

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Andrew
Given Name	Alistair
Company / Organisation	Manchester Airports Group (MAG)
Person ID	1287074
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Andrew
Given Name	Alistair
Company / Organisation	Manchester Airports Group (MAG)
Person ID	1287074
Title	JP-Strat 10 Manchester Airport
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Family Name	Andrew
Given Name	Alistair
Company / Organisation	Manchester Airports Group (MAG)
Person ID	1287074
Title	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not	The combined allocation JP3A Medipark / Timperley Wedge states that "Significant transport improvements are required and will need to be subject to furthermore (sic) detailed traffic assessment and masterplanning for each of the allocations. Policy JP Allocation 3.2 Timperley Wedge then goes on

<p>to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</p>	<p>to state in paragraph 16 that these will be through, inter alia, a new spine road through the site with connections to the existing road network. Paragraph 17 then sets out that it will be necessary to "Make the necessary improvements to the Strategic, Primary and Local Road Networks to enable the proposed level of development and mitigate the increased vehicle numbers including...ii) junction improvement to Thorley Lane / Runger Lane; iv) contributions to improvements at M56 J3 and Terminal 2 roundabout. These improvements are drawn from supporting documents 10.01.53 - JPA3.2 Timperley Wedge Masterplan and 10.01.58 - JPA3.2 Timperley Wedge Allocation Topic Paper. Both of these documents reference the transport conclusions drawn from the Trafford Locality Assessment. This latter document makes unsubstantiated and undeliverable assumptions about the percentage of traffic accessing / egressing the Timperley Wedge allocation utilising the Thorley Lane Bridge over the M56 motorway. It asserts that this route will link the allocation via the "Rainbow works" road scheme to the A555. The Rainbow Works is a road scheme which is an obligation on Manchester Airport to deliver with the expressed intention of improving access to / from the M56 from Terminal2 at the airport. The scheme is the subject of a S278 agreement between Manchester Airport, Manchester City Council, Trafford MBC and Highway England and has an agreed scheme design. This design feeds traffic directly into the airport campus. It is untenable for the airport to accept the levels of background traffic assumed in the Locality Assessment to be utilising the rainbow works to access / egress Timperley Wedge to transit through the Airport estate to access the A555. The airport is supportive of improved sustainable and active travel links between the Timperley Wedge allocation and the airport, but cannot support an all traffic link that would feed traffic directly into the airport site. With the current discrepancies between the policy and the supporting evidence the policy cannot be deemed to be effective.</p>
<p>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</p>	<p>The policy needs to explicitly rule out the current assumptions contained in the supporting material that the rainbow works will provide an all traffic link between Timperley Wedge and the A555.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Andrew</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Alistair</p>
<p>Company / Organisation</p>	<p>Manchester Airports Group (MAG)</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1287074</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JPA 10: Global Logistics</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Sound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>It is not considered that the scale of development envisaged by this policy should be limited as set out, and accordingly the policy soundness is in question. The evidence based "Employment Topic Paper" states that "Manchester Airport provides a major opportunity to boost the competitiveness and prosperity of Greater Manchester, and the wider UK, and support higher levels of economic growth" and that the benefits of the exceptional connections will be maximised by factors including but not limited to "completing the development of Airport City immediately around the airport, providing a total of around 500,000 sq.m of office, logistics, hotel and advanced manufacturing space." The quantum of floorspace already delivered and taken up over a relatively short period as part of the Global Logistics element of the Airport City Enterprise Zone, the size of proposed developable area as a proportion of the allocation site area suggest that the policy has not been written in a manner that will secure the requisite amount of floorspace for Employment and Logistics purposes set out in the Employment Topic paper. Restricting the floorspace figure within JPA10 cannot be said to fulfil the area's objectively assessed needs, when the Employment Topic paper recognises a shortfall in precisely the type of employment land that JPA10 is proposing to deliver. Therefore the policy fails the test of soundness on being positively prepared.</p> <p>Furthermore, the reduction in floorspace from a previous version of the plan from 40,000sq.m to the current 25,000sq.m has not been sufficiently justified. In the first instance, the proposed cap on floorspace proposed by the policy is not commensurate with the overall size of the allocated site. Secondly, whilst there will be a need to mitigate the impact of any development in respect of the site's ecology, landscape and access, the evidence base does not adequately substantiate that a greater level of floorspace could not be accommodated. On this basis, a policy restriction on floorspace is inappropriate and unjustified. It would be far more appropriate for the policy to set a minimum amount of floorspace and for future development management decisions to control the final upper amount accommodatable on site.</p> <p>Overall, given the above and the proven success of developing out Global Logistics as part of the Airport City Enterprise Zone, it is evident that the policy hasn't been effectively prepared, as a greater amount of floorspace is clearly deliverable within the plan period to meet unmet demand.</p>
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	Replace the words "around 25,000sq.m" with "a minimum of 25,000sq.m".
Family Name	Andrew
Given Name	Alistair
Company / Organisation	Manchester Airports Group (MAG)
Person ID	1287074
Title	Supporting Evidence

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>
<p>Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</p>	<p>MAG wish to see the supporting evidence for policy JPA3.2 Timperley Wedge revised to reflect the position in respect of committed road schemes (Rainbow Works) and their availability / suitability to accept general background traffic. MAG will seek to enter into discussion with relevant parties and seek to agree a Statement of Common Ground in relation to this matter in advance of any examination into the Plan.</p>