

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
British Waterways	Support	Plan 11.5	British Waterways welcomes support for the restoration of the Manchester, Bolton and Bury Canal and improvement of its towpaths within the sections on Middlewood and Chapel Street South. However, the line of the canal is not shown on any of the plans that illustrate the document. The line of the canal should be shown on Plan 11.5 – Physical Constraints as there should be no development on the line of the canal that would prejudice any future restoration.	ACCEPTED Plan to be amended.	Line of Manchester Bolton Bury Canal to be shown on Plan 11.5.
CAMRA	Observations	General	<p>As a Campaign dedicated to Real Ale and the public houses that sell it we would like to submit some comments in response to the above document. Although there are no specific references to particular buildings there are several references to maintaining a good mix of uses (e.g. Items 2.7, 4.6 and 6.9) to provide infrastructure and support facilities which will be required in any development. There are several closed public houses in the area and we feel that some or all of these could be returned to their former use along with maintaining the public houses that are currently still open.</p> <p>The public houses we have identified within the designated areas are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adelphi – ‘Old Pint Pot’ (open). 2. Middlewood – No public houses, although the possibility of a canal side development (item 5.11) would appear attractive. 3. Historic core – ‘Peel Park’ & ‘Dock and Pulpit’ (closed), ‘Church’ & ‘New Oxford’ (open). 4. Chapel Street South – ‘Jollies’, ‘Bell Tower’ & ‘Ye Olde Nelson’ (closed). 5. Central Station Area – ‘Albert Vaults’ (closed), ‘Egerton’ & ‘Mark Addy’ (open). <p>Item 4.4 iii refers to replacing essential facilities which have been lost. It would seem sensible to reinstate purpose built facilities to their former use and the above could provide a variety of the different kinds of public house for the different people the area could attract. For example the ‘Egerton’ is a good example of a working class pub while the ‘New Oxford’ provides a fine selection of beers for a varied clientele and the ‘Mark Addy’ appeals to office workers and a more upmarket customer.</p>	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
CAMRA	Observations	General	We appreciate that there is some deterioration in some of the closed buildings such as ‘Ye Olde Nelson’ which could affect	NOTED Comments noted. For reference,	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			possible future development. 'Ye Olde Nelson' in particular has suffered serious fire damage, although we note that in appendix B a planning application did show retention of this building along with a new build eight storey apartment block. We also believe that this is a listed building although it is not identified as such in Plan 11.8).	Ye Olde Nelson is not a listed building, but is identified as an Unlisted Building of Significance on Salford City Council's Local List of Buildings, Structures and Features of Architectural, Archaeological or Historic Interest.	
CAMRA	Observations	General	We also appreciate that the various (and possibly speculative – 4.4 vi) ownerships of the closed public houses may complicate whatever eventually happens to them but we feel that the right approach for the attractive development of the area would be to try to maintain there use. However the fairly recent reopening of the 'New Oxford' and its increasing popularity (not only locally but nationally) is testament to what can be achieved by the right approach and the right custodians.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
CAMRA	Observations	General	Key views (Policy SC7) notes maintaining existing views along Chapel Street as being of special significance which combined with retaining the sense of a grand Victorian city street (item 5.12) and securing the regeneration of the various designated areas suggests that maintaining the striking buildings (such as the 'Bell Tower', 'Ye Olde Nelson' and the 'Albert Vaults') along Chapel Street would enhance the mixture of old and new buildings that could result from this planning guidance.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
Dandara	Support	General	The Chapel Street corridor provides the arterial route into the City's historic core from the west. The volume of traffic and footfall is clearly significant. In addition, it also happens to facilitate direct access into the other half of the regional centre, Manchester. For far too long, what is an intrinsically attractive built form, and potentially inviting corridor, has suffered physical blight and decaying buildings amongst a number of jewels. The stretch from Oldfield Road to the junction with Trinity Way (southern side) is particularly poor in terms of quality of urban fabric. This is most unfortunate and needs direct intervention. It is therefore essential to seek to reverse the current state of affairs. Whilst the Chapel Street corridor is only a component part to the study area, it is the literal and physical spine upon which to encourage the renaissance of the limbs that are the wider character areas. The planning guidance document is therefore warmly welcomed and supported as a matter of land use and holistic principle.	NOTED Support noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
Dandara	Observations	General	Without seeking to undermine the purpose of the guidance, it is felt that a major opportunity has been missed in the draft in terms of the extent of the study area. Specifically, it is somewhat puzzling as to why the north eastern boundary is drawn where it is. Given the existing Exchange/Greengate study area, which is focused around the north eastern end of Chapel Street, allied to the emerging Salford Central area, we now have a situation where a sizeable "chunk" of the Chapel Street corridor (that part bounded by Trinity Way, Chapel Street, Quay Street, River Irwell and Blackfriars Road) falls between two stools. This area includes our own Chapel Wharf estate, a sizeable and, in our view, key component of the omitted area. This does not make a great deal of sense. It is our firm view that the omitted area should be given the same degree of support and recognition and therefore incorporated into the site boundary. To fail to incorporate the said area would surely be against the grain of the draft guidance in so far as seeking to ensure that the "whole area must come forward in an integrated, coordinated and comprehensive manner" as stipulated at paragraph 1.5 to the consultation draft.	NOT ACCEPTED The existing boundary of the Planning Guidance reflects the geographical area that the city council considers appropriate for the western gateway to the city centre and for comprehensive regeneration to help diversify its economic base and bring in new activity.	None.
Dandara	Observations	General	From a Dandara perspective, it is noted that the Council is explicit in its determination to address previous shortcomings brought about by fragmented ownership. To this end, the Council is further encouraged to reconsider the site boundary and include, inter alia, the Chapel Wharf estate given the clarity over ownership and hence ability to deliver.	NOT ACCEPTED See above.	None.
Dandara	Observations	Paragraph 5.8	Continuing with the same theme, it is noted that five separate character areas have been identified. It is suggested here that the Dandara Chapel Wharf site is worthy of consideration as a key component of a sixth character area within an extended site boundary. The opportunity to discuss with the City a dedicated policy framework for Chapel Wharf is welcomed notwithstanding that the site does benefit from an existing planning permission and first phase Reserved Matters approval. The ability to develop such a framework would enable inherent flexibility, approach and certainty to legislate for, inter alia, changes in market conditions, demand and trend.	NOT ACCEPTED See above.	None.
Dandara	Observations	Policy SC14	The proposed new developments and infrastructure improvements are generally welcomed. The underlying theme of	NOTED Comments noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			<p>reinforcing the importance of the station to the transportation network is particularly important given the station's location and footfall.</p>		
<p>English Cities Fund (ECF)</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>ECF welcomes the introduction of dedicated planning guidance for the Salford Central area. It is of the view that the planning and development issues that affect the area warrant the production of bespoke, dedicated guidance of this nature. The guidance contributes towards the creation of a planning and development framework that has the potential to deliver the comprehensive regeneration of the area it covers. It encourages and will influence the delivery of a number of high quality, coordinated developments and infrastructure and environmental improvements, which collectively will contribute significantly to regenerating the area within which ECF's development agreement applies.</p> <p>ECF is particularly pleased to see that the guidance fully embraces the concept of dealing with the area comprehensively. For too long the area's successful regeneration has been stalled by poor quality, unconnected developments that have occurred piecemeal throughout the area ECF has been brought into regenerate. The area is also affected by a multitude of undeveloped sites and sites that have for too long been used for temporary uses like surface car parking, which does little to contribute to creating a vital and viable urban area.</p> <p>ECF's development agreement requires a substantial portion of its developer's profit to be ploughed back into the area through the cross subsidisation of commercially less viable developments it is required to bring forward. For this reason ECF is pleased that the draft guidance makes it clear that all developments through the area covered by the guidance will be expected to contribute significantly to the delivery of high quality public realm, new and improved infrastructure and other works that collectively will contribute towards regenerating the area.</p> <p>Overall, ECF is pleased that the Council has dedicated time and resources to produce quality planning guidance of this nature, and fully endorses the strategic and comprehensive approach it advocates for bringing about the regeneration of the area. ECF hope that once the guidance is finalised and adopted it will be applied robustly by the Council.</p>	<p>NOTED Support noted.</p>	<p>None.</p>

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
ECF	Support	Policy SC1	ECF supports this policy by reference to the comments we make above because it endorses a comprehensive approach to the regeneration of the area. ECF is particularly pleased that all developers will be required to demonstrate how their proposals would contribute in a positive and pro-active manner to the comprehensive regeneration of the area.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
ECF	Observations	Policy SC2	In time ECF will produce and consult on its own development framework and masterplan as this will be used to support the planning application it intends to make in future for a number of connected developments across part of the area covered by the planning guidance. Accordingly, ECF see merit in CSURC taking the lead in the producing an early development framework and masterplan for the entire area covered by the guidance. It would be useful if this could be at a strategic level so as to create some flexibility for when ECF's evolving proposals for individual sites are worked into a greater state of detail for promotion through its development framework and materplan.	NOTED Support noted. Central Salford URC will lead the preparation of the Development Framework as identified in Policy SC2 of the Guidance.	None.
ECF	Support	Policy SC3	ECF supports this policy and trusts that it will be applied equally and with impartiality when developers promote schemes in Salford Central for the reasons given earlier.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
ECF	Observations	Policy SC5	ECF generally endorses the aspirations of Policy SC5 but would point out that some of the desired transportation improvements are likely to be difficult to deliver in the short term as they are little more than conceptual proposals at this early stage. This should be borne in mind when the planning guidance is being applied, particularly if there is an expectation that some transportation proposals are to be delivered as planning gain through planning applications for specific sites.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
ECF	Support	Policy SC6	ECF generally support this policy and hopes that the work by CSURC in producing a development framework and masterplan will assist in setting building heights precedents which it, and all other developers, will be expected to follow.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
ECF	Observations	Policy SC12	ECF generally support this policy, but wonder whether it should be extended to reflect that striking, contemporary architecture can contrast very well with historic buildings and conservation areas. Accordingly, ECF would ask that the policy be tweaked to reflect that '....quality in-fill development....' Could include buildings	NOT ACCEPTED Policy SC12 as worded encourages striking quality infill development that builds on the quality and character of the	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			whose architecture is contemporary and striking.	area. It is considered that contemporary design falls within the scope of this, and therefore no amendment to the policy is necessary.	
ECF	Observations	Policy SC12	ECF also wonder whether it would be worth confirming that any proposals should be supported by a heritage and conservation appraisal / strategy, as this is something it intends to formulate in support of its proposals as they evolve.	NOT ACCEPTED Heritage and conservation issues will be addressed through the Development Framework, to be prepared in accordance with Policy SC2 of the Guidance. Impact of proposed development schemes on heritage and conservation issues should be addressed in the supporting Planning Statement and Design and Access Statement which accompanies the application.	None.
ECF	Support with conditions	Policy SC13	ECF generally supports this policy but notes that the area can only be dealt with comprehensively if the Islington Estate is included in the evolving development proposals for this part of the area covered by the guidance. In saying this ECF acknowledges that any proposals for the Estate and area around it will need to take account of what residents aspire to in terms of its long term future. Hopefully, consultation on the planning guidance will provide feedback on what this extends to, and can be incorporated in the development framework and masterplan CSURC will produce.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
ECF	Support	Policy SC14	ECF support this policy and feel that it might strengthen its aspirations if the policy confirms the importance of ensuring that all developments here are properly connected and have the potential to link to the heart of the Regional Centre.	ACCEPTED Reasoned Justification to be amended to include reference to encouraging linkages with the heart of the Regional Centre.	Amend Reasoned Justification to refer to encouraging linkages with the heart of the Regional Centre.
ECF	Other	Chapter 8	ECF asks whether consideration could be given to increasing the list of items that contributions will be sought for, so as to reflect that some monies could be used to assist in the implementation of developments that might otherwise be unviable.	NOT ACCEPTED The city council has obtained legal advice on the wording of Section 8 – Planning Obligations	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
				and it is not considered appropriate to amend the Schedule of Appropriate New and / or Upgraded Infrastructure in this way.	
English Heritage	Support	General	English Heritage welcomes the importance placed on the area's historic environment and the role which its protection and enhancement can play in the successful regeneration of the area as a whole. The policies on archaeology and protection of key views are supported.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
English Heritage	Observations	Policy SC6	Policy SC6 deals with building heights, however the meaning of the different formulations of wording is not clear. For example in the Core Area of the Salford Central Station is 15 storeys a minimum requirement with no maximum height, similarly for the adjoining area is 8 storeys a minimum with no maximum, whilst at River Irwell Quays a maximum height of 7 storeys is set.	NOT ACCEPTED Policy wording is considered clear. Purpose of Policy SC6 is to establish guidelines on building heights.	None.
English Heritage	Observations	Policy SC6	The reference to impacts on the conservation area and listed buildings in the last bullet point is supported however for clarity it should also refer to their settings. Reference to the English Heritage / CABE Guidance on Tall Buildings in the reasoned justification is supported.	ACCEPTED Last bullet point to be amended.	Amend last bullet point of Policy SC6 to refer to impacts on the conservation area, listed buildings and their settings.
English Heritage	Observations	Policies SC10 – SC14	The policies for each character area provide further guidance and it would be helpful if the guidance on building heights were also included and expanded upon here.	NOT ACCEPTED The guidelines for building heights is clearly set out in Policy SC6 therefore it is not considered appropriate to repeat these.	None.
English Heritage	Observations	Policy SC14	In particular the suggestion for a tall landmark building in the air space above Salford Central Station. The importance of the historic rail viaducts and bridges in defining the area's sense of place is identified earlier in the report. It will be important for such a development to be informed by a character appraisal of the area and its setting.	NOTED Policy CH2 of the UDP provides protection for the setting of listed buildings and structures, and it is therefore not considered appropriate to duplicate this within this Guidance.	None.
Environment	Observations	Paragraph 6.14	Other core and relevant policies that should be referred to are:	PARTIALLY ACCEPTED	Add Policies EN8 – Nature

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
Agency			ST13, EN8 and EN9.	Within Appendix A, Policy ST13 – Natural Environmental Assets is identified within the list of key policies within the UDP that are supported by this Planning Guidance. Policies EN8 and EN9 will be added to the list at Appendix A.	Conservation Sites of Local Importance and EN9 – Wildlife Corridors to the list of key policies of the Salford UDP identified at Appendix A.
Environment Agency	Support with conditions	Paragraph 6.25	The Environment Agency supports the inclusion of paragraph 6.25 highlighting flood risk and agrees that for the majority of the Salford Central area is in a low risk area. However, we would recommend that the submission of flood risk assessments (where necessary) is included in paragraph 9.1 as a requirement for planning applications. Even within flood zone 1, sites of 1ha or more should be accompanied by a FRA. Applications that require an FRA and do not include this, should not be registered. Implementation of the above may help to prevent the approval of applications contrary to the Environment Agency's advice. This seems to have occurred for the first of the key development sites listed in Appendix B (land west of Damask Ave, Adelphi).	ACCEPTED Additional point to be included within paragraph 9.1 to refer to the need to submit a Flood Risk Assessment where appropriate, in compliance with Policy FRD1 of the Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance.	Include additional point within paragraph 9.1 to refer to the need to submit a Flood Risk Assessment to accompany applications for any development proposals in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, and any operational development proposals of 1ha or above in Flood Risk Zone 1, in order to comply with Policy FRD1 of the Flood Risk and Development Planning Guidance. Additional paragraph 9.3 to be inserted, to refer to the Planning Application Validation List that the city council will shortly adopt which will supercede the list of items identified at paragraph 9.1.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC5	A major aspect in respect to accessibility is to create open and safe public access along the River Irwell corridor as stipulated in the Irwell City Park SPD. Plan 11.6 fails to show new public access along the River Irwell at Adelphi.	ACCEPTED For consistency, Plan 11.6 to be amended.	Plan 11.6 to be amended to show improving connections (public access) alongside the river at Adelphi.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC5	Whilst the Environment Agency welcomes new pedestrian access along the river, we would currently question the need for a new footbridge crossings over the Irwell, when there is currently existing nearby crossings that are presently poorly used and offer opportunity for enhancement i.e., Prince's Bridge, which would also tie into the main link for the new Bolton and Bury Canal. The overall aim should be to minimise disturbance to existing habitats, whilst allowing public access to less sensitive areas.	NOT ACCEPTED The city council has jointly with Manchester City Council and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council prepared Planning Guidance for Irwell City Park to establish the planning framework for the river corridor,	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
				including detailed issues of facilitating riverside public access. This Planning Guidance was subject to public consultation in August to September 2007 and is due to be adopted in March 2008. This issue is addressed within the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.	
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC5	In respect to accessibility the Environment Agency would recommend there adequate provision for safe and convenient access, especially for disabled persons particularly along any new riverside walkway, ensuring compliance with policy A2 of Salford UDP.	NOTED This issue is addressed within the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.	None.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC6	<p>This policy is currently weak and fails to give sufficient emphasis in protecting and enhancing the River Irwell corridor. We would recommend any new riparian development is sensitively designed, and reduces built encroachment of the past. The Environment Agency would request that all re-development along the River Irwell corridor create wide undeveloped margins for landscaping and for new amenity access/riverside walkway. The River Irwell corridor should be seen as excellent riverside development location to which any new residential development should face, avoiding the sharp division between development and river corridor area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Openness should be set as a key attribute for any development alongside the River Irwell. 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 riparian 	NOT ACCEPTED These issues are addressed within the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			development and create a significant new amenity and landscape resource along the river. Therefore a development free amenity/landscaped zone buffer of between 8 to 10m minimum should be stipulated as part of the planning guidance.		
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would seek 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. 	ACCEPTED Additional point to be added to paragraph 9.1.	Include additional point at paragraph 9.1 to identify the need for sunlight analysis work as part of the Design and Access Statement accompanying relevant applications.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC7	The River Irwell corridor is a major greenspace and landscape element in this urban area of Salford, however this has not been picked up as one of the major key views (Plan 11.7)	ACCEPTED Plan 11.7 to be amended.	Plan 11.7 to be amended to identify key views along the River Irwell corridor.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC8	There should be the avoidance of poor design techniques of sighting car parking areas alongside riparian route ways, as this provides poor boundary treatment and security issues for footpath users.	NOTED The Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) identifies the need for riverside routes and public spaces to be well overlooked.	None.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC10	A core principle within this area should be to create a distinctive waterside frontage by providing adequate provision for pedestrian access and greenspace/landscaping. Therefore an easement buffer of between 8 to 10m minimum should be stipulated as part of any new development.	NOT ACCEPTED This issue is addressed within the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.	None.
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC10	<p>General environmental improvements is also too vague. The document should provide some guidance of possible options that should be considered within this environmental improvement theme i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessing the possibility of constructing a new fish pass at Adelphi weir, which is largely impassable for fish and limits 	NOTED These issues are addressed within the adopted Nature Conservation and Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (referred to at	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			<p>the ecological potential of the River Irwell and it's recovering fishery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing existing invasive plant species, • creating a new native landscaped riverside zone with adequate space to allow such landscaping reach maturity without impacting on neighbouring development, • adding new roosting/nesting opportunities for riparian species, • adopting sustainable building techniques for new boundary developments i.e., green roof systems, • creating new safe riparian walkways, accessible to all, along the Irwell • design of sensitive riverside lighting, i.e., directed to where it is needed to avoid light spillage. 	<p>paragraph 6.19) and the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26). It is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.</p>	
Environment Agency	Observations	Policy SC14	<p>Again a core principle within this area should be to create a distinctive waterside frontage by providing adequate provision for pedestrian access and greenspace/landscaping. Therefore an easement buffer of between 8 to 10m minimum should be stipulated as part of any new riparian development.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has already questioned the need for new crossings of the Irwell (SC5), when there is currently existing nearby crossings that are presently poorly used and offer opportunity for enhancement i.e., Prince's Bridge which would also tie into the main link for the new Bolton and Bury Canal.</p>	<p>NOT ACCEPTED These issues are addressed within the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.</p>	None.
Environment Agency	Observations	General	<p>The Environment Agency would expect as part of any regeneration alongside the River Irwell, has high standards in respect to design. Presently the current guidance lacks emphasis or focus in protecting and enhancing such important local environmental asset. We would seek the opening up of access along the River Irwell, especially with the river being identified as wildlife corridor, a Site of Biological Interest (SBI) in parts, and a key asset within the Salford UDP and SPD documents. This section of the River Irwell also forms an integral part of the Irwell Valley Way footpath linking Bacup in the River Irwell's upper tributaries to Manchester City centre.</p>	<p>NOTED These issues are addressed within the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.26) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.</p>	None.
GMPTE	Support	Chapter 8	<p>We support the intention to deliver comprehensive regeneration to this key area. Indeed, a comprehensive approach is essential in order to plan and deliver infrastructure (including public transport</p>	<p>NOTED Support noted.</p>	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			improvements) and environmental improvements as well as to deliver the vision for the area. The ability to pool developer contributions, as set out in Section 8, is central to this ability to deliver, given the high cost of many of these schemes.		
GMPTE	Support	General	GMPTE supports the objective of reducing the number of car lanes on Chapel Street and giving more priority to public transport, walking and cycling, and is working with Salford on a number of schemes to improve accessibility, including the Leigh-Salford-Manchester QBC, improvements to Salford Central station and the longer term potential for the conversion of the Wigan-Manchester rail line to Metrolink operation.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
GMPTE	Observations	Policy SC14	As regards Salford Central station, it has not yet been confirmed that the bus/rail interchange would be on street. We would therefore request that the sixth bullet point of Policy SC14 be amended to read: 'Provision of a bus/rail interchange adjacent to Salford Central Station (suitable locations to be investigated).'	NOT ACCEPTED Existing policy wording relating to provision of an on-street bus/rail interchange adjacent to Salford Central Station to be retained.	None.
Highways Agency	Observations	General	The Agency is responsible for managing the trunk road and motorway network in England. In the vicinity of the Salford Central Area, the network we manage includes the M602 and M60 motorways. Both these motorways experience significant amounts of congestion, particularly during the peak periods. As a result, we welcome proposals that may lead to a reduction in the need to travel on these routes.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
Highways Agency	Observations	General	Some of the proposals within the above document may help to reduce the need to travel by private car. As such, they would normally be welcomed by us. However, the lack of any transport based assessment makes it impossible at this time to identify whether these proposals would actually have a positive or negative affect on our network. I note from the document that one of the main outcomes desired is the remodelling of the A6 through the area. The proposals to maintain the use of this corridor for improved public transport provision is welcomed. However, given the importance of this route as a major artery into the regional centre, the adverse affects caused by the diverted traffic may significantly outweigh the benefits created by the improved public transport facilities.	NOTED Comments noted. Detailed proposals will be dependent on the outcome of transport modelling work.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			<p>Any modelling of the proposed changes must, given the nature of the route, take into account implications of potential reassignment of traffic further away than just the immediate corridors. There is significant potential for decisions on route choice to be made as far away as the M60.</p> <p>Without an assessment of the Transport implications of changing the A6 it is not certain that this proposal is actually deliverable. As this appears to be a significant aspect of the plans for the area it is therefore questionable, at this time, whether these plans can come to fruition. Indeed, what are the implications if the changes to the A6 are proven not to be feasible?</p>		
Highways Agency	Observations	Policy SC1	<p>There are positive aspects in the document. Policy SC1, outlining the need for a comprehensive approach, is very much welcomed. It is only with such an approach that the cumulative impact of the redevelopment can be assessed and adequately provided for. The traditional, piecemeal approach would not adequately deal with the issues that may arise, particularly when it comes to the provision of transport infrastructure and services.</p>	NOTED Support noted.	None.
Highways Agency	Support	Paragraph 8.9	<p>The recognition of the need to pool resources set out in para 8.9 is also welcome.</p>	NOTED Support noted.	None.
Lance City	Observations	General	<p>Trinity Way (the Inner Relief Road) represents the perimeter of Manchester / Salford City Centre, whilst Chapel Street (A6) is a historic arterial access route. As such, the point at which these two roads meet is of great importance.</p> <p>Their junction is currently dominated by vehicular traffic, but is surrounded by a number of attractive buildings, including the former Salford Cinema and the former Brown Brothers Building. A remarkable opportunity exists here to reduce the dominance of vehicular traffic, to improve the pedestrian experience and to partially transform the junction into an attractive civic space. This new space would help enhance the gateway into city centre and could be created by taking a section of land from the vacant former car parking site at the junction's south-eastern side. This arrangement would create two new corner sites and would provide an opportunity to create significant buildings at the edge of the new civic square.</p>	NOTED Comments noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
Lance City	Observations	Paragraph 11.4	<p>The 'Core Area' as identified by the planning guidance (Plan 11.4) is considered too narrowly drawn. Whilst it is recognised that constructing office buildings with active ground floor uses on this site as identified would complement nearby Spinningfields, the erection of a development of 15 storeys or more on this site (and not on the site to the north of the viaduct) would pander to the City of Manchester at the expense Salford's own centre - it would emphasise the barrier of the viaduct.</p> <p>Instead the 'Core Area' should incorporate Salford Central Station and the large area of vacant and underused land on the northern side of the railway viaduct – bounded to the south by Gore Street, to the east by New Bailey Street, to the north by Chapel Street and to the west by Trinity Way.</p> <p>This site is probably the most important within Central Salford. It forms a gateway into Manchester / Salford City Centre and represents a strategic arrival point for pedestrians and road and rail users. As such, it should be the focus for significant and landmark development – 'hiding' the taller development behind the viaduct would not be acceptable. This development could be placed at the new corner sites created following the transformation of the Chapel Street/Trinity Way junction into a new civic space.</p>	<p>NOT ACCEPTED The height of buildings on the north side of the viaduct will be considered on their individual merits. The Development Framework to be prepared in accordance with Policy SC2 of the Guidance will provide further guidance on the detailed form of development on sites across the area.</p>	None.
Lance City	Observations	General	<p>Salford Central Station and its viaduct act as visual and physical barriers between Central Salford and Manchester City Centre. The concentration of significant and landmark developments in the 'Core Area' on the southern side of the viaduct will only emphasise and consolidate this segregation. Instead, there is a need to integrate the station and the viaduct. Perhaps the station could become a facilitator and visually and physically 'bridge' the two sides of the viaduct.</p>	<p>NOT ACCEPTED See above.</p>	None.
Lance City	Observations	General	<p>Opening up the arches of the viaduct to pedestrians will achieve this to point, but there is also an opportunity to develop over the top of the viaduct – perhaps by developing a covered passageway with shops, cafes and restaurants or by simply erecting a large 'Welcome' sign over the railway line</p>	<p>NOTED Comments noted.</p>	None.
Lance City	Observations	Plan 11.7	<p>Plan 11.7 'Key Views' fails to illustrate the importance of views towards the junction of Chapel Street and Trinity Way. This junction is the most significant within Central Salford and</p>	<p>ACCEPTED Comments noted. Plan 11.7 to be amended.</p>	Plan 11.7 to be amended to identify additional key view, towards junction of Chapel

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			therefore views towards it should be explicitly identified.		Street and Trinity Way.
Lance City	Observations	General	<p>The draft planning guidance appears to consider Chapel Street as an entity with a single homogenous character i.e. a route that is dominated by vehicular traffic and lined with redundant and underused buildings. In reality, this is not the case.</p> <p>True, from its junction with The Crescent the road does function as a dual carriageway. However, upon reaching Trinity Way, vehicular dominance significantly reduces and following its junction with New Bailey Street, an increase in pedestrian activity is paralleled by an increase in animated commercial and retail uses. There is an opportunity to further enhance the pedestrian experience along Chapel Street and towards Spinningfield by introducing public realm improvements and by changing the priority of traffic signals at the junctions of Chapel Street with Trinity Way and New Bailey Street, perhaps by introducing exclusive pedestrian phases.</p>	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
Lance City	Observations	General	It is recognised that this guidance is driven by the need for the 'comprehensive redevelopment' of Salford Central. However, where a site or development works well in terms of its location, accessibility and proposed use, layout, design, scale and massing, it is suggested that a more collaborative and coordinated approach be undertaken.	NOT ACCEPTED It is considered implicit that a collaborative and coordinated approach will be necessary to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment of the Salford Central area.	None.
Manchester Broughton Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	Observations	Paragraph 4.4	We note in your Central Planning Guidance Document under the section 'Reasons for a new approach' (item iii) you comment on 'the need to provide and replace essential facilities lost over the last 20 years' including 'places to meet and community facilities'. Would facilities such as places of worship be included in these terms and if so could this be included in the document? We are concerned that organisations such as ours who will be needing increased meeting facilities in the future are not being included in the Local Development Framework.	NOT ACCEPTED Paragraph 4.4 (iii) refers to 'community facilities'. It is considered that places of worship fall within the scope of this, and it is therefore not considered appropriate to refer specifically to places of worship.	None.
Natural England	No comments	General	On this occasion we do not wish to give detailed comments on the above document as it relates to urban centre redevelopment and would not significantly affect our environmental interests. We would stress that the absence of comments or direct involvement on individual plans or proposals is simply an expression of our	NOTED Comments noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			priorities. It should not be taken as implying a lack of interest or indicating either support for, or objection to, any plan.		
North West Regional Assembly	Observations	Policy SC5	Proposed policy SC5 of the document outlines a number of proposals and schemes in terms of improving transport provision to and from the Salford Central area. I note that only the Leigh Guided Busway is listed in RFA. While the Assembly would support the additional schemes and proposals, it should be ensured that a mechanism is in place for their delivery.	NOTED Comments noted. No change is required for the purposes of the Planning Guidance.	Noted.
North West Regional Assembly	Observations	General	I note that a number of SPDs and Planning Guidance Documents prepared by the council are listed to be considered along side the Salford Central document, one of which is the Housing Planning Guidance (2006). While this particular document addresses housing mix and affordable housing, I consider a specific policy within the Salford Central Document is required to address such a fundamental issue.	NOT ACCEPTED These issues are addressed within the adopted Housing Planning Guidance (referred to at paragraph 6.21) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.	None.
North West Regional Assembly	Observations	General	While issues such as “A Sense Of Place” and “Key Views” are given a specific policy within the document, even though such issues are likely to be covered in various other SPDs and Planning Guidance Documents, affordability and housing mix is absent.	NOT ACCEPTED See above.	None.
North West Regional Assembly	Observations	General	Adopted RSS polices UR7 - Regional Housing Provision and UR9 - Affordable Housing and Submitted Draft RSS policies L2 - Understanding Housing Markets and L5 - Affordable Housing all offer support and guidance on the establishment of policies to secure affordable housing and therefore should be given some recognition within the document.	NOTED Comments noted. These policies are referred to at Appendix A – Key policies supported by this Planning Guidance.	None.
Northwest Regional Development Agency	Observations	Paragraph 2.5	Paragraph 2.5 states that "all parts of the area need to be brought forward together and redeveloped concurrently". Whilst we support the objective of regenerating the area in a comprehensive manner, requiring the whole area to be redeveloped concurrently may be unrealistic. Consequently there is a risk that acceptable proposals may be delayed whilst schemes for other are still being worked up.	ACCEPTED Paragraph 2.5 to be amended.	Amend paragraph 2.5 to read “To successfully achieve this, all the parts of the area need to be brought forward together and redeveloped within the same broad timeframe”.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
Northwest Regional Development Agency	Observations	Policy SC2	Policy SC 2 does not appear to add significantly to Policy SC 1 which requires developers to demonstrate how their proposals will contribute to the comprehensive regeneration of the area. We suggest that Policy SC 2 could be deleted and the reference to the forthcoming Development Framework incorporated within Policy SC 1.	NOT ACCEPTED It is considered that the purpose of these Policies is more effectively achieved by retaining them as separate policies.	None.
Northwest Regional Development Agency	Observations	Policy SC4	Policy SC 4 is essentially a vision for the area, rather than a policy, and might be better 'repackaged' as such	ACCEPTED Policy SC4 to be reworded to provide greater clarity as to its purpose and scope.	Amend Policy SC4 to provide greater clarity as to its purpose and scope.
Northwest Regional Development Agency	Observations	Chapter 6	There is some duplication between Policy SC 1 and the final paragraph of the various area-specific policies (SC 10 to 14) regarding the need for proposals to demonstrate how they would contribute to comprehensive regeneration of Salford Central as a whole.	NOTED Comments noted. It is considered important to emphasise the need for comprehensive regeneration of the whole of the Salford Central area.	None.
Northwest Regional Development Agency	Observations	Paragraph 6.26	Parts of the Salford Central area also lie within the area covered by Draft Planning Guidance for the Irwell City Park, on which the Agency has previously commented. The cross-reference to the Irwell City Park at paragraph 6.26 is helpful and should help to ensure that development proposals have regard to both documents.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
Northwest Regional Development Agency	Observations	Paragraph 4.4	On a point of accuracy, the first paragraph on page 7 states that land at Islington Way was acquired by NWDA. The land was actually acquired by the City Council with funding from NWDA.	ACCEPTED Paragraph 4.4 (iii) to be amended.	Amend paragraph 4.4 (iii) to state "Some sites were acquired and 'allocated' for these types of use e.g. land at Islington Way was acquired by the city council with funding from the NWDA and..."
Phil Beckett	Observations	General	I consider it essential that all Council planning guidance should be properly aligned with the URC Vision and Regeneration Framework for Central Salford, which talks explicitly about "investing in a strong and distinctive centre for Salford" (a key intervention theme) and the re-establishment of Salford City Centre.	NOTED Central Salford URC have been fully engaged in the preparation of the Salford Central Planning Guidance, and it is considered that there is close alignment with the Central Salford Vision	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
				and Regeneration Framework.	
Phil Beckett	Observations	General	Also, consultations in respect of the draft URC vision very much indicated that people want a centre for Salford and there was concern that, otherwise, the area would be "swallowed up" by Manchester. However, the Guidance makes only very oblique references to a centre for Salford, and the focus is on the planning concept of the Regional Centre and something called "Manchester/Salford City Centre". Presumably, planning policies developed before the URC Framework was approved have been used to inform the production of the Guidance.	NOT ACCEPTED Central Salford URC have been fully engaged in the preparation of the Salford Central Planning Guidance, and it is considered that there is close alignment with the Central Salford Vision and Regeneration Framework. The Regional Centre comprises Manchester / Salford City Centre and the Salford Central area must develop its role in a way that is complementary to the other parts of the Regional Centre. Distinctiveness of the Salford Central offer is considered implicit in this complementarity of role.	None.
Phil Beckett	Observations	General	The fact that the URC Framework and the Guidance are out of line, means that there is much scope for confusion, e.g. part of Salford Central is in "Manchester/Salford City Centre", and the other part is not. This compounded by the current nonsensical signage along the inner relief route, which informs drivers that to get to Salford they must turn into Chapel Street West. So, according to the road signs, one part of Salford Central is IN Salford and the other part is not IN Salford!	NOT ACCEPTED See above.	None.
Phil Beckett	Observations	General	If the objective of a "a cohesive and distinctive sense of place and character for Salford Central", or the URC's objective of a "strong and distinctive centre for Salford", are ever to be realised, then both the Planning Guidance and the signage must be amended to reflect both the Salford city boundaries and Salford Central's boundaries.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
Phil Beckett	Observations	General	Having said the above, the Planning Guidance is fine overall and the fact that the URC will take the lead on producing a comprehensive Development Framework for the area makes me more optimistic. Hopefully, Salford Central will become a destination rather than a gateway, and the Regional Centre will be	NOTED Support noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			formed by two distinct but inter-related city centres existing side by side.		
St Philips and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	General	The Church Council of St Philip's Church discussed the draft Planning Guidance and was very supportive of the broad aims. We wholeheartedly support Policies SC 1-4.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
St Philips and Sacred Trinity Churches	Observations	Policy SC5	We would like to see an addition into this policy that "to support Chapel St as a destination there will be adequate parking for visitors". Whilst we applaud the desire to increase public transport accessibility and we support the desire to make the area easier to use for pedestrians and cyclists we are concerned that for the people that will still use the car, parking is getting more and more difficult. We would like to see a coherent parking strategy with new residential developments having sufficient parking on site, existing residential streets having a parking scheme where necessary, main streets having short stay parking, side streets having longer stay parking (eg 2 hours), and no streets that encourage commuter parking.	NOTED A car parking strategy for the area is to be addressed as part of the preparation of the Development Framework, as identified under Policy SC2 of the Guidance. Policy SC8 relates to car parking and servicing, therefore it is not considered necessary to include an additional reference to car parking within Policy SC5.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Observations	Policy SC6	We had a concern that the City will allow too many too tall buildings and would in particular like the last bullet point to have "Most" inserted before "developments are expected to achieve heights of ...". This area does include the Farmer Norton site which is adjacent to bungalows. We think it important that the scale of buildings is proportional to those around them (whether they are listed or not).	ACCEPTED Policy to be amended.	Amend final bullet point of Policy SC6 to state "Within the Historic Core, Chapel Street South and Adelphi areas, developments are generally expected to achieve heights of..."
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC7	Good.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Observations	Policy SC8	It is important that levels of Car Parking are appropriate for visitors as well as those that live in the development or work there.	NOTED Comments noted,	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC10	We welcome these.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity	Support	Policy SC11	We welcome these.	NOTED Support noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
Churches					
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC12	We especially welcome the idea of a public space surrounding our church and would welcome early discussions about this.	NOTED The preparation of the Development Framework in line with Policy SC2 will provide the mechanism for exploring options around this.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC12	We also think that the large Farmer Norton site that is no longer wanted by the University provides an excellent opportunity for high quality family housing in the area. The site is large enough to be of interest to developers for something other than the usual apartments and it is in City Council control. It could provide a much needed balance within the housing provision in the area. The Adelphi St frontage may need to be a little higher to relate to the developments on the other side of the road but then the development could drop in height to at most 3 storeys where it's adjacent to Devine Close.	NOTED The preparation of the Development Framework in line with Policy SC2 will provide the mechanism for exploring options around this.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC12	We would like an additional point to say "improvement to the public space at St Stephen's Gardens to make it an attractive open space which will include quality artwork that reflects the history of the space (as a church & school)."	ACCEPTED Policy to be amended.	Include additional bullet point to Policy SC12 "Further improvements to St Stephen's Gardens".
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC13	We especially welcome suggestion of a playing field for St Philip's School.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Support	Policy SC14	Proposals are welcomed.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
St Philips' and Sacred Trinity Churches	Observations	General	Additional points. We would welcome discussion about how we can enhance the accessibility and usage of our building. For example we need financial help to install ramped access that is in keeping with our building. We wish to see increased use of our building but we also need help addressing the parking problems, as our historic building has no associated parking.	NOTED Comments noted. No change is required for the purpose of the Planning Guidance.	None.
The Theatres Trust	Support	Policy SC12	We support this policy and are pleased to see that cultural facilities will be included for new developments, infrastructure upgrades and improvements. Facilities for major leisure and entertainment use should be concentrated in the city centre. A	NOTED Comments noted.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			<p>balanced leisure scene will entertain and stimulate visitors, residents and local businesses with visiting audiences enlivening the surrounding area in the evening, and providing regular custom for local bars and restaurants outside normal working and shopping hours.</p> <p>The Trust particularly requests that the document provides sufficient protection to ensure continued theatre use within the central area, particularly where buildings for performance arts may not be covered by listing or conservation area designations, or may be affected by proposals which come forward for development sites. This should include performing arts facilities that stand-alone, are part of other facilities, or are contained within educational or community buildings.</p>		
The Theatres Trust	Support	Policy SC12	Generally city centres are the heart of communities and an expression of their culture and identity. As well as shops and small businesses they should provide a range of functions including leisure and cultural facilities centred on restaurants, pubs, clubs, theatres, cinemas, libraries and museums. As such all these elements play an active role in creating vibrant centres and a stimulating night-time economy.	NOTED Comments noted. Paragraph 4.4 (iii) refers to the acknowledged demand for a range of local facilities.	None.
United Utilities	Support	Paragraph 6.24	United Utilities supports the objective of reducing the use of potable water. Whilst there is no shortage of potable water supply in the north west at the moment, predictions on global warming and increased use of water by our customers means that we cannot be complacent. United Utilities is aware that some local authorities are utilizing a national scheme a Code for Sustainable Homes which builds on EcoHomes and are adopting this as a means of encouraging developers towards environmental sustainability. Indeed the Department for Communities and Local Government is likely to require its application in future development. Water efficiency is part of the scheme. Whilst water meters encourage responsible use of potable water, we would also advise attention to building design to conserve potable water. This could include water saving devices such as low volume taps (except at the kitchen sink), low volume showerheads, dual flush toilets, save-a-flush devices, water efficient washing machines and dishwashers. In this way, the Salford Central redevelopment is an opportunity for the local authority to demonstrate its sustainable green vision for the future.	NOTED These issues are addressed within the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document (referred to at paragraph 6.24) and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.	None.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
United Utilities	Support	Paragraph 9.1	United Utilities supports the inclusion of the requirement for a description of underground utility services affecting the development with the planning application.	NOTED Support noted.	None.
United Utilities	Observations	Paragraph 9.1	Planning Applications should include a Flood Risk Assessment for sites within Flood Zone 1 which are greater than 1ha and all sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3.	ACCEPTED Additional point to be included under paragraph 9.1 on need for Flood Risk Assessment as per Environment Agency representation.	Amendment to paragraph 9.1 already identified above in relation to Environment Agency representation.
United Utilities	Observations	Paragraph 9.1	As United Utilities are not statutory consultees we would welcome consultation on these sites and would ask that where you believe you should consult the Environment Agency you consider consulting United Utilities. This is important as we are involved for two aspects of flooding, sewer flooding and reservoir inundation. Information on these two aspects is not in the public domain and not available from any other source.	NOTED Comments noted. This is a development control issue, and will be raised with the city council's Development Control function. The city council will shortly adopt a Planning Application Validation List , which will be referred to in Section 9.	None.
Valley and Vale Properties	Support	Policy SC11	Valley and Vale Properties own the Middlewood Locks site which forms a substantial part of the area covered by the draft guidance. We welcome the guidance and consider Policy SC11 (Middlewood) is generally consistent with our planning permission for Middlewood Locks 06/52762/OUT granted on the 27 April 2007.	NOTED Comments noted.	None.
Valley and Vale Properties	Objection	Policy SC6	Policy SC6 is not consistent with the extant permission and needs to be amended. SC6 currently says "Within Middlewood Locks, developments are generally expected to achieve heights of 6-7 storeys, complemented by some 8 storey buildings". As you will be aware, the approved Design Code for Middlewood Locks allows for buildings generally much higher than 6 —8 storeys. Most of the plots have approval for developments of up to 13 storeys and some plots have approval for tall buildings up to 32 storeys. SC6, as it is currently worded, could be interpreted as limiting the heights of buildings on Middlewood Locks to 8 storeys. Such a policy would not be consistent with the existing planning approval and would be unacceptable to my client.	NOTED Policy SC6 to be amended to remove references to building heights.	Amendment to Policy SC6 to remove references to building heights.

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Representation	Recommendation	Proposed Changes
			<p>I suspect that you are actually trying to say that there should be a minimum height of 6-7 storeys in order to achieve a density consistent with the scale of the site. An approach along those lines might be better.</p>		

The following comments were received after the consultation period had ended.					
Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Response	Recommendation	
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Support	General	We strongly support the development of this guidance and are pleased to see the Council working towards a strategic framework in partnership with the private and community sector. This area continues to suffer from poor levels of investment, particularly when considering the areas position close to Manchester City Centre. We are, however, very disappointed with the outcome of this document and feel that it fails to address the key reasons why this area underachieves and the low level of business investment.	NOT ACCEPTED It is considered that the Planning Guidance clearly acknowledges the reasons why this area has historically failed to attract development, and that it effectively responds to these issues through establishing a robust policy framework for the comprehensive regeneration of the area.	None.
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Observations	General	Vision - This document lacks any significant vision or ambition for this part of the city. Salford City Council should draw on the strengths of the sites proximity to a booming Manchester City Centre, strong residential demand, a shortage of quality office space and the availability of significant open land within this area. These strengths have not been captured and as such, the document is a missed opportunity to create something more distinctive. In order for businesses to invest, they need to buy into a vision for Salford Central, enabling them to see that their investment will be part of a greater ambition and encourage people to want to be part of this area.	NOT ACCEPTED It is considered that the Planning Guidance clearly sets out the vision and direction for change for this important area of the City of Salford and the Regional Centre, in terms of its comprehensive regeneration to diversify its economic base and bring in new activity.	None.
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Observations	General	Crime - A major concern for existing businesses in this area is the high crime rate. This, more than most, is preventing investment by existing firms and has provided this area with a very low reputation, putting off investment from outside the area. Sadly, crime and security has not been properly addressed in this document; a significant omission. It is vital that the Council works with local traders to understand the severe disruption and deterrence crime if causing to the area. The Chamber of Commerce would be happy to assist in providing those connections with the existing business community.	NOT ACCEPTED Issues of preventing crime through the design of the built environment are addressed in the adopted Design and Crime Supplementary Planning Document (referred to in paragraph 6.17), and it is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents. The city council and other partners are working to address issues of crime and security within this area.	None.

The following comments were received after the consultation period had ended.					
Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Response	Recommendation	
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Observations	General	<p>Accessibility - The Salford Central area suffers from poor connectivity internally and with Manchester City Centre. The area is too close to the city centre to drive yet walking and cycling is dangerous, unpleasant and is poorly accommodated within the existing infrastructure. It is encouraging that this has partially been recognised but it is not possible, from this document, to see how this issue will be comprehensively addressed. This needs to be a priority and security along these routes needs to be taken into account. Proposals to enhance the streetscape and to widen pedestrian routes only go part way to addressing this concern. We are, however, extremely worried by proposals, which will involve "...reducing the number of lanes and adding on-street parking...". This part of town suffers from significant congestion and any proposals to further restrict vehicle movement need to be thought through very carefully. Furthermore, on street parking in this area has, in many places, been specifically removed due to the high levels of vehicle crime. This has not been addressed and therefore, further on street parking will only reverse previous crime reduction efforts. The Chamber is highly supportive of any proposals to improve public transport, this, however, should not be achieved by restricting vehicle movements, cattle railings, lane restrictions, complex road layouts and plagues of traffic lights and road signs, which often accompany regeneration and development schemes. Removing such restrictions will not only improve traffic flow but also make it simpler and more user friendly for cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>NOTED Comments noted. Issues of connectivity and car parking will be addressed within the Development Framework which will be produced in line with Policy SC2 of the Guidance.</p>	None.
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Observations	Chapter 8	<p>Planning Obligations - The business community recognises that they must contribute to improved and upgraded infrastructure in the area in which they invest, however, they are wary of how their contributions are spent. A clear vision for the area would provide the basis for which these funds can be channelled. The current 'wish list' (paragraph 8.8), is too broad and vague, and as such it would be unlikely that all will be realised, enhancing the scepticism surrounding planning obligations.</p>	<p>NOT ACCEPTED Paragraph 8.9 Schedule of Appropriate New and / or Upgraded Infrastructure clearly sets out where planning obligation financial contributions will be directed.</p>	
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Observations	Chapter 8	<p>In addition, funding for security and public safety issues is again, missing.</p>	<p>ACCEPTED Additional point to be included.</p>	<p>Add additional bullet point to Schedule of Appropriate New and / or Upgraded Infrastructure relating to security and public safety issues.</p>

Salford Central Planning Guidance Consultation Responses

APPENDIX 1

The following comments were received after the consultation period had ended.					
Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Response	Recommendation	
Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce	Observations	Chapter 8	We would encourage Salford City Council to engage a lot more closely with existing business within this area. A lack of business involvement from the earliest stages, may account for the poor structure and major omissions from this document.	NOTED The city council and partners already do much work to engage with organisations representing business interests across the Regional Centre. Specific to this area, the Chapel Street Partnership Board and Chapel Street Business Group are two prominent forums where the city council actively engages with local business interests.	None.
Red Rose Forest	Support	General	<p>Thank you for inviting Red Rose Forest's comments on the Salford Central Planning Guidance - Consultation Draft. We welcome this Planning Guidance in general terms as making a major contribution to regeneration within the Forest area.</p> <p>We particularly 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.</p>	NOTED Support noted.	None.
Red Rose Forest	Observations	General	We welcome the reference to the Irwell City Park Planning Guidance, and recognize the contribution the regeneration of this area can make to the creation of the Irwell City Park. The Planning Guidance area overlaps with lower end of the proposed Croal Irwell Regional Park, and while we appreciate that including a reference to the Regional Park may not be possible as it is not yet an adopted policy, it may be desirable to refer to the need to create/enhance opportunities for walking and cycling upstream as part of a "gateway experience" for the rest of the Irwell Valley (as shown on Plan 11.6 – Connectivity).	NOTED Additional reference to be included within Appendix B – Regeneration Context to refer to links to Croal Irwell Regional Park.	Add additional reference within Appendix B – Regeneration Context to refer to links to Croal Irwell Regional Park.
Red Rose Forest	Observations	General	We welcome the commitment to environmental improvements such as "enhancing the streetscape" and "establishing local green boulevards" but would welcome explicit reference to the use of trees (as in the Time for Action newsletter which refers to a	NOTED Issues of design and streetscape will be addressed in the Development Framework	None.

The following comments were received after the consultation period had ended.					
Organisation	Nature Of Response	Section	Response	Recommendation	
			<p>“vibrant tree-lined” Chapel Street). Trees not only enhance the landscape and encourage wildlife – they provide shade and reduce wind speeds, improving the local microclimate and reducing heating/cooling costs for neighboring buildings. Red Rose Forest’s Green Streets programme has shown that with careful selection of tree species and the use of state-of-the-art planting techniques, tree planting can deliver benefits for the environment, for local image and for community cohesion.</p>	<p>which will be prepared in line with Policy SC2 of the Guidance.</p>	
Red Rose Forest	Observations	General	<p>We would also welcome specific reference to the enhancement of the area’s Green Infrastructure in line with Draft Regional Spatial Strategy policy EM3 on green infrastructure which states that plans, strategies, proposals and schemes should;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify, promote and deliver multi-purpose networks of greenspace, particularly where there is currently limited access to natural greenspace or where connectivity between these places is poor; and • Integrate green infrastructure provision within existing and new development, particularly within major development and regeneration schemes. This could include not only greenspaces and street landscaping but also the use of permeable surfacing, green roofs and other features to deliver multiple environmental and climatic benefits. 	<p>NOTED Policy EM3 of Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy is identified at Appendix A as a key policy supported by this Planning Guidance. It is not considered appropriate to duplicate issues that are covered within other planning policy documents.</p>	None.