

Ordsall Riverside Planning Guidance

Consultation Statement

**Salford City Council
Central Salford URC**

July 2008

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Approach to Consultation	4
3	Community Involvement at Pre-Production Stage	6
4	Draft Planning Guidance Consultation	11
5	Responses to Consultation on Draft Planning Guidance	12
	APPENDIX A: First Stakeholder Workshop: Commentary on Discussion Topics	16
	APPENDIX B: Individuals and organisations consulted on the draft guidance	21
	APPENDIX C: Schedule of representations received and council's responses	24

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Salford City Council has adopted Planning Guidance for the Ordsall Riverside area of Central Salford. This document describes the approach taken towards public involvement in the preparation of the draft Planning Guidance, details the consultation responses received and states how they have influenced the final document.
- 1.2 Ordsall Riverside covers an area of 30.6 hectares, forming the strip of land between Ordsall Lane and the River Irwell / Manchester Ship Canal. It extends from Trafford Road in the south west to Regent Road in the north.
- 1.3 Ordsall Riverside is designated as one of the four mixed-use areas in the Regional Centre under policy MX1 of the Salford Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The reasoned justification to this policy states that it is important that the area's transformation into a mixed-use area is gradual and managed and not at the expense of local employment opportunities.
- 1.4 The Planning Guidance has been prepared to guide this transformation and to ensure that development is coherent and sustainable, takes full advantage of the tremendous natural asset that the River Irwell presents and provides long-term benefits to the wider community.
- 1.5 Before work commenced on preparation of the draft Planning Guidance, local stakeholders were engaged in the preparation of a Masterplan for the area, as described in section 3 below. The development of a Masterplan provided an opportunity to set out proposals for comprehensive redevelopment – looking at the proposed distribution of uses across the corridor, the opportunities for the creation of public open space and the enhancement of the riverside walkway and the opportunities to improve connections and the movement network.
- 1.6 Both the consultation exercise carried out during development of the Masterplan and the vision for the corridor it sets out have informed the preparation of the draft Planning Guidance.
- 1.7 The draft Planning Guidance was subject to a further process of consultation, as described at section 4 below.
- 1.8 Comments received regarding the draft Planning Guidance were taken into account in drafting the final version of the Planning Guidance, as described at section 5 below.

2 Approach to Consultation

- 2.1 The Ordsall Riverside Planning Guidance does not form part of Salford's Local Development Framework. Whilst there are therefore no statutory requirements for public involvement during the production of Planning Guidance, the approach used closely paralleled the process for producing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The approach to consultation has therefore been developed with regard to Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Part 5), which establishes the arrangements for public participation in the production of an SPD, and Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks.
- 2.2 The purpose for taking a comprehensive approach to consultation is to engage a wide range of stakeholders in planning for the future of Ordsall Riverside, and to support the weight that can be accorded to the Planning Guidance as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
- 2.3 The approach to consultation described in this Consultation Statement was developed in accordance with Salford's Submission Draft Statement of Community Involvement (subsequently adopted in March 2008). This document has been prepared in accordance with several city-wide plans and strategies dealing with public consultation, including which include Gold Standards IN Community Involvement developed by Partners IN Salford (Salford's Local Strategic Partnership).
- 2.4 The key principles for community involvement identified in Salford's Submission Draft Statement of Community Involvement (and derived from PPS 12) have informed the development of this Consultation Strategy:
- Front loading of involvement – the production of the Planning Guidance, and the Vision for the Masterplan that preceded it, was informed by the extensive consultation and engagement programme that was undertaken as part of the preparation of the Central Salford Vision and Regeneration Framework (see www.centralsalford.com) and also through consultation undertaken on the preparation of the Ordsall Riverside Masterplan.
 - Use of engagement methods that are relevant to the community concerned – the approach to involvement recognises the need to target different groups through means that are appropriate to each. The approach also utilised existing networks as channels for communication, including the Ordsall Community Forum.
 - Continuous involvement – the approach taken built in opportunities for continuing involvement through stakeholders being invited to comment on the Masterplan, and the preparation of the Planning Guidance.
 - Transparency – this Consultation Statement provides transparency through providing certainty about who will be involved in the process, how, and at what point.
 - Accessibility – public consultation on the production of the Planning Guidance will offer everybody access to documents in a format that suits them.

- Planning for involvement – the purpose of preparing this Consultation Statement is to clearly set out the approach to consultation and participation in order to ensure that effective involvement is secured.

3 Community Involvement at Pre-Production Stage

- 3.1 Once the need to prepare Guidance had been established, Salford City Council (jointly with Central Salford Urban Regeneration Company (CSURC)) commissioned the production of a Masterplan for Ordsall Riverside to set out how planning policy objectives for the corridor could be translated into practice. Consultants, Urban Initiatives, were appointed to lead this work.
- 3.2 The Masterplan was developed as an inclusive process with consultation being undertaken with the local community and local stakeholders; those with a development interest in the corridor and statutory consultees.

Ordsall Community Forum

- 3.3 The Ordsall Community Forum is a group of residents, Salford City Council officers and other local stakeholders, such as education and healthcare professionals and Police Community Support Officers. The Forum meets on a six-weekly basis to discuss issues of interest and concern within the neighbourhood. The Forum was consulted at two stages. The first stage was on 23 January 2007 to inform those attending of the masterplanning process and discuss their initial thoughts and priorities. The second stage was six weeks later on the 6 March 2007, where the emerging Masterplan was presented.
- 3.4 At the first Forum meeting, the masterplanning team, Urban Initiatives, made a presentation which described Ordsall Riverside in its context, showing the opportunities and challenges for redevelopment, and presented the initial Vision for the transformation of the corridor. Forum members asked a number of questions and raised several issues which the masterplanning team used in the development of the Masterplan. Issues raised related to:
- **Security:** A concern was raised regarding the current safety of users of the riverside walkway. Street lighting has been smashed along this route. The masterplanning team responded that they would look at this issue and suggested that an approach to tackling this was to ensure the riverside walkway is overlooked by new development and that all public spaces are robustly designed and have a clear function. They suggested that neighbourhood management for Ordsall Riverside would be important.
 - **Design:** A concern was raised that recent development was being built too closely to the river. In addition, that high walls to the riverside walkway and the perceived separation of new development was not creating a safe or pleasant environment. The masterplanning team responded that this issue has been acknowledged and that the masterplan would include design principles to guide the design of new development alongside the riverside walkway.
 - **Ordsall Hall:** A Forum member said that, historically, the grounds of Ordsall Hall banked down to the river, and that being able to see the river from the Hall (and vice versa) would be a positive outcome of the Masterplan. The masterplanning team responded that this option was being considered as part of the public realm proposals.

- St. Clement's Church: A Forum member asked whether the masterplanning process could contribute to raising the visibility of St Clement's Church as attendance at the church was rising after a period of decline. The masterplanning team responded that they had identified this connection as part of the baseline research and a potential 'green finger' on this alignment was being considered as part of the masterplan process.
 - Implementation: A query was raised as to what 'powers' would be available to implement the masterplan proposals and guidelines. A Salford City Council representative explained that the final Masterplan would subsequently be converted into non-statutory Planning Guidance. However, as the city council do not own any land in the corridor, implementation would be dependent on working with landowners and developers in the corridor.
 - Traffic generation: A query was raised as to the impact of new development on traffic flow along Ordsall Lane as congestion is currently a problem. The masterplanning team responded that the trip generation created by development was being analysed as part of the Masterplan process.
- 3.5 At the second Forum meeting, the masterplanning team presented a draft of the Masterplan and described the proposed form and layout of development, based on the creation of three Character Areas, and the public realm and infrastructure elements of the scheme. The Forum supported the Masterplan and thanked Urban Initiatives for their work.

Landowners and Developers

- 3.6 Landowners and developers were invited to participate in the Masterplanning process through 'Stakeholder Workshops'. The first Stakeholder Workshop was held at the Ordsall Neighbourhood Centre, on 7 February 2007, 14:00 to 16:30. The workshop was attended by 23 people, which included developers, landowners, agents, consultants, city council officers and the masterplanning team.
- 3.7 The Workshop introduced the masterplanning process, and discussion centred around a discussion on the Vision promoted for Ordsall Riverside. Following a short introduction by CSURC Chief Executive Chris Farrow, the masterplanning team presented their initial Vision for the area.
- 3.8 Following this presentation, attendees broke into three groups and were invited to discuss a number of key elements of the Vision. This discussion was facilitated by the masterplanning team and comments were recorded.
- 3.9 The discussion topics were:
- (i) Block structure and mix of uses;
 - (ii) Irwell City Park;
 - (iii) Green Fingers;
 - (iv) Ordsall Lane Boulevarding; and
 - (v) Bridge Location

- 3.10 Commentary on each discussion topic is set out in Appendix A. In summary, there was general support for the Masterplan principles, although there was some concern regarding viability. Participants thought that it was important that the riverside walk would be animated. The transformation of the public realm will require more than just tree planting to create the change in image that is required, and a high quality scheme should be produced to ensure this. Other important comments included requests that the arrangements for the maintenance and management of the public realm are put in place at the appropriate point and that security and anti-social behaviour issues are addressed in advance of the redevelopment. Of the two proposed river crossings, the agreed priority is the Cornbrook Bridge rather than the Ordsall Hall 'green link' Bridge.
- 3.11 In terms of the action taken on the consultation responses received, the Masterplan was amended to provide some intensification of development in order to address viability concerns. An additional storey of development was added to the riverfront. Active frontages are promoted on all key routes through the Masterplan area. The public realm elements of the scheme have been given further consideration, the emphasis is on simple but robust design. Clear guidelines have been included for the design of the public realm elements, including the Quayside, green fingers and Ordsall Lane. The second river crossing has been omitted from the Masterplan.
- 3.12 The second Stakeholder Workshop was held at the Ordsall Neighbourhood Centre, on 6 March 2007, 14:00 to 16:30. The workshop was attended by 30 people, which included developers, landowners, agents, consultants, city council officers and the masterplanning team.
- 3.13 This Workshop was held at an appropriate stage in the masterplanning process, following revisions to the Masterplan that had been made based upon discussions with city council and CSURC, and the outcome of the first Workshop.
- 3.14 The second Workshop involved the masterplanning team presenting the revised Masterplan, updating stakeholders on progress and discussion on the emerging Masterplan proposals. The format of the workshop was similar to the first workshop with a presentation by the masterplanning team, followed by discussions around three tables. In this case, discussions were focused on:
- (i) Mix of uses;
 - (ii) Building height; and
 - (iii) Delivery and phasing.
- 3.15 Commentary on each discussion topic is set out in Appendix A. In summary, the revised approach to the location of commercial development, clustering these uses around the northern and southern sections of the corridor (adjacent to existing mixed use areas) and key nodes (such as the Cornbrook Bridge link) was generally supported. There was a desire from participants to promote alternative uses along the waterfront to encourage activity and increase perceived safety. The proposed height and design approach for the central, mainly residential, section of the corridor was considered appropriate,

although some participants called for greater height at the northern and southern ends of the corridor. There was very strong support for the delivery of Cornbrook bridge in an early phase of the redevelopment. Participants felt that it may be difficult to achieve the variety in facade treatment of the Dutch examples presented (Java Island, Borneo and Sporenburg). It was felt that support would be needed from the public sector in regard to the provision of infrastructure. It was generally agreed that the Masterplan promoted a high-quality and attractive approach to the redevelopment of the area and that the production of a Masterplan would help to provide designers and developers with a level of certainty.

- 3.16 In terms of the actions taken in response to the second consultation session, further retail and food and drink uses have been included along the waterfront section of the Masterplan. However this has been limited to locations where there will be the most pedestrian movement, such as at Regent Road and Cornbrook bridge. Detailed guidelines on the set principles for development, including the scale of buildings and the common building line are being included in the Masterplan. The Masterplan will also include detailed guidance on the various public realm elements proposed, including Ordsall Quayside, the green fingers and the public space in front of Ordsall Hall. Cornbrook bridge is clearly supported and the Masterplan will promote it as an early win which should be delivered in an early phase of the redevelopment. The Masterplan will be supported by development appraisals of each site to test the viability of the proposals. In addition, the Masterplan will also include an analysis of potential section 106 contributions (based on the adopted Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document) to ensure that the public realm proposals are broadly deliverable.

One-to-One Stakeholder Consultation

- 3.17 Six one-to-one consultation sessions took place between 14 March and 29 March 2007. The masterplanning team met with landowners and/or developers (and in some cases their consultants) in relation to six sites in the Ordsall Riverside corridor. The format of the meetings was that the masterplanning team would recap on the Vision and draft Masterplan for the corridor, and then present the proposals for the site in question. A discussion then followed where the consultees responded to the proposals and in some cases discussed their proposals for their sites. The notes from these meetings are appended to the Ordsall Riverside Masterplan Report, available from the city council.

Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report.

- 3.18 Comments from Statutory Consultees were invited on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage were approached in accordance with the SEA Regulations. In addition, the Scoping Report was sent to the Government Office for the North West, North West Regional Assembly, Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, Environmental Services Directorate and the Manchester Ship Canal Company.
- 3.19 During the five-week consultation period in December and January 2006, comments were received from English Heritage, Natural England, Salford City

Council and the Environment Agency. Their comments are summarised in the Sustainability Appraisal which was produced alongside the Masterplan document with commentary indicating how the issues raised have been addressed either within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report or within the Masterplan document itself.

4 Draft Planning Guidance Consultation

- 4.1 There was a formal six-week period of consultation on the Draft Planning Guidance, which ran from 25th January 2008 until 4:30pm on 6th March 2008.

Copies Available for Inspection

- 4.2 Copies of the draft Planning Guidance and supporting documents were made available for inspection at the following locations:
- Via the city council's website www.salford.gov.uk/ordsall-riverside
 - At Ordsall Library, Broadwalk, Eccles, Swinton and Walkden Libraries
 - At the main reception, Salford Civic Centre, Chorley Road, Swinton

Making Representations on the Draft Planning Guidance

- 4.3 Anyone with an interest in the regeneration of the Ordsall area was encouraged to comment on the draft Guidance.
- 4.4 Press notice: A statement was published in the Manchester Evening News on the first day of consultation, 25th January 2008, to identify the period of consultation and where the draft Planning Guidance and supporting documents could be viewed.
- 4.1 Letters were sent to a range of individuals and organisations, informing them of the consultation process:
- National, regional and local organisations, listed at appendix B;
 - all individuals and organisations who were involved in the previous masterplan consultation exercise;
 - all businesses trading within the area of the draft Guidance;
 - all residents of properties within and facing the area of the draft Guidance;
 - all individuals and organisations previously requesting to be notified of consultations on policy documents relating to design, housing, employment and the economy, retail and leisure, accessibility, environment, heritage, recreation, development control policies, and Ordsall ward.
- 4.5 Members of the Ordsall Community Forum were advised of the consultation process and a presentation on the draft Guidance was made to the meeting of the Forum on 4th March 2008.
- 4.6 Comments on the Draft Planning Guidance could be made online via Salford City Council's website, via email, by post, by fax or by hand.

5 Responses to Consultation on Draft Planning Guidance

5.1 A total of 21 individuals and organisations submitted representations within the consultation period.

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Representation from</u>	<u>Agent</u>
1	Abstract Nikal Ltd	Drivers Jonas
2	Bellway Ltd	Turley Associates
3	Broughton Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	
4	CABE	
5	Council of British Archaeology NW	
6	Council for the Protection of Rural England, Lancashire Branch	
7	English Heritage	
8	Environment Agency	
9	Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive	
10	Kingsfold Developments Ltd	White Young Green
11	LPC Living Ltd	Armstrong Burton
12	McKelvey, Dr D	
13	Natural England	
14	North West Development Agency	
15	Ordsall Community Forum	
16	Peel Holdings Ltd	
17	Ramblers Association	
18	Ravenblack Developments Ltd	DPP
19	Space Developments Ltd	Drivers Jonas
20	The Theatres Trust	
21	United Utilities	

5.2 A further 3 organisations submitted representations that were received after the consultation period. (The Highways Agency, Red Rose Forest and Sport England).

5.3 Appendix C sets out a detailed schedule of all the representations and the council's responses.

5.4 In summary, the main issues raised through the consultation, and the council's responses, were:

- Widespread support for the overall vision for the future of the Riverside Corridor.

Response: The support for the overall vision is welcomed.

- Concern as to the non-statutory status of the document.

Response: Although they do not form part of the council's local development framework, Planning Guidance documents are an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications and have the advantage of a relatively short preparation timetable. The Guidance is consistent with the statutory development plan and other

relevant planning policy documents and each policy is linked back to a policy in the UDP.

- Objections that the draft did not include guidance on biodiversity issues.

Response: It is not the purpose of the Planning Guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD set out council policy on this issue. Policy ICP 21 of the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance also sets out requirements in respect of biodiversity that apply to this specific waterside area.

- Objections that in view of the long-standing difficulties with TV reception in Ordsall, the draft did not include guidance on telecommunications issues.

Response: Reference to the relevant policies in the Telecommunications SPD added in section 6A.

- Objections that the overall approach, policies and plans in respect of building form and layout were too closely tied to the Masterplan and did not allow potentially acceptable different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan.

Response: It is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of the Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan. Policies have been redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.

- Objections that the relationship with UDP policies and draft policies on employment use were confusing and contain inappropriate duplication.

Response: The purpose of the employment policy is to establish the circumstances in which reuse or redevelopment of employment sites will be considered to contribute to the implementation of the regeneration strategy, for the purposes of UDP Policy E5. Given that the reasoned justification to UDP policy MX 1 state that it is important that the transformation of Ordsall Riverside is gradual and managed, it is entirely appropriate that the policy should set out specific local requirements. However, it is agreed that the draft policy contains unnecessary repetition with policy E 5 and that the clarity of the policy and reasoned justification should be improved.

- Objections that the requirements for provision of family orientated housing are unreasonable.

Response: UDP policy MX1 defines the Ordsall Lane riverside corridor as one of four mixed use areas. MX1/4 is distinguished from the other three as being able to provide a broader mix of housing types. Adopted Housing Planning Guidance also states that residential accommodation developed in the corridor should include a significant proportion of housing. A percentage has been included in the policy to provide guidance on what this proportion should be and to ensure that there is a defined standard on which development proposals can be evaluated.

- Objections that the relationship with adopted Housing Planning Guidance and the draft policy on affordable housing were confusing and contain inappropriate duplication.

Response: Since the consultation draft was published, the council have published a Development Control Implementation Note: Affordable Housing which addresses most of the local issues in the draft policy. Although the inclusion of affordable housing is considered to be of particular local significance in Ordsall Riverside, it is no longer considered necessary to include an affordable housing policy in this document.

- Objections that the minimum width proposed for the riverside walkway is too narrow.

Response: The draft specified minimum width of 4 metres is significantly narrower than shown in the illustrative Masterplan. 4 metres is the preferred minimum width for a shared pedestrian and cycle route and takes no account of other aspirations such as provision of soft landscaping and habitat creation. Policy and reasoned justification amended to encourage provision of a minimum width of 8 metres.

- Objections that the maximum heights specified for development were too low.

Response: The proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. Although it agreed that some greater flexibility to allow designers to develop different design solutions, the principles of the maximum building heights shown in the Masterplan should be maintained.

- Objections that the draft Guidance gives insufficient priority to cycling issues.

Response: Further clarification is included regarding cycle routes.

- Objections that the proposed bridge link to Pomona in Trafford cannot be delivered without either public funding or agreement with the Pomona landowners.

Response: The reasoned justification to the policy presents a robust justification for the need for the bridge, and the benefits accruing from its provision. The general parameters for its location and alignment that would allow those benefits to be realised are set out.

- Objections that proposals requiring the delivery and phasing of employment uses are too restrictive.

Response: The requirement for 50 percent of total floorspace in specified areas to be developed for non-residential uses is considered necessary in order to ensure the maintenance of employment uses within the corridor as it evolves into a mixed use area. However, it is agreed that the policy should allow for lower proportions if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated.

- Objections that the relationship with adopted Planning Obligations SPD and text regarding their application in the Corridor were confusing and contain inappropriate duplication.

Response: It is not the purpose of the Guidance to duplicate the Planning Obligations SPD, but to set out local circumstances in the application of those policies. Planning obligations are essential to deliver the infrastructure required to support the transformation of the corridor and the relevant section is fundamental to the document and ensures that all developers and landowners receive consistent information. However, presentation of the section is amended to improve clarity.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 5.5 In adopting the final draft, the council considered how sustainability issues have been integrated into the document and how the Sustainability Appraisal has been taken into account.
- 5.6 The consultation draft of the Planning Guidance was supported by a Sustainability Appraisal of the original Masterplan. This document has now been amended to relate specifically to the final draft of the Guidance, also incorporating minor changes suggested through consultation. Full details of representations received are included in the schedule at Appendix C.
- 5.7 The appraisal of the consultation draft made no recommendations regarding the content of the Guidance. It is considered that sustainability issues have been adequately addressed. The revised SA is published on the council's website (www.salford.gov.uk/ordsall-riverside).

Equality Impact Assessment

- 5.8 In accordance with the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, a first-stage Equality Impact Assessment was carried out on the draft Planning Guidance. This concluded that a more detailed appraisal was not required, as the proposed policy has no significant differential impact on any group. None of the representations received questioned the content of the Assessment.
- 5.9 The assessment is published on the council's website (www.salford.gov.uk/ordsall-riverside).

APPENDIX A

First Stakeholder Workshop: Commentary on Discussion Topics

(i) Block structure and mix of uses

- With regard to commercial development, participants generally agreed that development should seek to capitalise on the proximity of Manchester city centre and Salford Quays and the potential of mediacity:uk. The promotion of employment/offices along Ordsall Lane (for example, having offices at ground floor level with residential uses above) was supported. The view was put forward that there is a need to focus on delivering a critical mass of employment, rather than spreading it equally across areas which largely comprise residential development.
- There was a question raised about how the proposed land uses in the Masterplan, particularly the local retail provision proposed on the Cornbrook link, relate to the existing and proposed uses in Ordsall to the west and Pomona/Trafford to the east, particularly in regard to retail uses, as there is a proposed retail centre at Phoebe Street/Trafford Road.
- There was a concern about the viability of schemes, considering the mix of commercial uses, family housing, affordable homes required, in addition to the likely contributions required towards green spaces, public realm, bridges and other section 106 requirements. This was related to a general concern about how the bridges and the management and maintenance of open spaces would be funded.
- Participants were generally supportive of the opportunity to create an attractive and high quality waterfront. The straight (central block) frontage to river was supported, although it was acknowledged that the potential land-take required by the proposals for the creation of public realm along the riverfront, the green fingers and the green space in front of Ordsall Hall would significantly reduce plot size (minimum 14/15 metre set back).
- Active ground floor uses were perceived positively, particularly around the proposed Cornbrook bridge. However, other participants had a concern that that central section would be 'dead', with interest polarised at the ends of the corridor.
- The height of development on Ordsall Lane of four to five storeys was supported by some participants, however, others expressed a view that the riverfront can take a greater height of 10 – 12 storeys. The concept of having taller buildings within the two ends of the corridor was generally supported.
- There was a concern about the transition period of redevelopment and how criminal activities may impact on the attractiveness of development schemes (for example, currently high fences are seen as a necessary means to protect development).

(ii) Irwell City Park

- There was a general consensus that the wider green strip along the riverfront is a strong idea and that people feel this is an attractive way of delivering Irwell City Park in this area. However, there was a concern over how this can be delivered.

- Participant's accepted that the intention should be to create a continuous, accessible walkway from Salford Quays to The Meadows, linking a series of activity nodes and punctuated by open spaces. A question was raised about who will use the space. It was agreed that variety and activity are key – how to animate: why would people use riverside route?
- Other issues that were raised include how to ensure that the public realm is properly designed and managed and how can security be improved at night.
- It is clear that there is a balance required between the benefits of the Park and costs and sites required from developers. There was concern about the fact that the establishment of green strip will 'eat into sites' – the requirements should be reasonable. The view was also put forward that the green fingers offer a choice of route through the area – both along the riverbank and through the development blocks (i.e. by establishing green fingers).

(iii) Green Fingers

- In principle, it was agreed that green fingers were a good idea, yet there was a general concern about the potential inefficient use of land. Associated with this, a concern was raised that loss of development land on green fingers as well as at the riverfront may reduce the viability of development schemes.
- It was felt that the 'devil is in the detail': the success of the public realm would depend on concerns regarding security, anti social behaviour and maintenance being resolved. There was a view that 'green fingers' should be kept green and that the design of green fingers should link into the boulevarding of Ordsall Lane
- Apart from the opportunity at Ordsall Hall, locating green fingers on existing roads and/or links was broadly supported.
- In terms of the wide green finger opposite Ordsall Hall, there was a query about how this space would be used and a suggestion that the current scheme for the improvement of Ordsall Hall grounds should be incorporated on the plans. It was suggested that a narrower green space in front of Ordsall Hall (on the site currently occupied by Vanguard) would more effectively frame the façade of Ordsall Hall. (NB: The early Masterplan drawing showed this green finger being the width of the grounds of Ordsall Hall, rather than just the façade. The Masterplan was revised following feedback received during consultation)
- There was a query regarding the option with the second bridge and the potential negative impact on views of Ordsall Hall. (NB: The initial options for the Masterplan included a second bridge from Pomona to Ordsall Hall, this was later discounted as a result of the consultation undertaken).
- There was a query about what the nature of 'green ribbon' from the opposite bank of the riverside past Ordsall Hall to Ordsall Park was. (NB: This early Masterplan concept was later discounted as a result of the consultation undertaken)
- A view was put forward that there should be some variety in the block structures and building line, rather than a linear approach being adopted.

(iv) Ordsall Lane Boulevarding

- There was general agreement on the benefits of a better and consistent layout

for development fronting Ordsall Lane, with tree-planting, overlooking and active frontages. However, currently, there is a need for fencing for security reasons, and there is a concern about the security of new uses aiming to establish active frontages on Ordsall Lane.

- In terms of strategic issues, it was questioned whether Ordsall Lane should remain designated as a heavy vehicle route. In addition, it was generally agreed that the traffic capacity of the Lane should be investigated alongside the traffic-generating capacity of new development. The view that Ordsall residents have a desire for the Lane to be calmed was put forward.

- In terms of the design for Ordsall Lane, it was recognised that simply planting lines of trees won't be sufficient to secure the change in image required. A view was put forward that artificial curves should not be introduced to control traffic speed/flows; in addition, the need to provide on-street car parking on Ordsall Lane was questioned.

- Whilst several people supported the idea of a consistent building line along Ordsall Lane, the view was put forward that introducing a variety of building lines and providing a variable width of footway would add interest to the route. Stretford Road was put forward as a useful model of the former.

- In addition, it was noted that opening up green fingers to give access to the riverside provides additional space for car parking and trees to be planted. This will further contribute to changing the character of Ordsall Lane. There was general agreement that there is a need to ensure strong crossing points at key nodes and the bridge link to encourage walking and (eventually) use of the Metrolink network. It was also suggested that there should be better bus stop facilities, and that this could be provided on build-outs into Ordsall Lane.

(v) Bridge Location

- There was a general consensus that it would be significant benefits in bridging over the Manchester Ship Canal and creating an access to Cornbrook station and the Metrolink network. Two locations were put forward by the masterplanners – one linking to Cornbrook Metrolink station based on the main east-west route through the Ordsall community and one located opposite Ordsall Hall, based on the concept of linking a chain of green spaces in the area. The locations for bridges chosen were supported, however, it was agreed on all three tables that the Cornbrook bridge was the priority. It was also suggested that the improvement of the existing Woden Street Bridge was more important than implementing the second 'green bridge'.

- There was a general concern about the potential cost of the bridge and who would fund it. There was a discussion about whether it could be funded by the Lottery as part of Irwell City Park. It was suggested that the viability of development may be an issue if developers were required to fund the bridge through section 106 contributions.

- In terms of the design of the bridge, questions were put forward about what the design and clearance constraints for surrounding development would be, particularly in relation to the open space proposed in front of Ordsall Hall. It was generally agreed that the bridge should be delivered alongside the proposed development in the corridor – for the benefit of both residents and developers.

Second Stakeholder Workshop: Commentary on Discussion Topics

(i) Mix of uses

- The overall concept of the south and north parts of the corridor being developed for a broad mix of uses relating to Salford Quays and Manchester City Centre, and the central area being an extension of the Ordsall residential area, extending it to meet the river, was broadly supported, however, there was still a concern that the central area may be 'dead' in the daytime. It was put forward that the tenure and size of properties, the occupant mix, implementing street-friendly design and promoting residential amenity and quality public realm are all important factors in ensuring activity and interaction in the central part of the corridor.
- It was agreed that proposing commercial space where there would be the greatest footfall and public transport accessibility makes good sense. As a development on the previously presented Masterplan, clustering small businesses in hubs, as described above, was supported by most attendees as businesses prefer this to being located in a linear arrangement. However, one participant put forward the view that there were too many uses proposed on individual sites.
- Ordsall Riverside was suggested to be a good location for small businesses, as the corridor is close to the Regional Centre (where there is little provision of this type) and has good transport linkages. In addition, another participant said that small businesses help to enliven street scene and can thrive in locations with lower residential values. However, the inclusion of live-work space was questioned as one participant's experience was that there was actually very little demand for it.
- In terms of retail and food and drink uses, it was questioned whether the Masterplan proposed enough retail space. Another participant put forward a suggestion that additional cafes/bars/restaurants would be desirable at the southern end of the corridor to encourage riverside activity. It was also suggested that there is potential for further retail space adjacent to Woden Street bridge. 'Special uses', where possible, should be introduced to the Quayside to draw people to the area and enliven the space.
- In terms of residential development, it was generally acknowledged by the participants that residential development would drive the redevelopment of the corridor. The main concern of participants related to the inefficient use of plots due to the large land take of the proposed public realm. It was suggested that privacy and amenity standards may be relaxed for new development. However, it was generally acknowledged that the public realm elements of the scheme are important in terms of 'place making'. It was suggested that perhaps blocks sizes could be increased to create larger private communal spaces.
- The appropriateness of including apartments at Exchange Quay and locating townhouses on Ordsall Lane were both questioned. The provision of affordable housing in the corridor was also questioned due to a perception that the Ordsall neighbourhood provides sufficient affordable housing. Although it was also suggested that shared equity properties would be appropriate in the corridor.
- It was acknowledged that the Masterplan cannot over-ride existing policy but that Salford City Council would listen to advice on the application of planning

policies where supplementary guidance/information is available.

(ii) Building Height

- There was general support for the uniform height in the central section of the corridor, as it will give continuity of form. There was a question on one table that a consistent six storeys on riverfront could represent too much uniformity, and that a variation of two stories should be permitted. However, another participant suggested that over shadowing of townhouses by apartments on riverside could be a problem. Generally, the principle of higher buildings along riverfront and lower buildings towards the Ordsall neighbourhood was accepted.
- Participants felt that there was potential for more height around Exchange Quay and in the northern part of the corridor, alongside other taller recent development such as St Georges Island. Another participant suggested that there was potential for a 30 storey landmark tower at adjacent to the Exchange Quay public space in the southern part of the corridor.
- High density low rise residential is likely to be a concern for development control in respect of interface distances
- Other comments related to how richness and diversity in building form and materials, as demonstrated by the Dutch example (Java Island), could be encouraged in Ordsall Riverside. Also, what the impact of tall buildings on Pomona, across the Ship Canal would be on development in the corridor.

(iii) Delivery and Phasing

- There were two main concerns relating to delivery and phasing. Firstly, the cost and the mechanism of providing the public realm elements and infrastructure, including the bridge (and what the section 106 requirement would be). Secondly, the viability of development, when the requirements of high quality design and public realm and infrastructure provision had been taken into account.
- It was agreed that the Cornbrook Bridge was a positive element of the scheme and that, if possible, it should be provided in an early phase. Extensive public realm on the Vanguard or Cornbrook bridge site may mean that developers hold back from redevelopment. If only a limited amount of funding was available for the proposed bridge, it was suggested that the existing Woden Street Bridge could be upgraded.
- Questions were raised relating to the mechanism for delivery of the public realm and the difficulty of being the first developer to take forward proposals for a site in the corridor. It was asked whether there would be support from public sector for those taking the risk on making the first step towards delivery. Another participant suggested that a management company was established so that developers can have a stake in the provision of and future maintenance of the public realm.
- It was generally agreed that the Masterplan promoted a high-quality and attractive approach to the redevelopment of the area and that the production of a Masterplan would help to provide designers and developers with a level of certainty.

APPENDIX B

Individuals and organisations consulted on the draft guidance

1 National/regional Organisations sent copies of the Draft Guidance for consultation

Regional Planning Body	North West Regional Assembly
Adjoining Local Authorities	Manchester City Council Trafford MBC
Natural England	Natural England (NW Region)
The Environment Agency	The Environment Agency
Highways Agency	Highways Agency
The Historic Buildings and Monument Commission for England	English Heritage
Regional Development Agency	North West Development Agency
Any Strategic Health Authority who functions in the area	North West Strategic Health Authority
Any sewage undertaker who functions in the area	United Utilities
Any water undertaker who functions in the area.	United Utilities
Government Departments	Government Office for the North West

2 National/Regional/Local Organisations notified of the Draft Guidance for consultation

Community	M/Cr Diocesan Board For Social Responsibility Jewish Representative Council Of Gtr Manchester Salford Community Network
Economic Development	Central Salford Urban Regeneration Company English Partnerships Greater Manchester Chamber Of Commerce Job Centre Plus Manchester Enterprises University Of Salford Salford Hundred Venture
Environment	Groundwork Manchester Salford Trafford Manchester Friends Of The Earth Sustainability North West
Health	Salford Primary Care Trust
Heritage and design	Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit Manchester Bolton And Bury Canal Society Victorian Society
Housing	Housing Corporation Home Builders Federation Contour Housing Group Ltd Great Places Salix Homes Irwell Valley Housing Association
Members of Parliament	Hazel Blears MP Ian Stewart MP
Natural Environment	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit Forestry Commission NW Lancashire Wildlife Trust Red Rose Forest RSPB The Woodland Trust Salford Ranger Team

National/regional Organisations Cont.

Recreation	Ramblers Association NW Inland Waterways Association Sport England National Playing Fields Association Salford Community Leisure
Transport	GMPTE; Greater Manchester Pedestrians Association; Ramblers Association; Open Spaces Society; Greater Manchester Centre For Voluntary Organisation;
Emergency Services	Greater Manchester Fire And Rescue Greater Manchester Police Force HQ
Utilities	Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority Mobile Operators Association National Grid Property Ltd
Voluntary	Salford Council for Voluntary Services Salford Citizens Advice Bureau

APPENDIX C: Schedule of representations received and council's responses

Paragraph/ Policy/Plan	Respondent No.	Council's Interpretation of Representation	Council's Response	Proposed Changes
General Comments				
General	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Support: Bellway Homes is generally supportive of the principles underlying the planning guidance and its aims and objectives. The value of the River Irwell and the creation of Irwell City Park is recognised.	Support noted	None
General	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Support: Support is given to the need to take a comprehensive approach towards the renewal of Ordsall Riverside as set out in the planning guidance and the related masterplan. This is key to realising the potential of the wider Ordsall neighbourhood. There is a clear risk of piecemeal development. This planning guidance has an important role in providing a robust framework to ensure delivery of the vision.	Support noted	None
General	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Observation: Concern over the informal status of the document as it may not have sufficient weight to achieve its stated aims and objectives, not being part of the LDF. Advice from GoNW is to avoid informal guidance. Should the guidance remain outside the LDF, it will need to be consistent with and cross-referenced to DPDs and SPDs. Although the planning guidance clarifies the status of the Masterplan as an approved regeneration document, there is still potential for conflict to arise between it and the UDP if the guidance remains informal.	Observation noted. Although they do not form part of the council's local development framework, Planning Guidance documents are an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications and have the advantage of a relatively short preparation timetable. The Guidance is consistent with the statutory development plan and other relevant planning policy documents and each policy is linked back to a policy in the UDP. No conflict between the Guidance and other policies is anticipated.	None
General	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Observation: The Environment Agency, even	Observation noted. The Environment Agency's	None

		where they have no planning objection to development, nevertheless advises that development should not take place within a safeguarded eight metre easement of the riverbank without its consent. Agreement needs to be reached with the Agency on this point to give clarity to applicants and allow a common treatment of the issue rather than dealing repeatedly with it on an application-by-application basis.	representation to the planning guidance is summarised in this document. The Environment Agency will continue to give guidance on development proposals on an application-by-application basis in their role as a statutory consultee.	
General	3 (Broughton Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses)	Observation: We represent all the Congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses in the area and are looking for plots of land for new or upgraded facilities for our members. No provision seems to be being made for places of worship and community halls in the regeneration proposals for Ordsall Riverside, particularly in paragraph 5.26 or 5.32 where we might expect such to be included. At this point in time we do not require any new facilities in the Ordsall area.	Policy EHC 3 of the adopted UDP sets out the council's policy in respect of the provision of community facilities. Ordsall Riverside is seen as an integral part of the wider Ordsall neighbourhood and locations for additional community facilities that meet the criteria of policy EHC 3 could be in other parts of the neighbourhood. It is not considered necessary to highlight the need for such provision in this Guidance.	None
General	4 (CABE)	Observation: Design is well established in planning policy and LDFs offer an opportunity to secure high-quality development.	Good urban design is fundamental to the planning guidance document, which is backed up by a robust masterplan.	None
General	4 (CABE)	Observation: Robust design policies should be included within all LDF documents.	The planning guidance has a section dealing with policies on urban design issues and should be read in conjunction with the Design SPD.	None
General	4 (CABE)	Observation: To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good design.	Observation noted.	None
General	4 (CABE)	Observation: Treat design as a cross cutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm.	The planning guidance is backed up by a robust masterplan, which considered these issues in a holistic manner. The planning guidance has also addressed each of these issues as well as regeneration initiatives in the surrounding area.	None
General	4 (CABE)	Observation: Design should reflect an	The planning guidance is firmly embedded in	None

		understanding of local context, character and aspirations.	Ordsall Riverside's local context. It integrates with regeneration initiatives in the surrounding area and positive aspects of local character, such as the riverside and Ordsall Hall, are central to the proposals.	
General	4 (CABE)	Observation: You should include adequate wording or hooks within policies to enable the development of other design tools and mechanisms, such as design guides and site briefs.	It is considered that the policies of this Guidance, coupled with other policies including the UDP and Design SPD provide a robust design context.	None
General	5 (Council of British Archaeology North West Regional Group)	Observation: These documents make numerous references to the area's heritage, but the only specific reference is to Ordsall Hall, where Heritage Lottery funding has recently been obtained to improve the setting of the building.	Observation noted. However, Ordsall Hall is the only significant heritage asset in the vicinity of the planning guidance area. Policy ICP 10 of the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance also sets out requirements for evaluation of the archaeological potential of an individual development site to be carried out and it is not the purpose this the planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents.	None
General	6 (Council for the Protection of Rural England, Lancashire Branch)	Observation: High rise buildings erected in the corridor may result in shadowing effect on the housing on the north side of Ordsall Lane. This will result in higher usage of energy by those residents in order to keep their homes warm and well-lit. This is contrary to the sustainability objectives of reducing contributions to climate change and minimising the use of natural resources.	Observation noted. It is not the purpose of this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. Policy DES 5 of the UDP sets out the council's policies in respect of tall buildings. Tall buildings that would result in unacceptable overshadowing or impact on microclimate would not be permitted under the criteria of that policy.	None
General	6 (Council for the Protection of Rural England, Lancashire Branch)	Observation: Soundproofing is essential for all high rise accommodation and especially for those apartments intended for family living.	Observation noted. This issue is outside the scope of this planning guidance, but is dealt with in Building Regulations.	None
General	6 (Council for the Protection of Rural	Objection: The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD sets out a number of	Objection not accepted. It is not the purpose of this planning guidance to repeat planning policy	None

	England, Lancashire Branch)	requirements for sustainable development in Salford. None of these proposals have been incorporated into the Ordsall Riverside Development Masterplan	guidance contained in other documents. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD is referenced in paragraph 6.30 of the draft Guidance.	
General	7 (English Heritage)	Support: The recognition given in the document to the Grade I listed Ordsall Hall and its setting is welcomed and supported.	Support noted	None
General	9 (Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive)	Observation: The Metrolink service does not provide good connectivity with the rest of Salford, especially to Salford Shopping City. Ordsall Lane is poorly served by bus services, it is considered important that adequate bus links are provided between the area and other parts of the City, for access to healthcare, education, retail and leisure facilities.	Observation noted. The implementation of these measures is outside the scope of this planning guidance.	None
General	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Objection: Proposals for the north-south route are not detailed enough. The Monmouth Park to the riverside green finger should include a cycle lane to connect the north-south route to the riverside area for cyclists.	Objection partly accepted. It is agreed that further clarification is required regarding cycle routes, but it is not considered necessary to provide significantly greater detail of the routes.	Access strategy map redrawn to give greater clarity.
General	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Support: On the whole I strongly support the draft plans. I think that they are a good idea and will greatly enhance the area	Support noted	None
General	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Objection: There is no mention of cycle parking – either internal or external – anywhere in the document. If you haven't got a safe place to park a bike then there is no hope, even with the best cycle routes, of getting people to cycle more.	Objection not accepted. It is not the purpose of this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, referenced in paragraph 6.30 of the draft Guidance, set out council policy on the provision of cycle parking.	None
General	13 (Natural England)	Support: We welcome the production of this Planning Guidance and see this as a valuable opportunity to secure gains for biodiversity, and the natural and built environments.	Support noted	None

General	13 (Natural England)	Observation: All local authorities and other public authorities in England and Wales have a duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. The duty aims to raise the profile and visibility of biodiversity, to clarify existing commitments with regard to biodiversity and to make it a natural and integral part of policy and decision-making.	Observation noted. It is not the purpose this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD referenced in paragraphs 6.22 and 6.30 of the draft Guidance, set out council policy on this issue. Policy ICP 21 of the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance also sets out requirements in respect of biodiversity that apply to this specific waterside area.	None
General	13 (Natural England)	Objection: We consider that although the area covered by the guidance is urban there has been little reference to the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan, particularly in terms of priority habitat and species. There is also no mention of protected species or the geodiversity or biodiversity value of brownfield sites.	It is not the purpose this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD, referenced in paragraph 6.22 of the draft Guidance, sets out council policy on this issue.	None
General	14 (North West Development Agency)	Observation: The NWDA recently commented on draft planning guidance for Irwell City Park, within which the Ordsall Riverside area sits. Whilst paragraph 6.31 says the two documents should be read alongside each other, it is clearly essential that they are mutually consistent and appropriately cross-referenced. Any revisions to the guidance in the light of consultation responses may also need to be incorporated in the Irwell City Park document (and vice-versa).	Observation noted. This Planning Guidance has been drafted to be read in conjunction with the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance and other documents.	Minor amendments to reflect changes between consultation draft and final versions of other documents..
General	14 (North West Development Agency)	Observation: The NWDA notes that this is a non-statutory planning document and, as such, it will not form part of Salford's Local Development Framework. We have previously expressed concern about the weight that can be attributed to such documents in determining planning	Observation noted. Although they do not form part of the council's local development framework, Planning Guidance documents are an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications and have the advantage of a relatively short preparation	None

		applications. Paragraph 6.9 of the consultation draft PPS12 published as part of DCLG's consultation on Streamlining LDFs) should be noted.	timetable. The Guidance is consistent with the statutory development plan and other relevant planning policy documents and each policy is linked back to a policy in the UDP. No conflict between the Guidance and other policies is anticipated.	
General	Highways Agency	Observation: The production of a masterplan for this area is supported by the Agency. However, given the scale of redevelopment envisaged, and its potential impact, it is essential that a Transport Assessment covering the masterplan area is produced. A combined assessment of the wider central Salford area would be prudent.	Observation noted.. The city council and Central Salford URC are assessing the evolving transport movement patterns across Central Salford as a whole and this work is best placed to make recommendations on how these movements can be managed in a sustainable manner.	None
General	Red Rose Forest	Support: We welcome this planning guidance in general terms as making a major contribution to regeneration within the Forest area. This is in accord with the objectives and priorities of Red Rose Forest and with 'England's Trees, Woodlands and Forests', the Forestry Commission Strategy for England.	Support noted	None
General	Red Rose Forest	Observation: We would welcome specific reference to the enhancement of the area's Green Infrastructure in line with Draft Regional Spatial Strategy policy EM3 on green infrastructure. While this is implicit in many of the proposals we would welcome explicit reference in order to reinforce the growing importance of Green Infrastructure as a planning approach.	Observation noted. The two requirements of the draft RSS policy EM3 dealing with multi-purpose networks of greenspace and the integration of green infrastructure provision within existing and new development are fully embedded within the planning guidance. Repetition of higher-level policy, particularly at the regional level, has been avoided to ensure the document is concise.	None
General	Sport England	Observation: Sport England have a particular interest in the creation of healthy and liveable neighbourhoods and to this end, we have produced a guide to assist the development of environmental design which encourages physical activity.	Observation noted. The planning guidance is based upon best practice in urban design and the example questions posed in the representation relating to the accessibility, amenity and awareness of leisure and recreation facilities can be satisfactorily answered.	None

General	Sport England	Observation: The introduction of a substantial amount of new residential properties into the area should be accompanied by the provision of adequate opportunities for participation in sport and active recreation.	Observation noted. The Guidance requires the provision of new recreation opportunities through provision of new public open space. The need for other forms of recreation provision outside the plan area falls outside the scope of this document.	None
Section 2: Purpose of Document				
Section 2	1 (Abstract Nikal Ltd)	Support: Overall our clients would like to express their support for the main principles set out within the Planning Guidance, which seeks to transform the riverside area from a derelict and under used semi-industrial corridor into a vibrant, attractive and sustainable mixed-use area.	Support noted	None
Section 2	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold welcome the City Council's vision for this important area of Salford and appreciate that this area requires a comprehensive planning framework to help shape the future development in the area over the next 5 to 20 years. This corridor represents an important employment area for the City that should be maintained.	Support noted	None
Section 2	14 (North West Development Agency)	Support: The Agency is generally supportive of the overall aims and objectives for the area which forms a key link between Salford Quays/mediacity:uk and Manchester city centre.	Support noted	None
Section 2	19 (Space Developments Ltd)	Support: Overall our clients would like to express their support for the main principles set out within the planning guidance, which seeks to transform the riverside area from a derelict and under used semi-industrial corridor into a vibrant, attractive and sustainable mixed-use area.	Support noted	None
Paragraph 2.2	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Support: Support for the objectives set out for the document, including the aim to revitalise the area.	Support noted	None
Section 3: Process for Producing Document				

Section 3	14 (North West Development Agency)	Observation: Chapters 3 and 5 contain references to the masterplanning exercise for Ordsall Riverside. It is mostly referred to in the past tense but somewhat confusingly referred to in the future tense. The document would benefit from a clear and succinct statement which establishes the Masterplan's current status and its relationship to the draft planning guidance.	Observation accepted.	References to the Masterplanning exercise clarified. See also response in relation to chapter 5.
Section 4: Planning and Regeneration Context				
Paragraph 4.14	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Observation: The idea that Irwell City Park is a 'park' needs to be promoted. Being long and thin, it is clearly a park with the potential for active recreation and so is ideal for encouraging walking and cycling.	Observation accepted.	References to the Irwell City Park expanded in reasoned justification to policy OR 3.
Section 5: The Ordsall Riverside Masterplan				
Paragraph 5.23	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Support: Support is particularly given to objectives (a) creation of a residential quarter and (h) provision of a pedestrian bridge.	Support noted	None
Paragraph 5.23	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Objection: Object to objective (d) provision of a limited range of facilities including local shops, bars and leisure opportunities. The provision of addition retail facilities at Ordsall Riverside could compromise the forthcoming application for the relocation of the district centre on the Radclyffe School site in the Ordsall neighbourhood and the redevelopment of the existing district centre site. Sufficient local facilities to meet Ward requirements will be provided in the district centre.	Objection not accepted. Paragraph 6.46 of the draft Guidance is clear that proposals for retail and leisure development will be permitted where they are consistent with the UDP and will be limited to small-scale local-needs provisions. Any proposed development in Ordsall Riverside that would be have unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability of any town or neighbourhood centre, including the planned replacement Ordsall neighbourhood centre would be contrary to policy S 2 of the adopted UDP.	None
Paragraph 5.29	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Support with conditions: The scale of development as outlined at paragraph 5.29, including the inclusion of tall buildings, is	Support noted. Overall building height, scale and massing will be considered in individual planning applications within the context of the planning	None

		supported. Absolute building height, scale and massing should be considered alongside storey height.	guidance.	
Section 5	14 (North West Development Agency)	Observation: Chapters 3 and 5 contain references to the masterplanning exercise for Ordsall Riverside. It is mostly referred to in the past tense but somewhat confusingly referred to in the future tense. The document would benefit from a clear and succinct statement which establishes the Masterplan's current status and its relationship to the draft planning guidance.	Observation accepted.	References to the Masterplanning exercise clarified. Specific section included stating the status of the masterplan and its relationship to the adopted Guidance.
Paragraph 5.30	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We very much welcome bullet points 2 and 3. The green fingers acting as linkages between the Ordsall neighbourhood and the riverside are most important. We feel that the new green linkages together with the improvement to the riverside environment will help to encourage people to take recreational walks. Ordsall Lane will be much improved by becoming tree-lined, and we welcome good pedestrian crossing facilities.	Support noted	None
Section 6: Planning Guidance				
Section 6 Part A	Red Rose Forest	Support: We welcome the references made in the Guidance to the Greenspace Strategy Supplementary Planning Document; the Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document; and the Sustainable Design & Construction Supplementary Planning Document. Taken together, these will ensure that the area's potential for environmental and sustainability improvements is realised.	Support noted	None
Paragraph 6.8	20 (The Theatres Trust)	Support: We support and welcome the mixed-use development policy for the Ordsall Lane Riverside Corridor which is to be developed as a vibrant	Support noted	None

		mixed-use area with a broad range of uses and activities including cultural use.		
Paragraph 6.11	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Objection: Paragraph 6.11 does not mention the potential benefit of using the Riverside area as a commuter and leisure route away from traffic	Objection not accepted. This paragraph accurately quotes existing policy.	None
Paragraph 6.22	8 (Environment Agency)	Observation: It should be emphasised in the planning guidance that PPS 9 now encourages the provision of new nature conservation features beyond the requirements for mitigation or compensation.	Observation partly accepted. It is not the purpose this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD, referenced in paragraph 6.22 of the draft Guidance, sets out council policy on this issue and refers to the requirements of PPS 9. However, this should be emphasised in the summary of that document.	Reference to Nature Conservation and Biodiversity SPD expanded to emphasise the requirements of PPS 9.
Paragraph 6.25	21 (United Utilities)	Observation: The City of Salford Strategic Flood Risk assessment contains very limited information on sewer flooding aspects. United Utilities are responsible for two forms of flood risk, sewer flooding and reservoir inundation. Details of properties at risk from these two sources are not in the public domain as there would be a risk of property blight. Development proposals of 1ha or greater and all proposals for new development located in flood zones 2 and 3 require Flood Risk Assessments and this requires the local authority to consult the Environment Agency. United Utilities would be pleased to inform a Flood Risk Assessment in relation to the two forms of flooding which are our responsibility.	Observations noted. The Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance advises on circumstances when United Utilities should be consulted on planning applications.	None
Paragraph 6.25 and 6.26	8 (Environment Agency)	Support with conditions: We are generally in agreement with these paragraphs relating to flood risk and in particular, the suggestion that planning applications should include a flood risk assessment alongside the Ship Canal. However, it	Conditions accepted. The Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance supplements UDP Policy EN19: Flood Risk and Surface Water which requires flood risk assessments to accompany development proposals considered	Reference to the provisions of the Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance

		would be preferable if this were a requirement rather than "strongly recommended".	likely to be at risk of flooding or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The current version of this Guidance, adopted July 2008, includes a requirement for flood risk assessments to be carried out for new development in this area.	updated.
Paragraph 6.30	21 (United Utilities)	Observation: United Utilities recognises that there is a lot of interest in grey water recycling and/or rainwater harvesting. However, a lot of research studies have been undertaken, which have demonstrated that they are currently expensive to install and to maintain, often use significant amounts of energy (increasing carbon emissions) and have public health concerns. Therefore, before seeking to require developers to implement these systems, you should be aware that acceptable and sustainable use of such systems has not been proved and so United Utilities cannot endorse their use at present. United Utilities request that you pay very close attention to building design to conserve potable water. This could include water saving devices such as low volume taps, low volume showerheads, dual flush toilets, save-a-flush devices, water efficient washing machines and dishwashers.	Observations noted. It is not the purpose of this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD, referenced in paragraph 6.30 of the draft Guidance, sets out council policy on minimising water consumption and the speed of quantity of surface water runoff.	None
Section 6 Part A	15 (Ordsall Community Forum)	Proposal: In view of the long-standing difficulties with TV reception in Ordsall, the document should draw developers' attention to existing policy requiring proposals for tall buildings to be accompanied by TV reception impact assessments and mitigation schemes.	Accepted. The adopted Telecommunications SPD requires developers to mitigate the impact of new development on TV reception.	Reference to Telecommunication s SPD added in section 6A.
Section 6 Part B	Red Rose Forest	Observation: We would be particularly interested to see some reference made to the role of green infrastructure for managing temperature and flood risk – for example, the section 'Urban Form and	Observation not accepted. It is not the purpose this the planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD,	Reference to Sustainable Design and Construction SPD expanded.

		Building Layout' could include reference to the use of porous surfaces for paths and car parking or green roofs on commercial buildings, all of which can slow/reduce runoff and cool through evaporation.	referenced in paragraph 6.30 of the draft Guidance, sets out council policy on minimising the speed of quantity of surface water runoff.	
Policy 1: Employment Uses	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Objection: There is potential for policy conflict between UDP policy E5 and policy 1 of the guidance as applicants are expected to demonstrate compliance with both policies. Policy 1 has unnecessary repetition and is seemingly more onerous than UDP policy E5, requiring applicants to additionally demonstrate that all reasonable steps have been taken to relocate existing businesses. Masterplan-compliant development which therefore accords with an approved regeneration strategy would be permissible in any event (i.e. without satisfying this criteria. There is no development plan basis for this additional criterion	Objection partly accepted. The purpose of policy OR 1 is to establish the circumstances in which reuse or redevelopment of employment sites will be considered to contribute to the implementation of the regeneration strategy, for the purposes of UDP Policy E5 (criterion 2c). Given that the reasoned justification to UDP policy MX 1 state that it is important that the transformation of Ordsall Riverside is gradual and managed, it is entirely appropriate that the policy should set out specific local requirements. The requirement to relocate existing local businesses is considered to be appropriate and reasonable. However, it is agreed that the draft policy contains unnecessary repetition with policy E 5 and that the clarity of the policy and reasoned justification should be improved. Cross-references to draft policies OR 12, 13 and 14 are also to be replaced by consolidation of all employment-related requirements into this policy.	Policy revised to improve clarity and remove repetition with UDP policy E 5.
Policy 1: Employment Uses	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Objection: The river corridor offers an attractive environment for food, drink and leisure uses and these facilities are necessary to serve the large residential and working population anticipated. The retail offer in the surrounding Ordsall neighbourhood is very limited. The guidance should contain appropriately worded informal policy that enables applications to proceed with	Objection not accepted. It is agreed that retail provision in the Ordsall neighbourhood is currently inadequate to meet the needs of the growing community in the area. However, Ordsall Riverside is not an appropriate location to meet the needs of the majority of residents in the wider neighbourhood. The council is currently pursuing plans to replace the existing	None

		confidence and not risk being in conflict with PPS6.	Ordsall neighbourhood centre with a new centre close to Trafford Road, a location convenient for the largest number of residents. Any proposed development on Ordsall Riverside that would be have unacceptable impact on the vitality and viability of any town or neighbourhood centre, including the planned replacement Ordsall neighbourhood centre would be contrary to policy S 2 of the adopted UDP.	
Policy 1: Employment Uses	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 1	Support noted	None
Policy 1: Employment Uses	14 (North West Development Agency)	Support: In particular we welcome the intention to retain employment uses as part of the mix of uses within the area.	Support noted	
Policy 1: Employment Uses	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support with conditions: Ravenblack supports policy 1 and the emphasis given to the continued reuse of employment sites or buildings for redevelopment. However, part 1, as worded, needs all applications to justify relocation of existing businesses, when this is only necessary where a property for redevelopment is both occupied and the existing user is being forced out or into closure.	Conditions accepted.	Policy amended to relate specifically to sites currently or last in employment use.
Policy 2: Housing Types	1 (Abstract Nikal Ltd)	Support with conditions: It is recognised that new residential developments should cater for a full range of needs, and should not be unduly dominated by a certain type of dwelling. With regard to the provision of family orientated dwellings within the Ordsall Riverside Corridor we would suggest that the wording of this policy reflects the acknowledgement within paragraph 6.54 of the reason justification, namely that it is recognised that not every site will be suited to the	Conditions partly accepted. Although the Riverside Living Area is seen as the most appropriate area for family housing, it is not accepted that all sites in the Regent Road Quarter and Exchange Quay areas are entirely unsuitable for such accommodation. However, it is agreed that the policy should be redrafted to give greater clarity as to how the policy will be applied.	Policy redrafted.

		development of family orientated dwellings, particularly within the Revitalised Exchange Quay character area. It is anticipated that the delivery of family orientated dwellings so close to Exchange Quay would harm the ability to deliver the commercial aims required of our client's site.		
Policy 2: Housing Types	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 2	Support noted	None
Policy 2: Housing Types	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Observation: No objections are raised to this policy. A large number of apartments have been provided in the wider Salford Quays area and therefore a greater reliance of family dwellings is required. However this should be assessed on a localised level where for example the adjacent Ordsall estate is characterised by terraced and semi-detached properties where it should be acknowledged that alternative dwelling types can assist in widening housing choice.	Observation noted	None
Policy 2: Housing Types	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Support: I am pleased to see that there is an attempt to get a mix of types of accommodation to ensure that we get a balanced population in the area.	Support noted	None
Policy 2: Housing Types	14 (North West Development Agency)	Support: We welcome the intention to create a balanced mix of residential accommodation, including family housing.	Support noted	
Policy 2: Housing Types	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Ravenblack broadly supports the objectives of delivering family housing within the corridor. However, a 25% area target is considered unreasonable as this relates to the Regent Road Quarter, which is acknowledged as part of the Regional Centre, and already has urban characteristics and density incompatible with delivering a significant percentage of family	Conditions partly accepted. Although the Riverside Living Area is seen as the most appropriate area for family housing, it is not accepted that all sites in the Regent Road Quarter and Exchange Quay areas are entirely unsuitable for such accommodation. However, it is agreed that the policy should be redrafted to give greater clarity as to how the policy will be	Policy redrafted.

		accommodation. Therefore the area target should be scrapped in favour of promotion of the Riverside Living Character Area only.	applied.	
Policy 2: Housing Types	19 (Space Developments Ltd)	Objection: The requirement to deliver a minimum 30% of family orientated accommodation on the site may not be deliverable if the market dictates that this type of accommodation is not commercially viable. This requirement could jeopardise redevelopment of the whole if there was no proven demand for the finished product. We would suggest that this requirement be expressed as a target rather than a prescriptive requirement.	Objections not accepted. UDP policy MX1 defines the Ordsall Lane riverside corridor (MX1/4) as one of four mixed use areas. MX1/4 is distinguished from the other three as being able to provide a broader mix of housing types. This point has been clarified in Housing Planning Guidance (adopted December 2006). Policy HOU1 states that residential accommodation developed in the corridor should include a significant proportion of housing. A percentage has been included in the policy to (i) provide guidance on what this proportion should be and (ii) to ensure that there is a defined standard on which development proposals can be evaluated by development control.	None
Paragraph 6.55	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Objection: Objections are raised in relation to the definition of a family orientated dwelling at paragraph 6.55. The objection relates to the principle of a family unit comprising of three bedrooms or more. A larger two bedroom unit can be classed as suitable for a family where a child occupies the second bedroom. Innovative, larger and more family orientated layouts comprising 2 bedrooms should be classed as family units, particularly for a couple with a younger family.	Objection not accepted. It is agreed that two bedroom dwellings with a good standard of private outdoor amenity space can provide suitable accommodation for many families. However, given the high proportion of small dwellings recently constructed or with planning permission in Central Salford, it is considered appropriate to specify the provision of larger family dwellings as a priority in this area. The council would welcome inclusion of two bedroom family dwellings in this area, but only in addition to the stated minimum proportion of larger dwellings.	None
Paragraph 6.55	L2 (Red Rose Forest)	Support: Inclusion of references to outdoor gardens and roof gardens is welcomed. This policy is in accord with the objectives and priorities of	Support noted	None

		Red Rose Forest and with 'England's Trees, Woodlands and Forests', the Forestry Commission Strategy for England.		
Policy 3: Affordable Housing	1 (Abstract Nikal Ltd)	Support with conditions: Our clients recognise and support the need to deliver affordable housing within the Ordsall Riverside area. The policy, however, should be consistent with both Salford City Council s Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Planning Obligations and Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing (PPS3) which states that local planning authorities will need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any threshold and proportions of affordable housing, including the likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery.	Conditions accepted. Since the consultation draft was published, the council have published a Development Control Implementation Note: Affordable Housing which addresses most of the local issues in the draft policy. Although the inclusion of affordable housing is considered to be of particular local significance in Ordsall Riverside, it is no longer considered necessary to include a policy in this document.	Policy deleted. Text emphasising local importance of affordable housing included in reasoned justification to policy 2.
Policy 3: Affordable Housing	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 3. Kingsfold are aware of the requirement to provide affordable housing within residential development where possible in accordance this draft guidance and UDP policy.	Support noted	None
Policy 3: Affordable Housing	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Affordable housing provision is set out in the adopted UDP, and in the Housing Planning Guidance (adopted 2006). The provision for affordable housing is therefore addressed and controlled through adopted policy, and there is no requirement for duplication. Delete Policy 3 in full.	Objection accepted. Since the consultation draft was published, the council have published a Development Control Implementation Note: Affordable Housing which addresses most of the local issues in the draft policy. Although the inclusion of affordable housing is considered to be of particular local significance in Ordsall Riverside, it is no longer considered necessary to include a policy in this document.	Policy deleted. Text emphasising local importance of affordable housing included in reasoned justification to policy 2.
Policy 3: Affordable Housing	19 (Space Developments Ltd)	Support with conditions: Our clients recognise and support the need to deliver affordable housing within the Ordsall Riverside area. The policy, however, should be consistent with both Salford City Council s Supplementary Planning Document	Conditions accepted. Since the consultation draft was published, the council have published a Development Control Implementation Note: Affordable Housing which addresses most of the local issues in the draft policy. Although the	Policy deleted. Text emphasising local importance of affordable housing included in

		(SPD) on Planning Obligations and Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing (PPS3) which states that local planning authorities will need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any threshold and proportions of affordable housing, including the likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery.	inclusion of affordable housing is considered to be of particular local significance in Ordsall Riverside, it is no longer considered necessary to include a policy in this document.	reasoned justification to policy 2.
Policy 4: Open Space	8 (Environment Agency)	Objection: Recommend that the current minimum width of 4 metres is inadequate to achieve the desired objective within the masterplan and this should be significantly enlarged to accommodate an attractive and useable outdoor space that encourages access and provides the ability to create or extend existing waterside habitats. Any new riverside development should be set back from the river corridor, particularly if it is a high rise development. The Environment Agency would seek the Planning Guidance document for the Ordsall Riverside stipulates a wide buffer between future riparian development and the river, and allows the creation of a much more inviting route way for the Irwell City Park. Therefore we would suggest it is necessary to stipulate a minimum development free amenity/landscaped zone buffer, of 8 to 10m minimum	Objection accepted. The draft specified minimum width of 4 metres is significantly narrower than shown in the illustrative Masterplan. 4 metres is the preferred minimum width for a shared pedestrian and cycle route and takes no account of other aspirations such as provision of soft landscaping and habitat creation.	Policy and reasoned justification amended to require a minimum width of 8 metres
Policy 4: Open Space	8 (Environment Agency)	Observation: The planning guidance should set high design standards from the outset to ensure the Ordsall Riverside development provides a exemplar of good design and sustainable development for future Salford regeneration proposals. Any new riverside development should be set back from the river corridor, particularly if it is a high-rise development. There is significant opportunity in this section to remove past poor	Observation noted. It is considered that the Guidance, read in conjunction with the Design SPD and Irwell City Park Planning Guidance establishes appropriate design standards.	

		riparian development and create a significant new amenity and landscape resource along the river. Where existing poor high walls or development tightly abut the new core riverside route way, these should preferably be removed as part of regeneration, providing a much improved and safer public realm.		
Policy 4: Open Space	8 (Environment Agency)	Proposal: Any car parking provision should not be located adjacent to the new riverside walkway, as this provides a poor safety perception and a loss of continuity along the river corridor.	Partly accepted. It is agreed that, in most cases, provision of car parking adjacent to the river will be unacceptable and it is considered that existing design and secure by design policies will preclude such development. Nevertheless, it is agreed that this should be reinforced by additional text in the site specific policies for the Regent Road and Exchange Quay Character Areas. However, it is considered that the provision of limited riverside parking on Ordsall Quayside, as described in the Guidance, will improve the perception of safety on the Quayside. It will be well integrated into the design of the Quayside and will adversely impact on continuity along the riverside corridor.	Text added to reasoned justifications to Character Area policies.
Policy 4: Open Space	8 (Environment Agency)	Objection: Recommend that priority is given to pedestrians in the public realm zone along the river.	Objection not accepted. It is considered that equal priority should be given to pedestrians and cyclists.	None
Policy 4: Open Space	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 4.	Support noted	None
Policy 4: Open Space	13 (Natural England)	Support: We welcome the links through this guidance with the Irwell City Park. We welcome a commitment for public access to open spaces and the waterfront.	Support noted	None
Policy 4: Open Space	13 (Natural England)	Objection: The new open spaces and linkages to the Irwell City Park would provide opportunities for	Objection partly accepted. Policy ICP 21 of the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance also sets out	References to biodiversity to be

		biodiversity and this should be explored within the guidance. Where landscape schemes are proposed as part of development proposals they too can contribute to biodiversity and networks of linked green spaces. We would welcome coverage of this in the guidance.	requirements in respect of biodiversity and it is not the purpose this the planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. However, it is considered appropriate to reinforce cross-reference to the other Guidance.	added to reasoned justification to policy OR 4.
Policy 4: Open Space	15 (Ordsall Community Forum)	Objection: It was noted that, although the proposed minimum walkway width of 4m would allow sufficient space for cyclists and pedestrians, it would not also allow sufficient room for adequate landscaping, particularly semi-natural riverside planting that would promote biodiversity. The forum considers that the minimum width should be increased.	Objection accepted. The draft specified minimum width of 4 metres is significantly narrower than shown in the illustrative Masterplan. 4 metres is the preferred minimum width for a shared pedestrian and cycle route and takes no account of other aspirations such as provision of soft landscaping and habitat creation.	Policy and reasoned justification amended to require a minimum width of 8 metres
Policy 4: Open Space	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We support this policy. We are particularly pleased to see that a green finger of open space will be provided in front of Ordsall Hall, creating a wide vista, and that it should be overlooked by surrounding development and have active uses fronting onto it.	Support noted	None
Policy 4: Open Space	17 (Ramblers Association)	Observation: We agree that the walkway alongside the River Irwell is a major feature of the public realm and we would like to see it designated as a definitive public right of way. We are pleased to see that the proposed riverside park will include a variety of open space areas of different characters, and we would urge that attention be given to the provision of some semi-natural green space as part of this mix.	Observation not accepted. Policy 17 of the adopted Irwell City Park Planning Guidance confirms that a combined footway and cycleway will be created along the entire riverside route of the Irwell City Park to provide the City Park with full public access all year round and at all times. It is not appropriate for this Guidance to specify whether or not this will be achieved by designation as a definitive right of way.	
Policy 4: Open Space	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: The provision of public space within Ordsall Riverside is supported by Ravenblack as set out in Policy 4.	Support noted	None
Policy 4: Open Space	19 (Space Developments)	Observation: The Guidance subdivides our client's site into two parcels of developable land	Observation noted. It was the intention of paragraph 8.9 to recognise the costs potentially	Section 8 to be redrafted to give

	Ltd)	<p>through the creation of a central Green Finger aligned with St. Clement's Drive. In addition, the widened riverside walkway and proposed secondary vehicular access route as part of Ordsall Quayside further reduces the amount of developable land.</p> <p>The draft guidance anticipates that our client will transfer this land to the Council via a Section 106 agreement, effectively passing on the maintenance and management on to the Council. Our client is concerned that this requirement to dedicate a significant section of their site would affect the viability of their development. They request that any dedication is taken into account when negotiating other planning obligations that may be required.</p>	involved in transferring land to the council.	greater clarity.
Policy 4: Open Space	L2 (Red Rose Forest)	Support: References to the widening of the riverside walkway, the provision of green fingers and the use of street and garden trees. This policy is in accord with the objectives and priorities of Red Rose Forest and with 'England's Trees, Woodlands and Forests', the Forestry Commission Strategy for England.	Support noted	None
Paragraph 6.66	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We are very pleased to see that attention will be given to creating waterside wildlife habitats. This will enhance the attractiveness of the area for visitors and contribute to increasing biodiversity in Salford.	Support noted	None
Paragraph 6.68	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We welcome more opportunities to access the riverside walkway, which are much needed.	Support noted.	None
Paragraph 6.69	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We agree with the guidance in this paragraph.	Support noted	None
Paragraph	17 (Ramblers	Support: Green fingers will be visually attractive	Support noted	None

6.73	Association)	as well as acting as shade from hot sun in summer and absorbing pollutants from the atmosphere.		
Paragraph 6.77	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Support: Paragraph 6.77 which proposes green fingers is supported. The introduction of an east-west pedestrian/cycle link across Ordsall and the inclusion of a new footbridge to the Metrolink station reinforces the principles of sustainable development outlined in PPS1. It encourages more people to walk or cycle rather than place reliance on the motor vehicle.	Support noted	None
Paragraph 6.81	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We are pleased to see that the route leading to Exchange Quay Metrolink station will be designed to encourage pedestrian access to the water from the Metrolink station.	Support noted.	None
Policy 5: Urban Form	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Developments Ltd support Policy 5.	Support noted	None
Policy 5: Urban Form	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support with conditions: Ravenblack supports the use of strong building lines to reinforce urban form, and the allowance of 'qualified' exceptions. The use of the word "exceptional" should be replaced by "qualified".	Conditions not accepted. It is considered that the phrase "exceptional circumstances" is appropriate and consistent with other policies.	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.
Policy 5: Urban Form	19 (Space Developments Ltd)	Objection: Our client is concerned that this policy is too prescriptive and may restrict innovative approaches to the design process. Whilst we recognise the thorough masterplanning exercise that Urban Initiatives undertook and agree with the principles, we are concerned that this policy seeks to implement the masterplan in a rigid manner and does not allow for design development and evolution of the masterplan.	Objection partly accepted. It is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan.	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.
Policy 6:	10 (Kingsfold	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support	Support noted	None

Active Frontages	Developments Ltd)	Policy 6.		
Policy 6: Active Frontages	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Ravenblack support the introduction of active frontages throughout Ordsall Riverside and the continued development of natural surveillance. Amendments requested to policy 6 wording to reflect requested changes to plan 10.7	Objection accepted.	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.
Policy 7: Building Heights	1 (Abstract Nikal Ltd)	Objection: Our clients support the notion of increased height towards Exchange Quay and agree that development that compromises urban form and legibility is not permitted. However, whilst we do note that the proposed hierarchy may be deviated from in exceptional circumstances, we remain concerned that the policy guidance is too prescriptive on height and may stifle designer's creative ability which may include going taller where this is supported by appropriate townscape justification.	Objection partly accepted. The proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. However, it is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan. However, the proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. Although it agreed that some greater flexibility to allow designers to develop different design solutions, the principles of the maximum building heights shown in the Masterplan should be maintained.	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.
Policy 7: Building Heights	8 (Environment Agency)	Proposal: The Environment Agency would recommend some form of sunlight analysis as part of any riparian development over 5 storeys, to clearly ascertain any shading effect on the adjoining river and amenity area.	Not accepted. It is not the purpose of this planning guidance to repeat planning policy contained in other documents. Policy DES 5 of the UDP sets out the council's policies in respect of tall buildings. Tall buildings that would result	

			in unacceptable overshadowing or impact on microclimate would not be permitted.	
Policy 7: Building Heights	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	<p>Objection: Kingsfold Developments object to Policy 7. The draft policy is too prescriptive and is not fluid enough to respond to changes in local circumstances. The guidance has failed to take into account a number of permitted proposals which are significantly larger in scale than that set out in the draft guidance.</p> <p>The representation suggests that a tall building situated along the riverside edge of the site, adjacent to the recently consented scheme on the Derwent Industrial Area and Slough Industrial Centre would reduce the physical impact of the massing of this scheme.</p>	Objection partly accepted. The proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. However, it is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan. However, the proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. Although it agreed that some greater flexibility to allow designers to develop different design solutions, the principles of the maximum building heights shown in the Masterplan should be maintained.	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.
Policy 7: Building Heights	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	<p>Objection: In relation to land interests along both Woden Street, and Everard Street it is considered that the masterplan building heights unduly restrict development potential.</p>	Objection partly accepted. The proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. It is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan. However, although it agreed that some greater flexibility to allow designers to	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.

			develop different design solutions, the principles of the maximum building heights shown in the Masterplan are considered to be appropriate and justified and no overall increase in building heights is considered acceptable.	
Policy 7: Building Heights	19 (Space Developments Ltd)	Objection: We are concerned that this policy requirement is too prescriptive on height and it may stifle the architectural design process which may evolve to form structures that may reach a height above that which is prescribed in Plan 10.8. Furthermore, where this can be supported by appropriate townscape justification and a thorough evaluation of sunlight, daylight and shadowing effects, we see no reason why a departure from the prescribed heights would only be permissible on demonstrable exceptional circumstances.	Objection partly accepted. The proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. It is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan. However, although it agreed that some greater flexibility to allow designers to develop different design solutions, the principles of the maximum building heights shown in the Masterplan are considered to be appropriate and justified and no overall increase in building heights is considered acceptable.	Policies 5, 6 and 7 redrafted and merged to provide clearer guidance and allow for alternative design solutions.
Policy 8: Key Views	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 8.	Support noted	None
Policy 8: Key Views	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: Ravenblack supports the development of key views throughout the corridor, in particular the importance of views along Woden Street towards the Woden Street Bridge.	Support noted	None
Policy 9: Ordsall Hall	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 9.	Support noted	None
Policy 9: Ordsall Hall	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We agree that the present setting of Ordsall Hall is poor and we are pleased to see this	Support noted	None

		policy designed to improve its setting.		
Policy 9: Ordsall Hall	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: Ordsall Hall is recognised as a landmark building within the corridor and the enhancement of its setting is supported.	Support noted	None
Policy 10: Ordsall Lane	9 (Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive)	Observation: The design and siting of infrastructure for bus operation on Ordsall Lane has the potential to be sympathetic to the policy for environmental treatment of the corridor. However, alongside this, action needs to be taken to ensure that the kerbside parking which currently exists is properly managed to avoid interference with the passage of buses	Observation noted. This is outside the scope of the planning guidance, and will need to be addressed in detailed design.	None
Policy 10: Ordsall Lane	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 10.	Support noted	None
Policy 10: Ordsall Lane	11 (LPC Living Ltd)	Support: The objectives as set out in Policy 10 relating to Ordsall Lane are also supported. The transformation of this area from a highway to an urban street would help increase the level of public amenity and aesthetic visions of the area. This could improve resident's aspirations and opinions of the area and further impact upon the economy.	Support noted	None
Policy 10: Ordsall Lane	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Objection: This does not mention cycling provision, where a cycle lane is clearly marked on the cycle plan for Ordsall	Objection not accepted. The provision of a dedicated cycle route along Ordsall Lane would occupy a significant proportion of the available width and may prejudice the scope to introduce street tree planting. Given that a traffic free cycle route is to be provided along the riverside, it is not considered essential to provide a dedicated route along Ordsall Lane, although the scope for cycle facilities will be reviewed when detailed designs for improvement of the Lane are developed.	None
Policy 10:	18 (Ravenblack	Support: Ravenblack support the transformation	Support noted	None

Ordsall Lane	Developments Ltd)	of this route through active frontages and appropriate boundary treatments.		
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	9 (Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive)	Support with conditions: The PTE supports the intention to provide the additional pedestrian bridge across the river and the link that it will open up to access Cornbrook Metrolink station. However, we note that the success of this route will be dependent upon securing land in Trafford for the bridge landing and a route to the station, including an additional crossing of the Bridgewater Canal	Observation noted.	None
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	14 (North West Development Agency)	Support: We welcome the intention to create a new pedestrian footbridge across the Irwell to link the Ordsall neighbourhood with the Metrolink station at Cornbrook.	Support noted	
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	16 (Peel Holdings Ltd)	Observation: Any bridge link to Cornbrook proposed in the planning guidance should be descriptive and will not seek to be specific on any alignment.	Observation accepted. Paragraph 6.120 states that the precise location of the bridge will be the subject of detailed discussions between the two planning authorities, landowners and prospective developers.	Paragraph 6.120 amended to refer to both the location and alignment of the proposed bridge.
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	16 (Peel Holdings Ltd)	Objection: The planning guidance outlines the desire and principle of achieving a bridge link to the Cornbrook Metrolink station. This can only be on the basis that the inclusion of such a link is appropriate having regard to any development masterplan for Pomona. Therefore if any Pomona masterplan cannot accommodate such a link it will not be appropriate. Any link proposed in the planning guidance should be descriptive and will not seek to be specific on any alignment.	Objection not accepted. The reasoned justification to the policy presents a robust justification for the need for the bridge, and the benefits accruing from its provision. The general parameters for its location and alignment that would allow those benefits to be realised are set out. It is anticipated that development of Pomona would demonstrate good design which, as set out in PPS 1, should address the connections between people and places by considering the needs of people to access jobs and key services, be integrated into the existing urban form and the natural and built	None

			environments and create an environment where everyone can access and benefit from the full range of opportunities available to members of society.	
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	16 (Peel Holdings Ltd)	Objection: The Cornbrook bridge link will not be privately funded and will not seek any contributions from other developments. This statement should be included in the planning guidance.	Objection not accepted. Although it is anticipated that the bridge will be largely or entirely funded through public sector funding this does not rule out contributions from the private sector. Such contributions would be fairly and reasonably related in scale to the proposed development. Section 8 sets out Salford City Council's approach to planning obligations that will be taken in the corridor.	None
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: A bridge here will enable visitors to the area to access the walkway from the Cornbrook Metrolink.	Support noted	None
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: Ravenblack support the development of a new river crossing and linkages this will create.	Support noted	None
Policy 11: Cornbrook Bridge	Highways Agency	Support with conditions: The proposed new bridge to the Metrolink station at Cornbrook is a very welcome proposal. It should be considered a "must do" and be an intrinsic part of the redevelopment of the area. Any Transport Assessments should demonstrate what additional capacity may be needed on the Metrolink.	Not accepted. Implementation of this route will be dependent upon securing land in Trafford for the bridge landing and a route to the station, including an additional crossing of the Bridgewater Canal. Although the council is committed to delivery of the link, it is not considered appropriate or practical to make it a precondition for other elements of redevelopment. Individual Transport Assessments could not assume that access to Metrolink will be available.	None
Paragraph 6.122	17 (Ramblers Association)	Support: We are pleased to note in paragraph 6.122 that development that would adversely affect the ability to deliver this strategic connection will not be permitted	Support noted	None

Policy 12: Exchange Quay Area	1 (Abstract Nikal Ltd)	Support: Our clients support the main principles of mixed-use development within the Revitalised Exchange Quay character area and the identification of offices, hotel and residential, with ancillary retail, as appropriate uses.	Support noted	None
Policy 12: Exchange Quay Area	1 (Abstract Nikal Ltd)	Support with conditions: Our clients cautiously support the requirement for 50 percent of total floorspace of their site to be developed for non-residential uses overall. We are cautious, as this figure does appear prescriptive, particularly as it does not appear to be supported by any clear market evidence that regeneration would be deliverable on that basis. We therefore suggest that this figure be expressed as a target, albeit with the onus on the developer to deliver, unless it can be demonstrated that the overall regeneration for the area would be equally served by an alternative mix. Of most concern to our clients is the requirement that employment space be delivered in the first phase of development of their site. We request that this requirement be removed, particularly in respect of the eastern portion of the site, in order to provide a more flexible and realistic basis for delivering commercially viable regeneration.	Conditions partly accepted. The requirement for 50 percent of total floorspace in specified areas to be developed for non-residential uses is considered necessary in order to ensure the maintenance of employment uses within the corridor as it evolves into a mixed use area. However, it is agreed that the policy should allow for lower proportions if exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. Without a mechanism for ensuring early delivery of new employment uses, there would be a significant risk of an overall loss of employment opportunities; however, it is agreed that alternative ways of providing such reassurance may be appropriate.	Policy requirement consolidated into policy OR 1 for clarity. Provision made for exceptional circumstance when less than 50% employment provision may be acceptable. Provision made for alternative ways of phasing provision of employment floorspace.
Policy 12: Exchange Quay Area	8 (Environment Agency)	Objection: General environmental improvements are too vague and give very little guidance to any prospective developers of what the scheme is trying to achieve along the River Irwell corridor and connecting green fingers.	Objection not accepted. It is considered that the Guidance, read in conjunction with the Design SPD and Irwell City Park Planning Guidance provide appropriate guidance.	None
Policy 12: Exchange Quay Area	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: Ravenblack support the continued development of Exchange Quay and identification of boundaries.	Support noted	None

Policy 13: Riverside Living Character Area	8 (Environment Agency)	Objection: General environmental improvements are too vague and give very little guidance to any prospective developers of what the scheme is trying to achieve along the River Irwell corridor and connecting green fingers.	Objection not accepted. It is considered that the Guidance, read in conjunction with the Design SPD and Irwell City Park Planning Guidance provide appropriate guidance.	None
Policy 13: Riverside Living Character Area	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: Ravenblack support the development of the Riverside Living Character Area and identification of boundaries.	Support noted	None
Policy 13: Riverside Living Character Area	19 (Space Developments Ltd)	Support: Space Developments Ltd fully supports the principle of the Riverside Living character area to be developed primarily for residential use, utilising the unique riverside location for urban living.	Support noted	None
Policy 14: Regent Road Area	8 (Environment Agency)	Objection: General environmental improvements are too vague and give very little guidance to any prospective developers of what the scheme is trying to achieve along the River Irwell corridor and connecting green fingers.	Objection not accepted. It is considered that the Guidance, read in conjunction with the Design SPD and Irwell City Park Planning Guidance provide appropriate guidance.	None
Policy 14: Regent Road Area	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd support Policy 14 and support a landmark building to be provided at the north eastern boundary of the corridor adjacent to Regent Road.	Support noted	None
Policy 14: Regent Road Area	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Ravenblack support the importance of the Regent Road Quarter in extending the Regional Centre. However an additional point should be added to the policy to state that a landmark (taller) building should be provided at the north side of Woden Street at its junction with Ordsall Lane.	Objection not accepted. It is accepted that the junction of Woden Street, an identified Green Finger, and Ordsall Lane could potentially be marked by a distinctive landmark building. However, it is not certain that such a building should necessarily be taller than its neighbours, given the proximity of low rise buildings on the opposite side of Ordsall Lane. The proposed changes to the design policy would allow alternative design solutions to be considered, but	None

			it is not appropriate to highlight this as a required location for a landmark building.	
Section 8: Planning Obligations				
Section 8	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Objection: In a former industrial corridor where intensive land remediation is anticipated, the requirements of paragraph 8.8 of the guidance, requiring that prepared land to be freely transferred to the Council for adoption, together with the payment of standard commuted sums plus an additional contribution to the Quayside improvements, to be extremely onerous. The Council is at considerable risk of jeopardising new investment if the requirement for contributions and planning gain is not applied pragmatically and flexibly.	Objection not accepted. It is considered that the Guidance, read in conjunction with the Design SPD and Irwell City Park Planning Guidance provide appropriate guidance.	None
Section 8	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Proposal: We recommend that the guidance provides some additional detail on how public realm and infrastructure improvements will, or may be funded and implemented in order to demonstrate the achievability of the masterplan, thereby encouraging market interest and greater development confidence and commitment in the area.	The Council is working in partnership with Urban Vision, Central Salford URC and many other partners in the delivery of the public realm and infrastructure improvements. However, it is not considered appropriate to detail these arrangements in the planning guidance document.	None
Section 8	7 (English Heritage)	Proposal: Section 8 covers planning obligations, I suggest that specific reference is made to Ordsall Hall and its setting covering heritage, archaeology and the interpretation of this important historic asset.	Objection not accepted. Although Ordsall Hall is an important historic asset, the purpose of section 8 is to set out the most immediate priorities for how planning obligations can assist in the delivery of the planning guidance.	None
Section 8	9 (Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive)	Proposal: The PTE would wish to see funding contributions towards public transport improvements be included within planning obligations. The PTE's view is that obligations on new development could be pooled and used to facilitate an incremental and co-ordinated	Not accepted. It is not the purpose this planning guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. Policy a 1 of the UDP and the Planning Obligations SPD set out the mechanisms for requiring developers to fund any mitigation measures identified in a transport	None

		development of additional and enhanced public transport services to improve the accessibility and connectivity of the corridor.	assessment and other measures considered necessary to achieve and acceptable level of accessibility.	
Section 8	10 (Kingsfold Developments Ltd)	Support: Kingsfold Development Ltd supports the principle objectives for the securing planning obligations. Kingsfold will where necessary enter into planning obligations which are both relevant and reasonable within the context of the proposed phased masterplan and surrounding infrastructure.	Support noted	None
Section 8	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Support: Ravenblack support the ambition of the draft masterplan to allow contribution to the wider infrastructure either onsite, or through a commuted sum.	Support noted	None
Section 8	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Rather than duplicating matters which are already set out in the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2007) this planning guidance should be consistent and cross-referenced with adopted policy. Chapter 8 should therefore be deleted in its present form and replaced with a simplified text and cross-reference to UDP/SPD policy.	Objection not accepted. It is not the purpose of section 8 to duplicate the Planning Obligations SPD, but to set out local circumstances in the application of those policies. Planning obligations are essential to deliver the infrastructure required to support the transformation of the corridor and this section is fundamental to the document and ensures that all developers and landowners receive consistent information. However, presentation of the section is to be amended to improve clarity.	Section redrafted to improve clarity.
Section 8	L3 (Sport England)	Observation: As part of redevelopment, there could be opportunities for securing planning obligations for leisure and recreation development.	Observation not accepted. Although the adopted Planning Obligations SPD would allow contributions to be sought to fund leisure and recreation facilities, Section 8 of the Guidance identifies other local priorities use of contributions, As planning obligations must be fairly and reasonably related in scale to the proposed development, it is not anticipated that additional funding will be available for such provision.	None

Paragraph 8.9	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Objection: Paragraph 8.9 states that where developers are required to transfer an exceptionally large proportion of their site to the council, a reduction in the standards can be negotiated. If the Council are applying Circular 05/05 guidance appropriately, the above circumstances should never occur, as all contributions should be appropriately related in scale and kind to any proposed development.	Objection partly accepted. It is agreed that all contributions should be appropriately related in scale and kind to any proposed development; the Planning Obligations SPD is consistent with Circular 05/05. The purpose of paragraph 8.9 is to reinforce this very point and clarify its application in the local circumstances of Ordsall Riverside. The wording of the section should be revised to avoid any misinterpretation.	
Section 9: Planning Applications				
Section 9	7 (English Heritage)	Observation: Section 9 of the guidance sets out the documents to accompany all planning applications. In view of the history of Ordsall Hall set out in paragraph 5.1 it may be necessary to undertake more intensive archaeological investigations in this area prior to the grant of planning permission. The GMAU archaeologist should be consulted for the detail of what might be required.	Objection not accepted. It is not appropriate for this document to specify the scope of archaeological investigations.	This section deleted.
Section 9	9 (Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive)	The PTE is encouraged to see that all planning applications for new development will be required to include a Travel Plan. However, these will need to include specific initiatives to encourage sustainable travel and set meaningful and measurable targets for mode share.	Objection not accepted. It is not appropriate for this document to specify the content of travel plans.	This section deleted.
Section 9	13 (Natural England)	Objection: We consider that where appropriate, opportunities for biodiversity, green space and access should be secured by planning obligations (section 106 agreements) to guarantee provision and maintenance.	Objection not accepted. The Planning Obligations SPD sets out council policy on use of such agreements.	This section deleted.
Section 9	13 (Natural England)	Proposal: We would appreciate a commitment to encourage the submission of ecological surveys with development	Not accepted.	This section deleted.

		proposals and the inclusion of this within the guidance.		
Section 9	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: This section should be deleted in full. Salford City Council is due to adopt a 'local list' as part of the national 'validation checklist' on the 7 April 2008. Section 9 is therefore an unnecessary duplication of these provisions, which would be subject to review and future change.	Objection accepted. It is agreed that inclusion of this section is unnecessary duplication of the local validation checklist.	This section deleted.
Section 10: Plans				
Section 10	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Objection: It should be made very clear in section 10 of the guidance that the component drawings are not prescriptive and are intended solely as a guide to be applied flexibly in determining the general form of development in the area.	Objection accepted.	The Masterplan is retained in the Guidance, but identified as being for illustrative purposes.
Section 10	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Objection: There are no plans which show the cycling routes through the area.	Objection accepted. Details of key cycling routes are to be included.	Access strategy map amended to show key cycle routes and linkages
Plan 10.2 Concept Diagram	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Until the construction of the Cornbrook Bridge the Woden Street Bridge will remain a key pedestrian route and linkage with Manchester City Centre. The plan should indicate the junction of Woden Street and Ordsall Lane as a 'node'.	Objection not accepted. This route is relatively indirect and unattractive and not a place where activity and routes are concentrated. However, the importance of the route is recognised by its identification as one of 6 green fingers.	None
Plan 10.3 Masterplan	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: The draft masterplan is too prescriptive in identifying detail. The proposed masterplan should identify indicative areas for development based on the street blocks, rather than indicating specific building plots and housing types.	Objection partly accepted. The Masterplan illustrates a development layout that complies with the policies of this document and demonstrates how these policies achieve a vision for the coherent and comprehensive transformation of the area. However, it is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts from those shown	The Masterplan is retained in the Guidance, but identified as being for illustrative purposes.

			in the Masterplan.	
Plan 10.4 Network of Routes and Spaces	2 (Bellway Ltd)	Support: We welcome the concept of creating a green finger leading to the riverside along Woden Street and also recognise that development along this street will form a key frontage in this area. In order to reanimate Woden Street and improve natural surveillance on this key route and elsewhere, active ground floor uses should be encouraged.	Observation noted	None
Plan 10.4 Network of Routes and Spaces	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: The plan identifies the network of routes around a pre-determined building plot and layout. This approach is similar to Plan 10.3 and is too prescriptive with regards to detailing.	Objection partly accepted. The Ordsall Riverside Masterplan illustrates a fine grain of development based on a layout of tight urban perimeter blocks. Most of the building blocks shown derive from the established grain of the Ordsall neighbourhood with new routes designed as extensions to existing routes within Ordsall. It is therefore considered unlikely that radically different approaches to the layout illustrated in the Masterplan would be acceptable on many sites. However, the Masterplan only illustrates one possible design solution and some variations may be acceptable.	The Masterplan is retained in the Guidance, but identified as being for illustrative purposes. Plan 4 to be merged with Plan 9
Plan 10.5 Ground Floor Uses	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: The ground floor uses proposed do not reflect the character areas as designated in Policy 14. Townhouse uses are more appropriate to the Riverside Living Character Area. Ideally no building types are indicated.	Accepted	Plan deleted
Plan 10.6 Upper Floor Uses	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Map 10.6 Upper Floor Land Uses is confusing in reference to 'townhouses'. It would imply only a 2, or 3-storey building, contradicting As per comment on Map 10.5, ideally no building types are indicated. If upper floor uses are to be indicated, simple reference to 'residential' is	Accepted	Plan deleted

		preferred over ' townhouse' as example.		
Plan 10.7 Key Frontages	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Plan 10.7 should be modified to exclude side streets, with the exception of key routes along Woden Street, from the proposed Cornbrook Bridge and toward Ordsall Hall.	Objection partly accepted. It is agreed that frontages to streets other than key frontages should be shown as indicative locations.	Plan amended
Plan 10.8 Building Heights	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Plan 10.8 should be modified to allow greater flexibility in building heights more appropriate to the development potential and capabilities of sites particularly within the Regent Road Quarter. This should be achieved through determining height parameters for the character areas/ building blocks, rather than individual plots. Uniform and low-scale development around 6+1 storey is considered too conservative for this area, and will potentially fail to capture the development potential and urban character sought.	Objection partly accepted. It is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts and building masses from those shown in the Masterplan. However, the proposed building heights take into account the character and legibility of Ordsall Riverside and respond to the corridor's location within the surrounding area, in particular the more suburban Ordsall neighbourhood. Although it agreed that some greater flexibility to allow designers to develop different design solutions, the principles of the maximum building heights shown in the Masterplan should be maintained.	Plan amended to allow greater freedom for different design solutions, but within the original maximum height parameters.
Plan 10.9 Street Hierachy	9 (Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive)	Observation: Consideration could be given to the highway hierarchy and traffic management in the corridor. For example, Ordsall Lane is being regarded as the primary route between Regent Road and Exchange Quays. It may be that Oldfield Road would be the better north – south primary route, with it's continuation across to the A6 at Chapel Street. This could potentially give the opportunity to reduce the number of traffic movements at the Ordsall Lane/Regent Road junction and thereby improve traffic flow on Regent Road.	Observation noted. This strategic overview of the highway hierarchy and traffic management in Central Salford is being undertaken by the council and Central Salford URC. However, the relative status of Ordsall Lane and Oldfield Road falls outside the remit of this Guidance.	None
Plan 10.9	12 (McKelvey, Dr.,	Objection: The segregation of the main waterside	Objection noted. It is anticipated that vehicular	Plan amended.

Street Hierachy	D.)	through route and the car access in this area is not clear. There should be a clear through route that is not impeded by car access. If cars have any access, even with the most stringent parking regulations, cars will park across a cycle route.	traffic will be segregated from cycle and pedestrian routes throughout the riverside and the revised movement hierarchy plan shows this intention. However, until detailed design work is undertaken, the precise arrangements cannot be confirmed.	
Plan 10.9 Street Hierachy	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: At present the title of this plan creates confusion. For the avoidance of doubt this plan should be amended to read “ Proposed Street Hierarchy For Vehicles”.	Objection accepted.	Plan 4 to be merged with Plan 9, revised and renamed
Plan 10.10	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Observation: The creation of Ordsall Place is supported but it is not clear how this relates to the current plans to build on the plot opposite, where the current LPC sales office is.	Observation noted. The site referred to is outside the area of the Planning Guidance. However, it is considered that the green finger in this location would achieve its objectives whether or not this particular site is developed.	None
Plan 10.10 Public Realm Strategy	12 (McKelvey, Dr., D.)	Observation: I think there also needs to be some clear thinking about this area in terms of cycle access from the east-west route to the riverside area. It should be safe and have priority to allow easy access to the great idea of a cycle friendly bridge across the Irwell.	The creation of a full network of cycle routes in the wider falls outside the scope of this Planning Guidance. However, plans have been included to illustrate key links to the emerging wider network.	Access strategy plan amended.
Plan 10.10 Public Realm Strategy	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: Ordsall Hall is recognised as a landmark building within the corridor and the enhancement of its setting is supported. This plan should reflect changes to the masterplan, in particular changing the prescriptive nature of building plots, detail relating to housing types, and the required alterations to the key frontages plan.	It is accepted that individual development schemes, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts from those shown in the Masterplan.	Detailed development layout labelled as illustrative.
Plan 10.11 Ordsall Quayside Detail	18 (Ravenblack Developments Ltd)	Objection: The plan at present is far too detailed in its approach to development, without due consideration for the delivery of sites as expressed, or factors such as residential amenity value, and private open space. For the avoidance	Objection partly accepted. The main purpose of the plan is to illustrate the setting out line for development frontage to Ordsall Quayside. This is considered to be a critical, specific requirement. However, it is accepted that the	Plan amended to simplify presentation. Although key aspects of the plan

		of doubt the title of this plan should be changed to "Indicative Ordsall Quayside Detail".	layout of individual development schemes set behind this building line, responding to their context, the content of this Planning Guidance and other planning policy, may result in different layouts from those shown in the Masterplan.	showing how Ordsall Quayside is to be laid out are retained, detailed development layout labelled as illustrative.
Appendix A: Key Policies in the Statutory Development Plan				
Appendix A	5 (Council of British Archaeology North West Regional Group)	Observation: We note that the Council's policy CH8 consists of a 'Local List of Buildings, Structures and Features of Architectural, Archaeological or Historic Interest'. We recommend that you contact the Greater Manchester County Archaeologist, Norman Redhead, to ensure that the list in your policy CH8 matches the Manchester Sites and Monuments Record, which you should regard as the definitive record on this subject, and to see if any other buildings, archaeological sites or historic features should be mentioned in your plan.	Observation not accepted. Policy CH8 is an adopted UDP policy; representations are not invited on UDP policies as part of this consultation.	None
Ordsall Riverside Sustainability Appraisal Report				
	6 (Council for the Protection of Rural England, Lancashire Branch)	Objection: The health effects of high rise living merit renewed consideration in this Sustainability Appraisal Report, primarily because they affect the most vulnerable sector of any population – the young and the old. It is important that the provision of affordable housing for families with children and for older people, should not be in high rise flats.	Not accepted. It is outside the remit of the Planning Guidance to determine who will occupy new properties and it is not considered appropriate or practical for such assumptions to be tested in the Sustainability Appraisal.	None
	6 (Council for the Protection of Rural England, Lancashire Branch)	See also other representations and responses listed under General Comments above.		
	8 (Environment	Objection: Whilst we support the preference for	Not accepted: It is not the purpose of this	None

	Agency)	<p>Option 1. The Environment Agency would have the following comments.</p> <p>1. If the Ordsall Riverside scheme is to embrace the principles of sustainable design and construction, the Environment Agency is disappointed that Sustainable Urban Drainage has been dismissed so early in the design process (P12, Sustainability Appraisal).</p> <p>2. Green roofs may also be a viable option to be considered as part of the design process.</p> <p>3. The Environment Agency would recommend that all new residential development aim to achieve a ' Level 4' rating, as part of the code for sustainable homes.</p>	<p>Planning Guidance to repeat planning policy guidance contained in other documents. The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD sets out council policy on minimising water consumption and the speed of quantity of surface water runoff, including SUDS and green roofs. It is not appropriate for the Sustainability Appraisal of this document to address the implications of other policies.</p>	
	13 (Natural England)	<p>Proposal: We are satisfied with the appraisal to date but would welcome reference to PPG17 in Appendix 1.</p>	<p>Proposal accepted</p>	<p>Reference to PPG17 in Appendix 1 to be included in Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>
Ordsall Riverside Masterplan Summary Report				
	6 (Council for the Protection of Rural England, Lancashire Branch)	<p>Objection: The consultation process, described in the Masterplan Summary Report of the Ordsall Riverside development, falls far short of the aspirational ideals set out in the Council's Draft Statement of Community Involvement. In particular residents should be told what is to happen to them whilst the development is taking place and whether housing will be made available for them on the re-developed site.</p>	<p>Objection not accepted. The consultation process, as described in detail in the published Consultation Statement, is considered to be appropriate to the theme of the document and the area of the city covered, in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The corridor largely consists of industrial and warehousing buildings and the only residential accommodation is of modern construction. It is considered unlikely that any resident will be directly affected by redevelopment proposals.</p>	<p>None</p>