

**Salford City Council Conservative Group response to draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework consultation: 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

Policies

Policy	Comment
SL1	<p>We support the aspiration to further develop the city centre areas of Salford and Manchester, providing both jobs and high-quality residential development. Providing additional and significant residential development at a higher density on brownfield sites in the urban core will enable us to protect green spaces in Salford and across Greater Manchester.</p> <p>We would like to see Greengate and Salford Central retain their own unique character whilst ensuring that links across the River Irwell are maintained and strengthened, enabling the two city centres to prosper together.</p> <p>We believe that both HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) will have a transformative impact on the Greater Manchester economy and it is important that Salford residents can easily access new transport options to ensure that the City is able to benefit.</p> <p>We note at paragraph 3.1.3 the importance of additional social infrastructure. With significant further development, the demographic make-up of the city centre area is likely to change, and the provision of social infrastructure such as schools and doctors is essential.</p>
SL2	<p>We are supportive of the measures outlined to support town centres across Greater Manchester. Making our town centres more efficient and increasing the level of residential development in our town centres will enliven these spaces and provide new homes and jobs.</p> <p>Many of the issues and solutions identified in policy SL2 also apply to other town centre sites, including Walkden, Swinton and Eccles within the City of Salford. We would like to see reassurance that the focus of this policy will not impact on efforts to enable these town centres to continue to grow and succeed.</p>
SL3	<p>We support the aspiration to continue the development of the Quays, which is rightly lauded as one of the most important economic developments in the country.</p> <p>We would particularly encourage the development of stronger transport links to the Quays, which is currently difficult to access from many parts of Salford and Greater Manchester, particularly by public transport from the outer areas of the City. We are pleased to see that this has been recognised in the policy.</p>
SL5	<p>We support those elements of the Western Gateway which can be delivered on brownfield land. <b>We oppose the proposals to release green belt and green field land, and in particular the proposals to</b></p>

	<p><b>allocate green belt land at Irlam and Cadishead, and at Barton Moss.</b> We will comment further on specific sites within the City of Salford in our comments on allocations.</p> <p>We agree with the need to provide significant transport infrastructure improvements in this area; the provision of a rail spur to Port Salford is essential to the successful operation of this site.</p> <p>We are very pleased to see the Trafford Park Metrolink line under construction and we support any proposals to extend this further to Port Salford. We would like to see a further extension to Irlam and Cadishead considered, or the extension of the Carrington spur rail link across the Manchester Ship Canal to Cadishead. We also support improvements to frequency and capacity on the Irlam rail line.</p>
SL8	<p><b>We oppose the release of green belt and green field land along the A580 corridor.</b> We will comment further on specific sites within the City of Salford in our comments on allocations.</p> <p>We support the proposed new RHS Garden Bridgewater, which will provide a huge boost to the local area, and acknowledge that significant improvements will need to be made to ensure that local transport infrastructure is able to cope with the visitor numbers.</p>
GM5	<p>We believe that the housing figures should be revisited in order to prevent inappropriate development on green field and green belt sites. We note that Salford is marked to provide a higher proportion of new housing relative to population and housing need, and looking again at this figure would enable the protection of green belt and green field sites in west Salford.</p> <p>In order to create sustainable communities, it is essential that social and transport infrastructure is provided before or alongside any new housing development.</p>
GM6	<p>Transport improvements must be implemented prior to or alongside new developments, to ensure that sustainable communities are created.</p> <p>We support the continued development of Manchester Airport which benefits the entire regional economy and we would like to see further improvements in transport links from across Greater Manchester.</p> <p>We support the completion of Port Salford and related transport improvements but we do not agree with the proposals to expand the site onto neighbouring green belt land.</p> <p>We welcome the early delivery of HS2 into the region and improved east-west rail links, and the associated improvements in local services. We welcome proposals to electrify suburban rail networks; electrification of the Walkden and Irlam lines will provide a significant boost to capacity, frequency and reliability.</p>

	<p>We welcome bus improvements which serve local communities but these should not be at the expense of existing road capacity which is already at a premium.</p> <p>We believe that further development of Salford Central as a passenger gateway is essential given the proposed development within the City Centre.</p> <p>We support the extension of the Trafford Park Metrolink to Port Salford and we would support a further extension to Irlam and Cadishead, or alternatively the restoration of the rail spur to Cadishead via Carrington.</p>
GM11	We support the proposals for the lowland wetlands but we would further suggest that the mosslands south of the M62 motorway be included within the scope of this policy rather than allocated for development.
GM13	<p>We support the additional designation of the West Salford Greenway as green belt land. As per the description of green belt set out in the policy, the Greenway prevents unrestricted urban sprawl in West Salford, it safeguards much-valued open space, and it helps to preserve the setting and special character of nearby historic Worsley Village and the wider Bridgewater Canal corridor.</p> <p>We do not support the allocation of green belt land in Salford and adjacent boroughs for development. We will comment further on specific sites in our comments on allocations.</p>
GM21	We support the aims set out in policy GM21 regarding school places and educational provision. It is essential that this social infrastructure is in place prior to or alongside any further development.
GM22	We support the aims set out in policy GM22 regarding health provision and healthy communities. It is essential that this social infrastructure is in place prior to or alongside any further development.
GM25	Although we disagree with a number of the specific site allocations, we concur with the principles of development 1-7 and A-F as set out in policy GM25.

#### Site allocations

Allocation	Response
WG2	<p>We do not support the release of the land west of Irlam and Cadishead for development as proposed in allocation WG2.</p> <p>This is green belt land, much of which is mossland and grade one agricultural land, which would be lost under these proposals. The development of this land would have an unacceptable impact on the local environment and place unreasonable pressure on the local community in Irlam and Cadishead, particularly with regard to traffic and congestion. Together with proposal WG3 this would create continuous urban sprawl from the city centre to the border with Warrington.</p>

	<p>Mossland at this site should be protected and enhanced under the provisions of policy GM11.</p>
WG3	<p>We do not support the release of land at Barton Moss for the expansion of Port Salford. Releasing this green belt land would create, together with proposal WG2, a continuous urban sprawl from the city centre to the border with Warrington. It would also have an unacceptable impact on traffic levels on the A57, which is already full beyond capacity in most peak periods.</p> <p>The framework should concentrate on delivering a successful and operational Port Salford within the boundaries of the existing permissions, including the appropriate improvements in local highways and public transport.</p> <p>Mossland at this site should be protected and enhanced under the provisions of policy GM11.</p>
ELR1	<p>Although the land at Mosley Common is not located within the Salford boundary, development of this site would have an unacceptable impact on nearby residents in Ellenbrook and Walkden. Development of this site would significantly increase congestion on local roads in both Wigan and Salford, and would result in the loss of the green wedge between Walkden, Mosley Common and Tyldesley.</p>
ELR5	<p>We do not support the release of green belt and green space land between Astley and Boothstown. The release of this land would have an unacceptable impact on residents in these areas, and would overwhelm local infrastructure, particularly with regard to roads. It would result in the loss of the green wedge between Boothstown and Astley, creating a continuous urban sprawl, and would impact on the special character of Astley Green and the Bridgewater Canal corridor.</p>
OA18	<p>We do not support the release of green belt land at East Boothstown. We believe that this site would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the existing local community, particularly with regard to road infrastructure, and would result in the loss of valued open space between Worsley and Boothstown. We are also concerned that the allocation of this site would impact on and partially devalue the character of the neighbouring RHS Garden Bridgewater development. The RHS development will itself provide new transport challenges which will only be exacerbated by housing development on this site.</p>
OA19	<p>The site at Hazelhurst Farm is the last remaining green buffer bounded by the M60, A580 and industrial and residential areas. It is greatly valued by the local community and the development of this site would create an unacceptable impact on the amenity of those living and working nearby. We do not support the release of green belt land on this site.</p>