

SRF Section	Comment/ Objection
Section 1: Introduction	<p>SRF is unlawful - SRF is a Development Framework. <i>RESPONSE: Text within the SRF has been updated to more clarify the status of the document as a material consideration in the determination of all planning applications relevant to the study area. The SRF is now more clear that it does not 'allocate' sites for development but simply identifies opportunities. It includes an indicative Development Framework and whilst it does not form part of the Development Plan, it has been prepared to be consistent with the policies of the Council's adopted Development Plan.</i></p> <p>Study Area should not be referred to as 'site'. <i>RESPONSE: SRF text updated throughout to refer to 'study area' rather than 'site'.</i></p>
Section 3: Drivers for Change	<p>Recent population projections should be factored into housing needs calculation. <i>RESPONSE: The SRF does not set or calculate the housing need. The housing need calculations are dealt with by the adopted development plan and its evidence base. The Planning Policy Context section details Policy CC3 (Housing) which states that the city centre will see the most intensive development of housing in the city.</i></p>
Section 5: SRF-wide Design and Development Principles	<p>Drafting on page 37 does not appear to reflect Policy H8. The SRF should not be seen to override adopted development plan policy. Policy basis for seeking affordable housing at rate specified in SRF is unspecific. <i>RESPONSE: Wording in relation to affordable housing has been updated to more accurately reflect the precise wording of Core Strategy Policy H8. The clear intention for the Northern Gateway is that at least 20% of new housing satisfies the City Council's requirements on affordability. Plans for the affordable housing strategy within the Northern Gateway will be developed with reference to the emerging Affordable Housing Policy Framework that follows endorsement of the 12 December 2018 report of the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration. However, it is recognised that until the review of the local development plan has been completed, specific development proposals will continue to be judged in accordance with Policy H8 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy (2012).</i></p> <p>It should be made clear that a flexible approach to parking within schemes be taken across the study area. <i>RESPONSE: The SRF document sets out that appropriate car parking strategies will be effective if they consider the potential demand by future residents, the promotion of alternative sustainable forms of transport and any impacts arising from the displacement of on and off-street car parking, along with additional car parking demand from the city centre. Car parking provision for each neighbourhood will be considered, having regard to the context of the wider transport offer in the area.</i></p> <p>Potentially conflicting statements re: form of development along Rochdale Road. <i>RESPONSE: The SRF text has been updated under the SRF-wide Development Principle, 'Urbanising Rochdale Road'. The principle of supporting Rochdale Road's transitioning role as an urban avenue that connects several neighbourhoods, routes and Retail and Service Hubs will involve a careful approach to facade treatment, materials and height.</i></p> <p>Sites fronting Sudell Street should have the flexibility to rise to up to 8 storeys. <i>RESPONSE: The illustrative heights depicted in this location are deemed to be appropriate and no changes have been made.</i></p> <p>All matters that flow from the Illustrative Masterplan should be termed as illustrative. <i>RESPONSE: The text within the SRF has been updated to reflect and emphasise that content is indicative and will guide future development across the Northern Gateway. It comprises a set of SRF-wide and neighbourhood-specific design and development principles which are indicative, alongside a series of plans and diagrams which are presented on an illustrative basis.</i></p> <p>Re-use of the viaduct should be seen as an option, not a requirement, of any future scheme. <i>RESPONSE: The SRF has been revised to make clear that the re-use of the viaduct is the preferred option rather than a requirement and the SRF has been amended to specifically and clearly set out that the feasibility of this needs to be tested. The SRF-Wide Development Principles Section now states that the re-use, where feasible of railway infrastructure and other post-industrial structures, including the Red Bank Viaduct, will be encouraged. Investigation will be required to assess feasibility and intervention may be required to facilitate overall enhancements.</i></p> <p>Difference between conceptual drawings (i.e. p.50) and elements of the illustrative masterplan need to be made. Certain illustrative material within the Development Framework (i.e. Sections 5 and 6) will not be used for the purposes of assessing planning applications directly. This distinction needs to be made. <i>RESPONSE: The text within the SRF has been updated to reflect and emphasise that content is indicative and will guide future development across the Northern Gateway. It comprises a set of SRF-wide and neighbourhood-specific design and development principles which are indicative, alongside a series of plans and diagrams which are presented on an illustrative basis.</i></p>
Section 6: Neighbourhood Design and Development Principles	<p>Current massing / layout along Dantzic Street (New Town) does not take account of significant level changes. Commented that 8 storey heights along Rochdale Road inconsistent with the height density residential setting being developed by the spatial framework. Proposed 12 - 14 storey heights. <i>RESPONSE: The illustrative heights reflected in this location are deemed to be appropriate and no changes have been made.</i></p> <p>Plans reflected in the draft SRF make the assumption that the Royal Mail Centre will not be retained within the study area long-term. <i>RESPONSE: The SRF is now more clear that it does not 'allocate' sites for development but simply identifies opportunities. The SRF also now makes clear, in the Neighbourhood Design and Development Principles that the various plans presented for the neighbourhoods in this section of the SRF are illustrative representations of the SRF-wide and neighbourhood design and development principles. The SRF also makes clear that the illustrative masterplan has been prepared in response to the SRF-wide and neighbourhood design and development principles and shows how the residential-led neighbourhoods could be developed. The SRF recognises that existing businesses bring value to the regeneration potential of the Northern Gateway, and opportunities will be sought to enable these companies to thrive in the context of change. With specific reference to Royal Mail, the indicative SRF Development Framework shows a long term vision for the Royal Mail site should Royal Mail determine to re-locate in future. The existing land use plan has been amended to clearly identify the extent of the Royal Mail site.</i></p>

<p>Section 6: Neighbourhood Design and Development Principles</p>	<p>Contesting approach to heights and conservative nature of heights in specific locations. <i>RESPONSE: The illustrative heights depicted throughout the document are deemed to be appropriate and no changes have been made.</i></p> <p>Concerns raised with proposals for residential uses within Red Bank / Vauxhall Gardens - compatibility with industrial / manufacturing uses. <i>RESPONSE: A change has been made to the SRF to indicate that a mix of commercial and residential uses, rather than purely residential use, could be suitable on the land immediately adjacent to the employment site. The concerns are noted and any form of development that is proposed in this locale will need to demonstrate how it will co-exist with the employment site in terms of movements, insulation, orientation of living spaces etc.</i></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding increased vehicular movements during the construction phase and the general impact on highway network and implications / health and safety risks in moving large quantities of manufacturing materials. <i>RESPONSE: Any development proposal brought forward will be required to produce a construction management and health and safety methodology which will include traffic management, deliveries and site parking and a health and safety plan that takes into account the wider environment.</i></p> <p>Supportive of overall SRF vision and objectives but objection raised to illustrative land use plan showing 'park' on land in private ownership and for which outline planning permission has been granted for housing. <i>RESPONSE: The SRF illustrative land use plan for the South Collyhurst neighbourhood has been revised to reflect the existing planning status of the land owner. The potential Neighbourhood Park is still in the general vicinity but is no longer shown as being overlaid on the consented site.</i></p> <p>Generally supportive of the SRF however concerns raised over the illustrative 'Scale, Density and Form' plan for the New Town neighbourhood which indicates an opportunity for a distinctive landmark building with a focus on height adjacent to Dalton Street and the Emmeline residential tower. <i>RESPONSE: All plans within the SRF are illustrative only in presenting an SRF Development Framework to be used as a material consideration in the Planning process rather than being a part of the Development Plan. All development proposals will be assessed on their own merit as part of the Planning process.</i></p> <p>Concerns raised that any redevelopment of the Queens Road junction should not fail to take into account the existing property and that the building should be retained and form part of any proposal for development of the area. <i>RESPONSE: The rationalisation of the Queens Road junction is reflected in the SRF as a design and development principle relating to vehicle movements in and around the Northern Gateway area. The junction is poorly laid out and inefficient in its use of land, which detracts from the quality of the environment and place-making potential of the wider neighbourhood. At this stage the SRF provides an illustrative plan for how development could come forward in this area. However, all development proposals will be subject to a detailed design process which will include full consultation with local stakeholders including residents and businesses.</i></p> <p>Request that key active frontages are identified on subject title along the western face of the Red Bank viaduct. <i>RESPONSE: Active frontages towards Red Bank have now been reflected on the Land Use plan for the Red Bank neighbourhood. Current massing reflects heights of up to 12 storeys with a landmark building. Requested to consider a series of 20 and 26 storey buildings.</i></p>
<p>Section 7: Implementation</p>	<p>No need for independent sites to be included in wider management arrangements. <i>RESPONSE: The Implementation section of the SRF now states that "future updates to this SRF and / or separate planning policy or guidance may identify 'best practice' approaches and develop a range of management and maintenance arrangements alongside delivery partners, landowners, developers and the Local Planning Authority. The overall approach to place management within the Northern Gateway will be reflective of the diverse nature of the study area and unique management and maintenance requirements presented by the presence of the River Irk, the variety and extent of public realm and open space and the individual character of the 7 neighbourhoods."</i></p> <p>SRF must be clear it is not expected that 3rd party ownerships will be developed by the JV. <i>RESPONSE: Third party landowners can bring forward planning applications on their own land/land they control. The Implementation section of the SRF now clarifies that MCC will also work with third party landowners in bringing forward planning applications on land not controlled by the JV partnership.</i></p> <p>The SRF should be updated to give further information on the structure, approach, scale and mechanism for developer contributions to be secured and the order in which infrastructure delivery will be required. <i>RESPONSE: The Implementation section of the SRF has been updated to reflect the following text: 'All development brought forward in the Northern Gateway will be required to make developer contributions in accordance with Policy PA1 (Developer Contributions) of the adopted Manchester Core Strategy. The Local Planning Authority will secure contributions from all new developments through the use of S106 Planning Obligations. All planning obligations sought by MCC as part of new developments will be in accordance with Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010). It is proposed that further, more detailed guidance relating to infrastructure delivery will form the basis of future updates to this SRF and / or through the preparation of separate planning policy or guidance. This further, more detailed guidance will facilitate further engagement with delivery partners and key partner agencies.'</i></p>