

**Salford City Council Conservative Group response to the consultation on the draft Salford Local Plan: 16<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Response</b>
CC1	<p>We support the aims of policy CC1, which will provide 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>The increased residential development within the City Centre will bring a change in demographics, and it is essential that social infrastructure within the City Centre is provided before or alongside further development to ensure that sustainable communities can develop and thrive.</p> <p>We support further investment to ensure that Salford Central station can act as a gateway not just to City Centre Salford but to the wider regional centre.</p>
CC2	<p>We support the creation of Greengate Park which will be a valuable addition to the environment within a growing and increasingly residential City Centre area.</p>
SQ1	<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>
OW1	<p>We support the further development of Ordsall Waterfront as a high-quality and primarily residential area. 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>
C1	<p>We support ongoing efforts to protect residents in Broughton from flooding and welcome the recognition of these efforts within a Local Plan policy.</p>
EC4/1	<p>We do not believe that the expansion of Port Salford onto Green Belt land at Barton Moss is sustainable development. This proposal would load unsustainable pressure onto local transport networks, and the loss of Green Belt under this allocation and allocation H3/4 (western Irlam and Cadishead) would create a continuous urban spawl between city centre Salford and the border with Warrington.</p>

	<p>Should this allocation be approved, we agree that the site should not be developed until the current Port Salford site is complete, and until appropriate new transport infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>We agree with the aim of extending the Metrolink line to Port Salford and we would like to further investigate whether this could be further extended to Irlam and Cadishead.</p>
EC4/2	We support the continued and more efficient use of Clifton Junction for employment use
EC4/3	We support the allocation of Ashton's Field for employment use. We do not support the allocation of this site within the Joint Waste Disposal plan and we would like to see alternative employment uses found for this site.
CT3/2	We support the development of RHS Garden Bridgewater which will provide a significant boost to the local and regional economy and enhance the local environment. We acknowledge that there is further work to do to provide sustainable travel options to the new site which do not impact on the amenity of neighbouring communities.
H2	<p>We believe that the housing figures should be revisited in order to prevent inappropriate development on green field and green belt sites. The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework shows 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>
H3/1	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.
H3/2	We do not support the release of green belt and green space land west of Boothstown, nor do we support the proposed release of adjacent land in Wigan borough as proposed by the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. 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.
H3/3	We agree that the land west of Hayes Road in Cadishead is appropriate for housing development providing that the appropriate infrastructure is in place.
H3/4	We do not support the release of the land west of Irlam and Cadishead for development.

	<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 EC4/1 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 GI3.</p>
H3/5	We agree that the Charlestown Riverside site is suitable for housing development providing that appropriate steps can be taken to mitigate flood risk.
H3/6	We acknowledge that the current usage of Brackley Golf Course is probably unsustainable. However, we would like to see further exploration of other uses which would allow the site to be retained for recreational usage.
H3/7	We believe that this land may be suitable for development providing that alternative amenity space can be allocated in the immediate neighbourhood.
H3/8	We do not support the allocation of the former St George's High School playing fields for residential development. This would be an unacceptable loss of valued green space and development of this site would place further strain on local amenities and infrastructure in Walkden and Little Hulton. This site should be retained as green open space and an appropriate recreational use found.
H3/10	We support the allocation of some land at Clifton Business Park for housing development, provided that this is carefully planned to ensure that the amenity of residents is protected from nearby employment and industrial uses.
H3/11	We are concerned about the impact of a change of use on this site on the nearby St Augustine's church, a grade 1 listed building. Any further development of this site must be handled with extreme sensitivity.
H3/12	We agree that Swinton Hall Road is an appropriate site for new residential development. It is close to transport links and to the amenities in Swinton town centre.
H3/13	The land at Hill Top Moss is part of Blackleach Country Park and is greatly valued by local residents as open space. We believe that it should be retained and enhanced as open space.
H3/15	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.
H3/16	We believe that the green space north of Lumber Lane should be retained. This is in effect an extended part of the West Salford Greenway and the loss of this green space would impact on the wider area. Hardy Grove is a narrow residential cul-de-sac and does not provide a suitable access point to new housing development.

H11	We support the aspirations of this policy which will help to provide a vibrant student quarter whilst protecting the character and sustainability of neighbouring areas.
ED2	We agree that any development must be phased to ensure that appropriate school places are provided prior to the completion of development.
HH1	We agree that new healthcare facilities must be provided to meet demand created by any new development. We would like to see the policy text amended to make clear that new facilities must be provided before or alongside new development, as per the similar pledge made for school places in policy ED2.
A4	<p>We support the proposals for further improvements to Salford's rail and tram network, including the upgrade of Salford Central station and potential Metrolink extensions to Port Salford, Irlam and Cadishead. We agree that Salford Central, Salford Crescent, Walkden and Irlam stations provide particular opportunities for increased patronage and improved services. Improved accessibility and development at Walkden and Irlam stations is essential to enable increased patronage, including level access and new car parking at Walkden station.</p> <p>The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework raises the possibility of reopening the "Carrington spur" rail line and if this is the case then we should consider whether a further extension to Cadishead is feasible.</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>
A6	We welcome and support the establishment of the principle that it is reasonable to refuse development on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
A11	We welcome the protection that this policy affords Barton Aerodrome.
A13	We welcome the continued protection of former transport routes from development; this enables us to enhance the local environment and green infrastructure whilst retaining the option of transport improvements in the future.
D1-12	We support the design principles outlined in policies D1 to D12.
HE1	We support policy HE1 which provides additional protection to heritage assets across the City.
G11	We welcome this policy but further note that the importance of Chat Moss extends to those areas of mossland south of the M62, which should be protected from development rather than allocated for the release of green belt under policies EC4/1 and H3/4.
G13	As per our comments on policy G11, we believe that the same level of protection and importance allocated to Chat Moss should be provided to those areas of mossland south of the M62.
G14	We support the proposals to protect and enhance the River Irwell and the Irwell Valley.
G15	We support the allocation as local green space of The Meadow, Brickfield Wood, Three Sisters, Blackleach Country Park, the West Salford Greenway, and Worsley Green. The existing boundaries of Blackleach

	Country Park, including the land at Hill Top Moss, should be retained and all allocated as local green space.
GB1	We strongly support the redesignation of the West Salford Greenway as green belt, and we support the allocation of Cutacre Country park and Wharton Playing Fields as green belt. We do not support the proposed release of five areas green belt for development and have outlined our objections to these proposals under our comments on draft policies EC4 and H3.
BG1	We support the principles established in policy BG1 and would like to see this provision extended to mossland areas and green space south of the M62 at Irlam Moss and Barton Moss.