

## Appendix 3

### Trafford Economic & Housing Growth Framework: Consultation Responses

This report presents the full record of consultation responses made on the draft Trafford Economic & Housing Growth Framework.

The report lists all 8 responses (6 online and 2 via email) to the draft Framework made over the consultation period. The Council has taken all representations received into account in preparing the final Trafford Economic & Housing Growth Framework.

No.	Full Representation	Trafford Council Response
1	<p>I have concerns about proposed intervention 1 'Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites'.</p> <p>You state that the interventions have been identified in the context of the council's corporate objectives, GM growth ambitions as articulated in the GMSF. Yet the framework as set out in the Trafford Economic Housing Growth Framework Final report makes no reference to the proposals which have been put forward in the GMSF for Flixton.</p> <p>The figures within the report sets out a projected population growth of 5.3% to from 2012 to 2020 totalling 12,800 additional people.</p> <p>The report lists potential areas &amp; figures for new homes as:            Carrington: 5,000-7,000            Trafford Waters: 3,000            Pomona/Cornbrook: 2,000            Trafford Wharfside: 900            Total: 10,900-12,900</p> <p>Based on census figures the average household occupancy in Trafford is 2.4.</p> <p>This would suggest that the actual housing requirement for the expected population growth is 5,333 additional houses up to 2020.</p> <p>In fact the figures quoted for potential new homes would be sufficient for almost a further 5 years based on the figures provided in the report (albeit under the assumption that growth would remain at</p>	<p>The Framework has been updated to include reference to the draft GMSF allocations at Flixton Station and Timperly Wedge / Davenport Green and clarify that the figures for proposed new housing relate to the period up to 2035.</p> <p>Additional information has been added recognising the role of the rail infrastructure on the Manchester to Liverpool line.</p> <p>Other points raised are being considered as part of the GMSF process which will provide the planning framework for the delivery of the intervention. No further amendments are required.</p>

### Appendix 3

<p>the same rate).</p> <p>I therefore question the proposed necessity for such a high number of houses to be built in Trafford in this time frame when the projected population growth does not support this.</p> <p>Although Trafford Council's prospective income (as set out in the report) from such high numbers may go some way to explaining this.</p> <p>I have further concerns about the information provided within the report whereby problems have been highlighted but with no proposed solutions:</p> <p>The report states there is a rising pressure for school places within Trafford and that 9% of the projected growth up to 2020 will be in the 0-15 age bracket putting increased pressure on school places in the future. Yet the report does not address any solutions to this problem.</p> <p>The report also states a clear distinction between the north and south of the borough with the north having a much higher proportion of deprived communities, yet does not provide solutions to redress this imbalance.</p> <p>The report makes reference to the highly accessible transport network, specifically citing the motorways and Metrolink. However, there is no mention of the rail network in the report. This contradicts the GMSF which cited improvements to the rail network as being a necessary part of the proposals to include Flixton in the GMSF.</p> <p>In summary, I have major concerns that the information contained within the report is significantly different to the information contained within the GMSF and that the information being provided to the public is therefore incorrect and misleading.</p> <p>You have asked the public to consult on both this report and the GMSF when in actual fact both reports contain significantly different information, specifically in relation to Flixton.</p> <p>Therefore either one or both of those frameworks must be revised in order to accurately reflect the proposals relating to Flixton.</p>	
--	--

## Appendix 3

<p><b>2</b></p>	<p>The following comments are made in the context of Barratt's interests at land within Trafford.</p> <p>1. Proposed Growth Intervention 1 – Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites</p> <p>The Growth Framework states that Trafford will play an important role in supporting ambitious growth planned for Greater Manchester over the next few decades. This will be achieved by prioritising and bringing forward employment opportunities and housing sites which will enable this growth.</p> <p>In relation to housing - the framework aligns closely with the vision set out in the emerging Greater Manchester Spatial Framework [GMSF]. The draft GMSF states that Trafford should deliver approximately 23,100 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, equating to 1,155 dwellings per annum. However the draft GMSF only specifically allocates approximately 12,000 dwellings in Trafford, leaving a further 11,100 dwellings to be delivered from the existing urban area over the plan period. Draft allocations AG3 Timperley Wedge and WG1 New Carrington anticipate the delivery of up to 10,800 dwellings between them. Coupled with the recently approved consent at Trafford Waters, Trafford therefore places a heavy reliance on the delivery of new homes on just three large strategic sites in the borough.</p> <p>The draft GSMF also proposes ambitious job growth of approximately 28,000 additional jobs in the borough over the plan period. The delivery of a range of housing to support the Council's economic growth ambitions is therefore key to ensure adequate choice is provided, including family and executive housing for new and existing residents - in the process supporting job growth within Trafford. The framework states that Trafford has highly skilled and local residents with strong educational infrastructure. It is therefore essential that the right amount and mix of housing is delivered within the borough to ensure that Trafford is able to retain its skilled workforce and also accommodate those wishing to start a family.</p> <p>Net housing delivery in Trafford for 2015/16 was only 207 units, below the current housing trajectory target of 694 net dwellings per annum and significantly below the proposed delivery of 1,155 dwellings per annum proposed for Trafford in the draft GMSF. Indeed Trafford's most recent Annual Monitoring Report (April 2012 – March 2013) indicates that every year between 2005/06-2012/13 the delivery of housing has been below the requirement. It is clear that there is already a substantial shortfall in housing delivery in Trafford, equating to persistent under delivery in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework [NPPF]. Trafford's record of under-delivery combined with the</p>	<p>The points raised are being considered as part of the GMSF which provides the planning framework for the delivery of the interventions. Therefore no amendments are required.</p>
-----------------	---	--

### Appendix 3

<p>relatively ambitious growth set out in the draft GMSF calls into question Trafford’s ability to meet its housing requirement, particularly with such a heavy reliance on the delivery of a handful of strategic sites. Consideration should therefore be given to the allocation of a greater number and mix of smaller sites, with fewer barriers to development, which can ensure that development comes forward in the earliest stages of the GMSF plan period. The framework broadly supports this approach and states that:</p> <p>“Trafford should engage further with wider developers and landowners to understand the potential increased value of sites so more homes could be brought forward.”</p> <p>Indeed Paragraph 2.35 of the framework states that:</p> <p>“The challenge is identifying the individual barriers preventing these privately owned sites from coming forward and identifying what action needs to be taken to overcome them. This would enable the delivery of an increased number of new homes to meet current and future housing and economic growth targets.”</p> <p>Furthermore, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority [GMCA] has accepted that it is not possible to accommodate all of the proposed housing within existing settlement boundaries and therefore exceptional circumstances exist to amend the existing green belt boundaries.</p> <p>There are concerns within the development industry that many of the proposed GM Green Belt releases are not located in those parts of the sub-region where housing need is strongest, or in locations where family housing is most appropriate. This could mean that sites either take longer to come forward, do not materialise at all or do not meet needs of those in need of a home. Trafford is, however, a desirable location for developers and a high value housing market area. The framework should usefully consider the need to allocate additional, smaller sites in Trafford through the GMSF (where those sites do not fully serve the five purposes of the Green Belt Land) to help stimulate greater housing delivery.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.35 of the framework suggests that there are issues with the identification and delivery of housing sites within Trafford:</p> <p>“Identifying and bringing forward attractive sites for further development is a problematic issue for the borough. One of the challenges faced is around bringing forward privately owned allocated sites and those with planning consent for further development.”</p>	
--	--

**Appendix 3**

	<p>There are also concerns across the development industry that insufficient land has been identified in the short term, and overall, to meet the Council’s identified requirement.</p> <p><b>2. Conclusions</b></p> <p>Securing economic growth and ensuring that family type accommodation is located in areas of high demand is a key priority of the GMSF. The southern part of the housing market area, which contains large swathes of Trafford, remains a desirable location for developers and continued under-delivery in this location could have an impact on economic development whilst exacerbating issues of housing affordability. It is therefore considered that the Trafford Economic and Housing Growth Framework should encourage the identification of a greater range and mix of sites in the borough (including smaller sites) to improve housing delivery.</p>	
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Q1: Do you agree with proposed intervention 1 ‘Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Green belt should not be used. Affordable houses should be built in all areas of the borough not just already deprived areas. Pollution is a major problem and housing should not be built where pollution is worst e.g. near the Trafford Centre.</p> <p><b>Q2: Do you agree with proposed intervention 2 ‘Growth Sector Focused Academic Partnerships’?</b></p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Don't understand this proposal.</p>	<p>The points raised in relation to the Green Belt and site allocations are being considered as part of the GMSF which provides the planning framework for the delivery of the interventions. Therefore no amendments are required.</p> <p>The Framework has been clarified to note that work to deliver future workforce investment will be aligned with GM wide initiatives to maximise the potential of existing resources.</p> <p>Altrincham is Trafford’s largest town centre both in terms of</p>

Appendix 3

<p><b>Q3: Do you agree with proposed intervention 3 'Future Workforce Investment'?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>We should always invest in this but it must be carefully targeted to ensure the best results. Not sure this proposal fulfils that criteria</p> <p><b>Q4: Do you agree with proposed intervention 4 'Strategic Approach to Business Support'?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>See above</p> <p><b>Q5: Do you agree with proposed intervention 5 'Integrated Culture, Tourism and Leisure Offer'?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Parts of the borough are being depleted of these services to the benefit of other already wealthy areas.</p> <p><b>Q6: Do you have any other comments on the Trafford Economic and Housing Growth Framework?</b></p> <p>The principal town in Trafford has always been Stretford. All the emphasis is now on Altrincham just because the wealthy live there. The whole borough should be considered for economic and housing growth not just dumping the worst of the housing and business growth in the already deprived areas such as Carrington and old Trafford.</p>	<p>population and the extent of the town centre boundary. The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) 2008 identified eight sub-regional town centres within Greater Manchester, including Altrincham. The adopted Trafford Core Strategy (2012) identified four town centres within the Borough and Policy W2.2 specifically identifies Altrincham, as the main town centre in Trafford. However the Framework is clear that it supports economic and housing growth across Trafford, with strategic development sites identified across the Borough. Therefore no further amendments are required.</p>
---	--

Appendix 3

<p>4</p>	<p><b>Q1: Do you agree with proposed intervention 1 ‘Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>There is nothing strategic about building houses with no additional infrastructure to accommodate the increased traffic on an already busy congested road. Schools are already oversubscribed. Public transport is poor. And yet in a place where there are much better public transport links, you choose not to even consider. Could it be because the lovely Mr. Anstee represents these voters? Do you honestly think that older people are going to move out of their much loved “under occupied” family home? They stay there because they want to, NOT because there isn't a smaller house available.</p> <p><b>Q2: Do you agree with proposed intervention 2 ‘Growth Sector Focused Academic Partnerships’?</b></p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p><b>Q3: Do you agree with proposed intervention 3 ‘Future Workforce Investment’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q4: Do you agree with proposed intervention 4 ‘Strategic Approach to Business Support’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q5: Do you agree with proposed intervention 5 ‘Integrated Culture, Tourism and Leisure Offer’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p>	<p>The points raised in relation to the Green Belt, supporting infrastructure and development site allocations are being considered as part of the GMSF process which provides the planning framework for the delivery of the interventions. Therefore no amendments are required</p>
----------	--	---

**Appendix 3**

	<p>You say you want to improve and promote leisure facilities, and yet you plan to build on a Golf Course that is well used by the local community. You also plan on removing green belt status from a playing field that is used every day of the week and every week of the year. How is this improving and promoting leisure ???!</p> <p><b>Q6: Do you have any other comments on the Trafford Economic and Housing Growth Framework?</b></p> <p>I think that it is disgusting that the good people of Trafford / Flixton have been lied to and ignored in this process. There has been no true Consultation. The decisions seem to have already been made. Sean Anstee should be ashamed of himself. He does not represent the people of Trafford. Maybe only a few of his Cheshire cronies. As with most self-appointed, egotistical politicians, he is truly only looking after his own interests. Mayor of Greater Manchester??? I don't think so !!</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>Q1: Do you agree with proposed intervention 1 ‘Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Cos u haven’t planned this correctly</p> <p><b>Q2: Do you agree with proposed intervention 2 ‘Growth Sector Focused Academic Partnerships’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>No because you haven’t planned this correctly</p> <p><b>Q3: Do you agree with proposed intervention 3 ‘Future Workforce Investment’?</b></p>	<p>Comments are noted but there is insufficient detail to provide a response. No amendments are required</p>



Appendix 3

	<p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>No because you haven't planned this correctly</p> <p><b>Q4: Do you agree with proposed intervention 4 'Strategic Approach to Business Support'?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Blah blah</p> <p><b>Q5: Do you agree with proposed intervention 5 'Integrated Culture, Tourism and Leisure Offer'?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Blah blah blah</p> <p><b>Q6: Do you have any other comments on the Trafford Economic and Housing Growth Framework?</b></p> <p>Yes, TBC will ignore this response and any other responses they receive; I call for a new council and request an immediate vote to enable the future of this fine borough to be effectively managed, not as it is at present.</p>	
6	<p><b>Q1: Do you agree with proposed intervention 1 'Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites'?</b></p>	<p>The points raised on development at Carrington and Flixton are being considered</p>

Appendix 3

	<p>No</p> <p><b>Q2: Do you agree with proposed intervention 2 ‘Growth Sector Focused Academic Partnerships’?</b></p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p><b>Q3: Do you agree with proposed intervention 3 ‘Future Workforce Investment’?</b></p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p><b>Q4: Do you agree with proposed intervention 4 ‘Strategic Approach to Business Support’?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>Q5: Do you agree with proposed intervention 5 ‘Integrated Culture, Tourism and Leisure Offer’?</b></p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p><b>Q6: Do you have any other comments on the Trafford Economic and Housing Growth Framework?</b></p> <p>The proposed 20,000 houses in a few quarter miles between Carrington and the Trafford Centre are preposterous. The ruination of Flixton Village is even more so.</p>	<p>as part of the GMSF which provides the planning framework for the delivery of the intervention. Therefore no amendments are required</p>
7	<p><b>Q1: Do you agree with proposed intervention 1 ‘Strategic Approach to Employment and Housing Sites’?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>I noticed that building on Flixton Green belt was not a strategic development site. I thoroughly support</p>	<p>The points raised in relation to development at Carrington and Flixton are being considered as part of the GMSF which provides the planning framework for the delivery of the intervention. Therefore no amendments are required</p>

**Appendix 3**

	<p>not building on this land. The building of so many houses in Carrington would need to be phased in line with new schools and new roads. Not build all 10000 houses and sit back and wait for the inevitable chaos. Coming off the Carrington spur road off the M60 on an evening is a joke, as is joining the motorway clockwise towards junction 9 in the mornings. 10000 additional cars will kill the area.</p> <p><b>Q2: Do you agree with proposed intervention 2 ‘Growth Sector Focused Academic Partnerships’?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>Q3: Do you agree with proposed intervention 3 ‘Future Workforce Investment’?</b></p> <p>Don't Know</p> <p><b>Q4: Do you agree with proposed intervention 4 ‘Strategic Approach to Business Support’?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>Q5: Do you agree with proposed intervention 5 ‘Integrated Culture, Tourism and Leisure Offer’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Comments</b></p> <p>Need to focus more on leisure. How can you say you are investing in leisure and then taking away William Wroe Golf Course and George Carnell Centre and relying solely on investing in Urmston leisure centre which is too small. I can go to Pure gym for £20 a month with much better equipment and opening times yet you are charging over £30 for a tiny room where you can't work out as you have to wait for machines. You are relying on private gyms to provide leisure in the area so you can close down the public services and save yourself money.</p>	
8	<b>Q1: Do you agree with proposed intervention 1 ‘Strategic Approach to Employment and</b>	The point raised in relation to

Appendix 3

	<p><b>Housing Sites’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q2: Do you agree with proposed intervention 2 ‘Growth Sector Focused Academic Partnerships’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q3: Do you agree with proposed intervention 3 ‘Future Workforce Investment’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q4: Do you agree with proposed intervention 4 ‘Strategic Approach to Business Support’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q5: Do you agree with proposed intervention 5 ‘Integrated Culture, Tourism and Leisure Offer’?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Q6: Do you have any other comments on the Trafford Economic and Housing Growth Framework?</b></p> <p>No building on green belt</p>	<p>the Green Belt is being considered as part of the GMSF which provides the planning framework for the delivery of the interventions. Therefore no amendments are required</p>
--	---	---