water. This could include water saving devices such as low volume taps (except at the kitchen sink), low volume showerheads, dual flush toilets, save-a-flush devices, water efficient washing machines and dishwashers.</p> <p>In this way, the eExchange, Greengate Development is an opportunity for the local authority to demonstrate its responsible ‘green’ vision for the future.</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to be made in Policy EG13</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
David Hardman (United Utilities) Continued	Policy	Policy EG17	Object	Avoid planting trees near utility services	Deep rooted shrubs and trees should not be planted in the vicinity of utility services as they can damage the service and prevent access in emergencies	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to be added
	Chapter	Planning Applications	Object	Add "utility services conflicts" to the list.	Please can you add to the requirements for planning applications a description of underground utility services affecting the development.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to be added to requirements
Highways Agency (Kristian Marsh)	Document	General	Observations		<p>The Agency has two principal comments to make on the document. The first relates to the likely transport impact of the proposals and the second to the make up of buildings within it.</p> <p>The location of the development is noted. It is clearly in a very accessible location and this is to its benefit. However, as no Transport Assessment has been provided it has not been shown that the transport networks in the area have the capacity to cater for redevelopment of the scale envisaged. Are any enhancements to the transport networks likely to be required? If so, what? It would be beneficial to establish such facts at this stage. Finding out that there is no capacity at the rail station, for example, when a planning application is submitted is likely to be too late.</p> <p>Turning to the make up of any new development, the document seems to allow the market to decide how it should</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b> TIAs and Green Travel Plans required to be submitted with all planning applications for new development.</p> <p>Discussions on strategic transport issues for north City Centre taking place between Salford and Manchester City Councils,</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Highways Agency (Kristian Marsh) Continued</b>					<p>be developed. Paragraph 6.2 states that "... the mix of any development will be informed by both commercial and economic considerations..." In essence, therefore, there could be 3 ¼ million sq.ft of office development on the site or 3 ¼ million sq.ft of housing, should the market decide that that is what is appropriate.</p> <p>There is an indication in the document of how many dwellings or how much commercial floorspace can be accommodated on the site. However, no recommendations as to an appropriate proportion of each is included. To achieve the development mix that the council would like to see, some indication of appropriate proportions set out within the document may be useful. Clearly, for the Agency, one use could have potentially greater consequences than the other.</p>	<p>CSURC and GMPTE</p> <p><b>REJECTED</b></p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to rigidly set out the mix of uses on individual development sites.</p> <p>The Guidance also states that the mix <b>must</b> reflect a diversity of facilities to create a vibrant community and good quality of life</p>
<b>Ian Stewart</b>	Document	General	Other		After reading through the planning	<b>NOTED</b>



Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p>(Blueprint Studios Ltd) Continued</p> <p>Ian Stewart (Blueprint</p>					<p>and artists.</p> <p>Further to this we have been championed by many of your colleagues as a catalyst for development in the area. At a recent meeting held by Salford City Council about the development of the Chapel Street area CIDS director Lyn Barbour cited our building as the most important building in the area in the last 10 years, other buildings mentioned were The Lowry and Imperial War Museum. We have also had visits from Sarah Noonan showing off our building to the prospective development team when the tender went out at the very beginning.</p> <p>History and Heritage The planning guidance holds great importance in keeping an historical element to this development to keep the character of the area in tact. Elizabeth House was completed in August 1870 by Sir William Mathers and was a key part of the community and used as a Christian Mission building (known then as the Queen Street Institute) for the surrounding area. It already has a musical heritage as concerts were regularly held in the Big Room upstairs. It also held one of the more charming aspects of the history – The Pleasant Sunday Afternoon (P.S.A.) Society, which we will one day revive.</p> <p>Financial Investment</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> After reviewing the historic character of the building, it is recommended that it is retained and the Development Framework amended to include it as part of an historic triangle of remaining buildings</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>(Blueprint Studios Ltd)</b> <b>Continued</b></p>					<p>We have been here for nearly 6 years now and invested over £1.5 million pounds and more blood sweat and tears than you can imagine. We are now recognised as one of the top Recording Studios in the country by the Association of Professional Recording Services (APRS) having been accepted into the Studio Accord accreditation.</p> <p>Elizabeth House Character. When looking for the premises it wasn't just a case of finding an old building that fitted the budget and satisfied the location requirement. If that had been the case we could have found a bigger building for less money in a similar location. It took 8 months to look around the city and finally find Elizabeth House. Once you walk into the Big Room (See pictures attached) it was sold there and then. Since then the other areas of the building have been developed by ourselves and with award winning interior designers to make the rest of the building reach its full potential. We now have 5 fully soundproofed rehearsal rooms and 2 fully soundproofed recording studios and the most beautiful recording and pre-production space in the Big Room. The building we own that houses our business is key to what we do, it has won us many clients and given us a great platform to achieve what we have achieved.</p> <p>Our Philosophy</p>	<p>including Collier Street Baths and the Eagle Inn</p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p>Ian Stewart (Blueprint Studios Ltd) Continued</p> <p>Ian Stewart (Blueprint Studios Ltd)</p>					<p>Our whole philosophy is based around leaving your ego at the door and making sure that everything that comes out of Blueprint is of the highest standard. We share in Salford's desire to create world class living, working and leisure as we aim for the studios to be world class facilities which we are well on the way to doing as indicated by the Studio Accord accreditation.</p> <p>Our Clients We already have a long list of high profile clients whilst also making sure that we attract the business of the local acts, both signed and unsigned. Our rehearsal business has around 50 different local bands run through every week. We have Mercury nominated band Elbow as a resident who actually recorded their 3rd studio album in the Big Room and are in the process of recording their 4th. Other major clients to pass through our doors are Johnny Marr, Russell Watson, New Order, Doves, Charlatans, Manchester Vs Cancer, 50 Cent and G-Unit, The Streets, BBC, Granada, Universal Classics to name but a few. In the last few years we have held events for Jack Daniels, Carling Live Events, Topman launch party aswell as various charity events.</p> <p>We have recently been named as the new home of The Tube, an innovative pop/rock music television program on Channel 4 in the 1980's that is now being revived. The Tube are keen to</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p>(Blueprint Studios Ltd) Continued</p> <p>Ian Stewart</p>					<p>being revived. The Tube are keen to make their new home iconic, the reason they have chosen Blueprint is due, not only to our hard work in achieving all the things we have achieved so far, but also because of the way the building looks and feels - for them there isn't another place like this in Manchester/Salford.</p> <p>The Future We predict exciting times ahead. It has always been in our plans to start a record label that would also be housed within the building and would be the culmination of everything we have worked for and give a natural extension to the rest of our business whilst creating opportunities for local bands to become signed acts.</p> <p>We think that the plans are promising for this area and we would love to be involved somehow. Your colleagues from CIDS have told us that we are one of the most important local creative businesses in the area and we have only been in business for 4 years. We will always strive to achieve and grow as a business that can only help the surrounding area and new community.</p> <p>In conclusion Elizabeth House is an unquantifiable part of our business and leaving the building is simply not an option. If need be, we will fight hard and long to stay here and as we have demonstrated above we would not be</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p> <p><b>NOTED</b></p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
(Blueprint Studios Ltd) Continued					<p>short of support.</p> <p>I have enclosed pictures showing our building and Big Room, if you would like any further details please do not hesitate to contact me on 0161 817 2525. Please visit our award winning website which has further pictures and information about our business <a href="http://www.blueprint-studios.com">www.blueprint-studios.com</a>.</p>	
GMPTE (Rosemary Olle)	Document	General	Observations		<p>Thank you for your letter of 26 July 2006 inviting comments on the draft Planning Guidance for the Exchange, Greengate. Given the scale of change expected, particularly as much of the proposed development is envisaged to be high-rise and up to 40 storeys high, the effect of generated traffic will be highly significant, and unless a high proportion of the generated trips is made by more sustainable modes, the increase in car traffic will undermine the City's aspiration for environmental improvements. To achieve a significant modal shift to public transport will require significant investment in infrastructure and services, and developer contributions will be crucial, given the current constraints on public funding.</p>	<b>NOTED</b>
GMPTE	Chapter	Planning	Observations		Reference is made, on page 15, to the	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
(Rosemary Olle) Continued		Guidance			<p>possibility of extending the Metro Shuttle to serve the Exchange and whilst this concept is to be welcomed there may well be funding problems unless a substantial contribution from developers is made. Due to the cumulative effect of so much development, it will be essential to have an appropriate policy framework which allows an element of developer contributions to be paid into a fund which can be used to bring about improvements to public transport, and possibly including a further extension to Metro Shuttle.</p> <p>It is noted that one of the key development sites includes the former railway viaduct and adjacent land. Although Network Rail (NR) wishes to dispose of some of this land, some will need to be retained for operational reasons. GMPTE and NR have now agreed how much land is needed for future operational requirements but NR cannot dispose of the surplus land until the Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) has approved it and GMPTE will be consulted on this first. As you are no doubt aware GMPTE is exploring ways of providing a Metrolink route between Cornbrook and Victoria. One of the options under consideration uses Cathedral Approach and part of the viaduct.</p>	<p>Developer contributions towards the cost of extending Metroshuttle will be considered</p> <p><b>NOTED</b> Discussions with GMPTE about use of Cathedral Approach ongoing</p>
GMPTE	Policy	Policy	Support		GMPTE supports Policy EG4 which	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
(Rosemary Olle) Continued		EG4			states that 'a major objective is to encourage a switch to public transport to reduce the impact of the car'. However there are currently no bus services running into the Greengate area: this will need to be addressed and on street bus infrastructure provided. Planned work on a Regional Centre Transport Strategy and a Sustainable Transport Strategy for Salford will ascertain whether or not there is a need for a specific interchange.	Bus services are being looked at in the context of the strategic transport study for the north City Centre (see reference above)
	Chapter	Plans	Observations		Although Plan 10.8 identifies primary pedestrian and cycle routes there are no links shown to Victoria Station or Shudehill bus station, which will be key destinations in public transport terms as they provide access to rail, Metrolink and bus services, including the Metro Shuttle. It is important that improved pedestrian linkages are considered as part of this planning guidance, and in particular that consideration is given to how the remaining railway viaduct can be utilised to assist pedestrian movement to/from Victoria/Shudehill.	<b>ACCEPTED</b> Additional routes and destinations to be indicated
<b>GMPTE</b>	Chapter	Plans	Object		GMPTE is intending to decide on a	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
(Rosemary Olle) Continued					<p>preferred option for a future alignment for Metrolink during October/November and until then will have to object to the proposed development on Site 1, as indicated on plan 10.4.</p> <p>For the same reason GMPTE is unable to release land in its ownership, which was formerly a bus station, and now shown as Public Realm on Plan 10.4, as this may also be required for the Metrolink proposal.</p> <p>In view of the fundamental issues highlighted above, we are keen to pursue the suggestion, made at the Joint Working Group on 9 August to meet with both Salford and Manchester City Councils to discuss transport issues and to work together to identify improvements and priorities. GMPTE would therefore be pleased to meet with you to discuss these wider issues.</p>	<p>Discussions with GMPTE ongoing</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Regular meetings being set up to discuss strategic transport issues (see above)</p>
Euro Car Parks	Document	General	Object		I write on behalf of Euro Car Parks,	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
(John Nicholson King Sturge LLP)					<p>owners and operators of two parking facilities within the study area, to object to the current Planning Guidance for the Exchange, Greengate.</p> <p>As a significant landowner we are very disappointed not to have been directly informed of the consultation process, which we have been made aware of by default. This has led to the current situation where we have seen one of our landholdings proposed as public open space, which has significant consequences in terms of value and development potential.</p> <p>Given the lack of direct notification and inadequate consultation method we have no alternative but to object. We do recognise the desire to deliver regeneration to Greengate, acknowledging its position as an integral part of the regional centre. However, the issues which need to be resolved to bring this forward are complex and the current process is inadequate, in terms of scope and timetable, to enable a proper constructive response to be formulated.</p> <p>Although we currently object, we do look forward to working together with other key stakeholders to deliver a mutually agreeable strategy for the future of Greengate</p>	<p><b>REJECTED</b> Letter <b>was</b> sent to Eurocarparks originally. Subsequent letter sent in response to this comment.</p> <p>Meeting held on 30 October between Eurocarparks and CSURC to discuss the planning issues. No amendment to Planning Guidance is recommended</p>
Ask Property	Document	General	Other		ASK is a long-term investor and	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Developments Ltd. (Michelle Brown)</b>					stakeholder within Salford, working in partnership with the City Council, the Urban Regeneration Company, English Partnerships, Network Rail and other key stakeholders. As a major landowner in the Greengate area, ASK has committed major investment in securing a basis for a major mixed-use regeneration project which will underpin the creation of long-term sustainable business and residential communities. ASK welcomes the production of the Planning Guidance for Exchange Greengate as a means of facilitating and guiding the comprehensive development of the area.	
	Document	General	Other		ASK is committed to delivering a high quality development of the Greengate area to aid and stimulate the regeneration of this part of the city which is currently dominated by vacant and dilapidated buildings. They welcome the production of Planning Guidance for the area to ensure that this strategic site within the city is developed in accordance with the vision of the City Council and other key stakeholders.	<b>NOTED</b>
<b>Ask Property</b>	Chapter	Planning	Observations		Paragraph 3.4 sets out a number of	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Developments Ltd. Continued</b>		and Regeneration			<p>documents that will form part of the City Council's planning policy framework for the city. The Consultation Draft Documents (Planning Obligations and Housing) are at a very early stage of consultation, having been considered by the public until very recently (19 June 2006), and therefore cannot be said to form part of the established planning framework for Exchange Greengate.</p> <p>ASK has previously made formal objections to both the Planning Obligations and Housing Supplementary Planning Documents (a copy of which is attached to this letter) and ask that the City Council consider these objections in the preparation of Planning Guidance for Exchange Greengate.</p>	
<b>Ask Property</b>	Chapter	Planning	Observations		Under paragraph 6.4 entitled	<b>REJECTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Developments Ltd. Continued		Guidance			<p>“Residential Development” the Draft Planning Guidance again refers to the Draft Supplementary Planning Document on Housing stating that “The type, size and tenure of new residential schemes will be in accordance with the city council’s Housing Supplementary Planning Document”. It is premature to refer to this document as adopted policy to be adhered to given that it is at such an early stage in the consultation process and the outcome of that process will not be known for some time. In the interim, proposals should be considered on their merits in line with the adopted policies of the Development Plan.</p>	Housing SPD to be adopted in November 2006 and it will be relevant statutory planning policy to be referred to in this Planning Guidance
	Chapter	Planning Obligations	Observations		<p>Section 8 of the Draft Guidance refers to the City Council’s Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations which, like the Draft Housing Supplementary Planning Document, is at a very early stage in the consultation process. As set out previously, ASK has made formal objections to this Document and request that reference to these Documents be removed from the Exchange Greengate Planning Guidance on the basis that they cannot be relied upon at this stage</p>	<b>REJECTED</b> Planning Obligations SPD to be adopted in December 2006 and it will be relevant statutory planning policy to be referred to in this Planning Guidance
Kay Le	Document	General	Object		We hereby object to contents of the	<b>REJECTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Property Investment Co Ltd (P Jolley)					Exchange, Greengate Planning Guidance Plan July 2006. Relating to land in our ownership in the Greengate/Norton Street and Duke St/Gravel Lane area in relation to proposals to have these areas open green areas rather than built on or used land areas as they are at present.	Meeting to be set up between Kay Le and CSURC to discuss the planning issues
Manchester City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein)	Document	General	Other		As you will be aware, Manchester and Salford City Councils are currently working in partnership to develop a strategy for the Irwell Corridor that is intended to provide a co-ordinated approach to determining future land use and development within the Corridor area. This will ensure that the area is developed in a manner that is complementary to the ongoing renewal of the wider regional centre. Greengate is a key component of the regional centre and the principle of high quality and high density mixed-use development and significant areas of first class public realm around this area is welcomed. However, there are a number of specific comments I wish to make on the following sections of the document.	<b>NOTED</b> Formal response to Manchester City Council comments to be sent to set out how Planning Guidance is/is not to be amended in the light of these comments
Manchester	Chapter	Planning	Observations		Commercial Development (6.7)	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein) Continued</b></p>		<p>Guidance</p>			<p>The guidance assumes that the area can accommodate new commercial development of about 1 million sq.ft. in a mix of floorplate sizes and states that this is not anticipated to directly compete with the traditional business core of the city centre. We need to understand what phasing and delivery assumptions underpin the market capacity analysis and the relationship of those assumptions to the phasing plan agreed on the back of the 'Urban Strategies' work. It is also important for us to understand the target market for the commercial development. It is essential to ensure collectively that sites around the regional centre are not competing with one another, since would only serve to drive down quality standards.</p> <p>Residential Development (6.3-6) The guidance anticipates that the Exchange can accommodate around 2,600 new homes but does not explain how this figure is arrived at. The forthcoming Housing Supplementary Planning Document referred to in the guidance will need to fully take into account and work alongside current Housing Market Renewal initiatives in Manchester, and incorporate the principles of sustainable neighbourhoods through a balance of size, type and tenure in the Exchange area.</p> <p>City Centre Transportation (6.14-15)</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b> Full response to be provided to Manchester on phasing and delivery strategy</p> <p><b>NOTED</b> Full response to be provided to Manchester on residential numbers, size and mix</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>Manchester City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein) Continued</b></p>					<p>The recognition of the need to secure a degree of modal shift towards public transport whilst acknowledging the importance of accessibility by private vehicles is welcomed, but it is unclear how provision of the estimated 3,000 car parking spaces will be phased or distributed around the area (para. 6.15). Clarification is also required regarding links between the estimated levels of parking required and proposed policy EG16, limiting parking to maximum standards in the Replacement UDP. Vehicular access into the Greengate area associated with the high density development proposed will require enhanced access to and from the Inner Relief Route, thereby affecting vehicular access to Deansgate/Victoria Street. The Strategic Traffic Management Plan mentioned in para. 6.14 will therefore require close joint working between the cities. It will have to include agreement on any potential changes to Victoria Street, such as partial or complete closure, and consequential impacts on the surrounding highway network if the proposed new pedestrian/cycle bridge is to achieve the stated aims. With regard to the development of public transport, extensive dialogue with operators is required if the extension of bus routes through the area and into the city centre along Chapel Street and Greengate is to be achieved.</p>	<p><b>NOTED</b>  Agreed with Manchester need for strategic transport discussion to cover issues, including traffic movements and flows, bus and rail provision, car parking and pedestrian and cycling facilities. Meetings commenced, also including CSURC and GMPTE</p>
<p><b>Manchester City Council</b></p>					<p>Urban Form, Density and Massing (6.25.22)</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b></p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p>City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein) Continued</p>					<p>(6.25-32) The principle of promoting high density, city centre-scale development in the Greengate area is welcomed, but it is unclear how the estimated range of building heights have been determined in the various locations described. In particular, reference to the CABI/English Heritage guidelines should be strengthened to ensure that any the development of any tall buildings meet the most stringent tests of quality. Clarification is required of the apparent contradiction of restraining development to a maximum of 6-8 storeys along 16-62 Chapel Street whilst also stating that buildings up to 20 storeys will be acceptable fronting the Greengate Link (para. 6.28). Notwithstanding the separate part of the guidance specifically considering historic environment issues, this section should explicitly state that a key consideration will be the impact of any tall buildings on the Cathedral Conservation Area and the nearby Grade I listed buildings in Manchester city centre, namely the Cathedral and Chetham's School.</p> <p>River Irwell Corridor (6.13) Given the acknowledged importance of the role of the river in potentially providing a link rather than a divide between the two cities, and the current joint work regarding the Irwell City Park 'Living Landmarks' letter, bid, Policy EC</p>	<p>Building heights to be clarified in text and plans</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Statement to be added</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to be added to text and plans</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<p><b>Manchester City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein) Continued</b></p>					<p>'Living Landmarks' lottery bid, Policy EG 3 should include specific reference to the Irwell City Park. This should be supported by plans 10.08 and 10.10 to include the proposed riverside walkway as a primary pedestrian/cycle route and an important element of future public realm.</p> <p>It would also be appropriate to include reference to improving water quality, biodiversity, potential for boat access and links to the River Irk corridor in this section of the guidance.</p> <p>Primary Public Realm (6.53) The Urban Cove is understood to be a critical 'gateway' element in the redevelopment of The Exchange, Greengate, but clarification would be welcomed that the proposed bridge will accommodate cyclists as well as pedestrians.</p> <p>Agreement will be required with the City Council of alterations that may be needed to Victoria Street to ensure that a new bridge in this location realises its potential to provide a high profile link between the existing active core of the city centre and the Greengate area.</p>	<p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Paragraph to be added</p> <p><b>REJECTED</b> Bridge is too narrow to accommodate significant numbers of pedestrians mixed with cyclists. It is intended to look at improving cycling facilities on Victoria Bridge Street</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Improved pedestrian crossing facilities over Victoria Street</p>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Manchester City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein) Continued					<p>city centre and the Greengate area.</p> <p>Secondary Public Realm (6.55) This section and the accompanying Plan 10.10 needs to make reference to the importance of creating active and attractive public spaces and routes along the River Irwell, as proposed in the current 'Living Landmarks' lottery bid.</p> <p>Conservation Area and Listed Building Issues (6.57-62) Clarification is requested on the proposed Cathedral Conservation Area appraisal and management plan, which the guidance states will be produced jointly with Manchester City Council, as this is not a piece of work which the City Council is aware of at present. It would be appropriate for this section of the guidance to draw specific attention to the impact that developments on the west side of the river Irwell will have on the setting of nearby Grade I listed buildings in Manchester, specifically the Cathedral and Chetham's School, and also on Grade II listed buildings such as the former Postal Sorting Office on Mirabel Street.</p>	<p>to be considered</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Reference to be added to text and plans</p> <p><b>NOTED</b> Response to Manchester to discuss process for joint appraisal of Cathedral CA</p> <p><b>ACCEPTED</b> Key Manchester buildings to be added to description.</p>
Manchester City Council					In accordance with the principles of joint working that are reiterated throughout	<b>NOTED</b>

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
City Council (Sir Howard Bernstein) Continued					working that are reiterated throughout the Consultation Draft Planning Guidance, I trust that the above comments will be of assistance to you and that the document will be amended to take the issues raised into account. Further clarity is required on the process of developing phasing, market capacity analysis and transportation issues in the Exchange, Greengate, as well as agreeing the principles contained in the Planning Guidance, and Manchester City Council looks forward to full involvement in this process.	
NW Regional Development Agency (John Litt)	Document	General	Other		The Northwest Regional Development Agency has no specific comments on the Draft Guidance	<b>NOTED</b>
Mrs S Rothwell	Document	General	Other		General Comments - The issuing of Planning Guidance is to be welcomed as an aid to controlling development pressures which are self evident within the area for which the Guidance is intended to cover. However it is questioned why it has been decided now to issue such detailed guidance given that almost the whole of the land to the north of the former railway land has been or is currently being developed. Further it is clear from the planning applications now before the City Council [53597, 53598, 53599] that almost the whole of the land to the south of the railway land, including my client's land, has been the subject of a very prolonged period of consultation between the URC, private	
Mrs S Rothwell						



Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Continued					of the draft Guidance. This is not to say that the proposals are without merit. On the contrary they appear to me to be proposals worthy of positive consideration. What concerns me is that faced with these very detailed proposals and in the light of the comments made above the LPA have closed their minds to other design solutions which might be brought forward for sites within the Guidance area.	
	Chapter	Purpose of this Document	Other		Paragraph 2.7 Given the non statutory nature of this document and the process being followed to adoption it is not clear how it can be incorporated into the Local Development Framework to the clear detriment of landowners, residents and other interested parties in the Guidance Area. It should remain what its title says, Guidance, and the LPA should at all times use it for that purpose only.	
Mrs S Rothwell	Chapter	Planning And Regeneration Context	Other		Paragraph 3.9 As far as I am aware the URC's Regeneration framework has not been the subject of any public consultation or is indeed available to inspect by the public and it is difficult therefore to accept that this document can be considered a material matter in the consideration of planning applications before the LPA. It may well be that I have misunderstood or are not aware of the statutory basis of the URC, which I understand to be a private limited company but compliance to its policies as stated in the Guidance	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Continued					appears to me to give it an authority which I am not aware it possesses.	
	Chapter	The Exchange Document Framework	Other		Paragraph 4.5 I am not aware that any public consultation was carried out prior to the adoption by the City Council of this Development Framework in 2003-2005. Certainly my client as a "key landowner" in Greengate was not made aware that this seminal document was being prepared/approved. It is not clear who instructed etc. Feilden Clegg Bradley Architects in this 2003/2005 work but it is noted that these are the same architects to ASK Property Developments Ltd. and Network Rail in their planning application currently before the Salford City Council as LPA. It would appear from the above that the "key" land owners might well have produced a scheme of development which maximises their land holding, perhaps to the detriment of other land owners? This is not to say that the development is not a satisfactory one from the LPA's perspective rather the close and sustained involvement of the two "key" owners mentioned and over a long period of time, have resulted in development proposals which are detrimental to other land owners here. Assurances are therefore needed from the City Council as LPA that they have not closed their mind to other proposals which may be brought forward for the development of key sites by persons other than the "key" landowners.	
Mrs S Rothwell	Chapter	Planning	Other		Paragraphs 6.20 &6.21. My client owns	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Continued</b>		Guidance			and operates a small business in Chapel St. It is not clear to whom the statements made here are being addressed. My client has been approached on several occasions by one of the “key” landowners although until recent times my client was not aware of the relationship which has now become apparent between the “key” landowners, the URC and the City Council. It is suggested that if the City Council is “concerned” at the position of small businesses then they should more explicitly say they will be involved in relocation/replacement in as transparent a way as possible having regard at all times to its involvement with other landowners “key” or otherwise.	
<b>Mrs S Rothwell</b>	Chapter	Planning Guidance	Other		Paragraph 6.24 This statement is welcomed but appears to be at odds with later statements, particularly in para 6.31. In the absence of more detailed guidance for specific sites within Greengate these statements are somewhat meaningless. Clearly if development of smaller sites can meet the policy objectives in the Area Specific Guidance it is not necessary therefore to insist on comprehensive development. Clearly each development proposal needs to be treated on its merits in accordance with the Design Policies of the Guidance. The development proposals affecting my client’s land and currently the subject of a planning application by a	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Continued					<p>“key” landowner are certainly a comprehensive scheme. However it is also clear that my client’s land is capable of being developed on its own in accordance with the Design policies articulated in the Guidance and should not be precluded because of some desire for a comprehensive approach [which may or may not be commercially viable]. Objection is therefore made to the bald statement in 6.31 and it is suggested that it be reworded to reflect the capability of sites to be developed in their own right so long as design policies are respected.</p>	
	Chapter	Planning Guidance	Other		<p>Paragraph 6.54 The use of Greengate itself south of the railway line here to provide a new area for public realm purposes is an exciting prospect. It is noted that Greengate to its junction with Chapel Street is proposed to be widened notwithstanding that this will have a major impact on the setting of a listed structure namely Greengate Bridge and its eastern side abutments. It is not clear why the alignment of the new building line on the western side of Greengate here has been chosen but to more protect the urban setting of these listed structures here it is suggested that an alignment following more closely the existing street pattern be followed, in accordance with the advice contained in para 6.32 of the Guidance.</p>	
Mrs S Rothwell	Chapter	Implementa	Other		Paragraph 7.5 This requires reference	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
<b>Continued</b>		tion And Monitoring			to timescale for the involvement of the City Council, the transparency by which this will be done and what is meant by "agency". Attempts have been made to acquire lands affected by proposals being made in the Greengate area from persons apparently having information arising from the matters I have referred to elsewhere in this submission.	
<b>Mrs S Rothwell</b>	Document	Conclusion	Other		<p>Conclusion.</p> <p>It is appreciated that the LPA needs to control major developments in its domain.</p> <p>This submission has attempted to explain why my client is seeking to influence the Guidance now belatedly put into the public arena. It is genuinely felt that actions have been taken by the LPA, whether by accident or design, which have resulted in detriment to my client.</p> <p>Clearly positions have been established well before my client had the opportunity, at least since 2003, to influence the LPA which would appear to be to her clear detriment.</p> <p>The LPA is asked to accept the proposed amendments/changes as set out in this submission so that confidence can be given, without detriment to the outcome of the development of Greengate, to the manner in which the City Council is exercising its statutory responsibilities.</p>	

Representor	ID/Type	Heading	Nature of Response	Summary of Response	Response/Representation	City Council Response
Continued					<p>Procedure for approval  Given the several responsibilities of the Salford City Council, statutory or others, in the matter of the development of The Exchange , Greengate I would be most grateful if you would advise me how decisions on responses to the Guidance and on the final document then to be approved will be taken and by whom.</p>	