

Greater Manchester Combined  
Authority

**Integrated Assessment of the  
Places for Everyone Plan**

PfE Proposed Main Modifications  
Addendum Report

Issue | September 2023

This report takes into account the particular  
instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied  
upon by any third party and no responsibility  
is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 238244-06

Ove Arup & Partners Ltd  
6th floor, 3 Piccadilly Place  
Manchester M1 3BN  
United Kingdom  
[www.arup.com](http://www.arup.com)

**ARUP**

# Document verification

<b>Job title</b>		Integrated Assessment of the Places for Everyone Plan		<b>Job number</b> 238244-06	
<b>Document title</b>		PfE Proposed Main Modifications Addendum Report		<b>File reference</b>	
<b>Document ref</b>					
<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Filename</b>	PfE IA Addendum Report for Proposed Main Modifications		
Issue	Sept 2023	Description	Issue		
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name	EKB	JHB	JHB
		Signature			
		Filename			
		Description			
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name			
		Signature			
		Filename			
		Description			
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name			
		Signature			
		Filename			
		Description			
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name			
		Signature			
<b>Issue Document verification with document</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					

# Contents

---

	Page
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Background to the Plan	3
1.2 Purpose of the Report	5
<b>2 Methodology</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3 Reasonable Alternatives</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4 IA of Thematic Policies</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 Introduction	12
4.2 Summary of Amendments	12
4.3 Summary of Assessment	13
<b>5 IA of Allocation Policies</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1 Introduction	28
5.2 Summary of Amendments	28
5.3 Summary of Assessment	30
<b>6 Summary</b>	<b>37</b>

## Appendix A

Equalities Impact Statement

## Appendix B

Assessment of Main Modifications to the Places for Everyone Submission Plan

## Appendix C

Thematic Policies – Assessment Tables

## Appendix D

## Allocation Policies – Assessment Tables

### **Appendix E**

#### PfE Allocation Boundary Changes

# 1 Introduction

---

Following the examination of Places for Everyone (PfE), the Greater Manchester (GM) Authorities have amended PfE as a result of recommendations from the Inspectors, action points being raised during hearings and updated with minor changes for consistency and clarity. These changes are shown in the 2023 PfE Composite Plan. The background to the PfE and the history to this addendum report is explained below.

## 1.1 Background to the Plan

In November 2014, the AGMA Executive Board recommended to the 10 Greater Manchester local authorities that they agree to prepare a joint Development Plan Document (“Joint DPD”), called the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (“GMSF”) and that AGMA be appointed by the 10 authorities to prepare the GMSF on their behalf.

The first draft of the GMSF DPD was published for consultation on 31st October 2016, ending on 16th January 2017. Following substantial re-drafting, a further consultation on the Revised Draft GMSF took place between January and March 2019.

On the 30th October 2020 the AGMA Executive Board unanimously agreed to recommend GMSF 2020 to the 10 Greater Manchester Councils for approval for consultation at their Executives/Cabinets, and approval for submission to the Secretary of State following the period for representations at their Council meetings.

At its Council meeting on 3rd December Stockport Council resolved not to submit the GMSF 2020 following the consultation period and at its Cabinet meeting on 4th December, it resolved not to publish the GMSF 2020 for consultation.

As a joint DPD of the 10 Greater Manchester authorities, the GMSF 2020 required the approval of all 10 local authorities to proceed. The decisions of Stockport Council/Cabinet therefore signalled the end of the GMSF as a joint plan of the 10.

Notwithstanding the decision of Stockport Council, the nine remaining districts considered that the rationale for the preparation of a Joint DPD remained.

Consequently, at its meeting on the 11th December 2020, Members of the AGMA Executive Committee agreed in principle to producing a joint DPD of the nine remaining Greater Manchester (GM) districts. Subsequent to this meeting, each district formally approved the establishment of a Joint Committee for the preparation of a joint Development Plan Document of the nine districts.

Section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Regulation 32 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 enabled a joint plan to continue to progress in the event of one of the local authorities withdrawing, provided that the plan has 'substantially the same effect' on the remaining authorities as the original joint plan. The joint plan of the nine GM districts has been prepared on this basis. Consequently, the Plan is proceeded directly to Publication stage under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) England Regulations 2012.

Following this consultation, the plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination, as per outlined in Section 20 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Three Inspectors, William Fieldhouse, Louise Gibbons and Steven Lee, were appointed by the Planning Inspectorate to assess the plan. Hearing sessions were held in 2022 and 2023 for participants to have the opportunity to provide evidence to support the Inspector's assessment of PfE.

Following these hearings, main modifications have been proposed to the plan by the Inspectors, as permitted by Section 23 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to ensure the plan is sound and legally compliant. All proposed main modifications need to be subject to a public consultation, and where required, with accompanying evidence base work such as Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment. A separate schedule of additional modifications has been prepared which will sit alongside the Main Modifications' schedule during the consultation period. It should be noted that these have been prepared at this point in time to make the modified plan more readable. The consultation is only about the proposed main and additional modifications, rather than the merits of the plan.

The plan's content has changed over time through the iterative process of plan making, but its purpose has not. In view of this, the environmental assessments carried out at previous stages remain valid (including their scope). To assess the impact of the main modifications between the submission version of PfE and PfE with the proposed main modifications against the IA framework, this addendum report has been prepared which forms part of the overall IA/SEA and should be read in conjunction with the previously completed GMSF and PfE IA documentation. A Non-Technical Summary and revised Equality Impact Statement has also been drafted.

## 1.2 Purpose of the Report

This current report provides an update to the previous 2020 GMSF IA (inclusive of the Scoping Report, Main Report, Main Addendum Report and Growth and Spatial Options Paper), the 2021 Growth and Spatial Options Paper, the 2021 Growth and Spatial Options and Reasonable Alternatives Addendum and the 2021 Non-Technical Summary.

This addendum report is to provide consideration of the impacts of the proposed main modifications to policies, as set out in the 2023 PfE Composite Plan. This report demonstrates that consideration has been given to the main modifications as part of the iterative IA process. This has been requested to be subject to the IA process as appropriate, as outlined in the inspector's letter from the 30<sup>th</sup> of March 2023 (titled IN33 in the PfE Examination Library).

Therefore, rather than reassessing all policies again, for transparency, this separate addendum report sets out the level of change between the submission PfE plan policies and the main modifications proposed for the PfE policies and whether this has resulted in a need for a reassessment. Where the main modification was 'significant' or 'potentially significant', those policies were subject to a full reassessment. The methodology of our approach is detailed in following section.

Where there has been no material change or 'minor change', those policies were not subject to a reassessment and the assessments from 2020 or 2021 IAs stand. It is considered that this IA approach is transparent and proportionate to the level of change as a result of the main modifications as the Plan evolved through to PfE.

This same approach has been used in 2021 following the withdrawal of Stockport Council.

It should be noted that no amendments have been proposed to PfE's vision and objectives as part of this process. Therefore, as part of this process it has not felt appropriate to re-assess these as the previous IA assessments of the plan's vision and objectives still stand.

With this addendum report, a non-technical summary has been written to support transparency as part of the IA process. This is not required at this stage but is good practise to enable greater understanding of the iterative IA process and how the IA is supporting the development of the PfE.

Additionally, a refreshed Equalities Impact Statement, which forms part of the Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA), has been updated as part of the iterative IA process. EqIA is designed to ensure that discrimination does not occur in the drawing up of plans and policies, and that such plans or policies meet the requirements of equality legislation in the UK, most notably the Equality Act 2010. It is being used as part of the IA to add value and depth to the assessment process. Under the Equality Act, public bodies are required to:

- have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination
- advance equality of opportunity, and
- foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities.

In order to understand which groups of people (or individuals), may suffer discrimination, the Equality Act sets out a series of "protected characteristics":

- age
- disability
- gender reassignment
- marriage and civil partnership
- pregnancy and maternity
- race
- religion or belief



- sex, and
- sexual orientation.

EqIA is two-stage process:

- Stage 1: Screening - this involves the assessment of impacts of the strategy/plan against the protected characteristics outlined above. If no negative effects are identified during screening no further assessment is required. If there are effects that cannot easily be mitigated, a full EqIA should be undertaken.
- Stage 2: Full EqIA - this involves more in-depth assessment of the impacts of the strategy/plan, the recommendation of mitigation measures, definition of monitoring and evaluation measures and public consultation.

To ensure this IA meets the requirements of EqIA, it will consider whether there is potential for PfE policies to affect people differently based on the protected characteristics and this is reflected in the IA Framework. The refreshed Equalities Impact Statement is shown in Appendix A.

## 2 Methodology

---

A review was undertaken of the proposed main modifications to determine the extent and significance of change in the context of the IA since the previous IA work 2020 and 2021. All PfE policies were reviewed to ensure the 2023 IA was comprehensive in its assessment.

The assessment table in Appendix B depicts and summarises the review process primarily through the following headings:

- 2020 or 2021 PfE Policy Reference;
- Policy Title;
- Summary of PfE Changes;
- Reason for Change and;
- Summary of level of change in the context of the IA (minor, potentially significant, significant change).

The first step was to analyse the main modifications proposed within the 2023 PfE Composite Plan. Based on the significance of main modifications and utilising professional judgement, each proposed main modification was then identified as 'minor change', 'potentially significant change' or 'significant change', as indicated in Table 1, in terms of their potential effect on the IA objectives. 'Potentially significant change' demonstrates a precautionary approach, balanced with being proportionate.

This review was completed to assist in the reassessment of policies within this round of the IA. Any main modifications to the reasoned justification text or wider plan wording have not been considered as the IA only assesses policies within the plan.

Within the tables, an overall qualitative summary was included for each policy to explain the effect the main modifications would have on the IA scoring for this 2023 IA. This can be found in Appendix B.

Table 1: Level of change

<b>Level of change</b>
<b>‘Significant’ level of change</b> – where changes to the policy are significant within the context of the IA; therefore, a full reassessment is required.
<b>‘Potentially significant’ level of change</b> – where changes to the policy were potentially significant within the context of the IA; therefore, a full reassessment is required.
<b>No change or ‘minor’ level of change</b> – where changes to the policy were not considered to materially affect or impact on the IA Objectives; therefore, a full reassessment is not required.

It should be noted that this approach is consistent with our previous work following the evolution of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) to PfE following the withdrawal of Stockport in 2021.

For those policies identified as ‘significant’ or ‘potentially significant’ in terms of their potential effect on the IA objectives, a full 2023 reassessment was subsequently carried out against the IA Framework. Where a main modification has been identified as ‘potentially significant’ but upon assessment did not result in an assessment change to that criterion, no amendment has been made to mitigation comments. These IA matrices are contained in Appendices C and D. The previous IA matrices for these reassessed policies have also been included for transparency, as well as to demonstrate the iterative IA process.

Where main modifications to policy wording have not been considered ‘significant’ or ‘potentially significant’ in terms of their potential effect on the IA objectives, a reassessment has not taken place within this round of the IA. This is because the proposed main modifications are not considered material within the context of the IA and therefore, the previous IA assessment conducted in 2020 or 2021, is still appropriate.

Where policies have been deleted, this is considered a 'significant change' in terms of their potential effect on the IA objectives. In other policies where the deleted policy has previously been referenced, we note this as a 'potentially significant' main modification. This resulted in the other policy being reassessed to ensure any implications of the deleted policy are identified as part of the IA process.

Designations proposed as part of the plan, including Green Belt additions, have not been assessed as part of the IA. However, we have noted and acknowledged the proposed designations included within the plan. Consideration has been given to the proposed Green Belt additions as to whether reasonable alternatives would be required to be considered as part of the IA. However, the proposed additions were felt to be minor when viewed against the Greater Manchester Green Belt as a whole, therefore it was not deemed to be required.

As part of this round of the IA, we have noted and have included the plan's Appendix D to be considered as part of our assessment where it is referenced within plan policies, as this constitutes policy and therefore needs to be considered as part of the IA process.

There has also been the creation of one new additional policy, titled 'Strategic Road Network' which has had a complete IA assessment. The assessment approach is in accordance with the set IA methodology and approach utilised in each iteration of the plan for consistency. This methodology is set out in the Main IA report.

### 3 Reasonable Alternatives

---

As one of the component parts of the IA, the Sustainability Appraisal, places specific emphasis on the consideration of reasonable alternatives. Planning Practice Guidance states that:

Sustainability appraisal should predict and evaluate the effects of the preferred approach and reasonable alternatives and should clearly identify the significant positive and negative effects of each alternative. (PPG: Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 11-018-20140306).

The Growth and Spatial Options IA have been outlined and assessed in the IA Main Report and the Growth and Spatial Options Paper in 2020 and the Growth and Spatial Options and Reasonable Alternatives addendum in 2021. These reports explored the reasonable alternatives to the PfE Plan. Each of the options were appraised against the same IA Framework as used to assess the thematic and site allocations policies, with recommendations for enhancement and mitigation set out for each growth and spatial option for completeness.

For the individual policies, the main alternative considered is the “without policy” scenario. As most policy seeks to build-in some degree of environment and/or socio-economic consideration which aligns with some part of the IA, this is generally not considered to be desirable.

Please refer to the full report cited in the above paragraphs for details surround the methodology and assessment outcomes of these growth and spatial options.

It is considered unnecessary to undertake a further round of assessment of reasonable alternatives of the Plan’s growth and spatial options. This is because the proposed main modifications, as shown in the 2023 PfE Composite Plan, are felt to not impact the growth and spatial option strategies of the Plan. Therefore, the appropriate reasonable alternatives have already been considered by the IA process within 2020 and 2021.

## 4 IA of Thematic Policies

---

### 4.1 Introduction

This section presents a review of the main modifications made to PfE's thematic policies and the outcomes from the 2023 IA assessment of the main modifications. These thematic policies cover general topics within the plan, as opposed to the allocation policies primarily focusing on site-specific topics, summarised in Section 5. Where the IA objective is not relevant to the policy, it has been given a neutral score.

### 4.2 Summary of Amendments

The following section summarises the main modifications in the 2023 PfE Composite Plan in the context of the IA.

#### **'Minor' main modifications to the thematic policies:**

The majority of main modifications made to thematic policies that were considered to be 'minor' were made to ensure they were in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, to ensure consistency and clarity with amendments to phrasing or removal of sentences to avoid duplication across the plan. These main modifications were considered minor as they did not materially alter the effect of the Plan on the IA objectives. As a result, in these instances the 2020 or 2021 IA assessments were still valid and did not need to be changed.

#### **'Potentially significant' main modifications to thematic policies:**

The majority of main modifications made to the thematic policies that were considered to be 'potentially significant' were to ensure consistency of approach across the strategic policies in relation to general matters such as infrastructure provision and quality of design, to provide clarity and remove repetition across the plan. Such main modifications were considered 'potentially significant' as they had the potential to change key policy drivers, messages and could materially alter the Plan. As a result, in these instances the policies were re-assessed.

### **‘Significant’ main modifications to thematic policies:**

The majority of main modifications made to the thematic policies that were considered to be ‘significant’ were to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework, to reflect agreement with key stakeholders, to provide clarity and remove repetition across the plan. Such main modifications were considered ‘significant’ as they changed key policy drivers, messages and materially altered the Plan. As a result, in these instances the policies were re-assessed.

There is also one additional new policy added to the Plan, ‘The Strategic Road Network’. This was identified as significant and has had a complete assessment within this round of the IA.

### **Removed thematic policies:**

The removal of the thematic policies JP-S4 – ‘Resilience’, JP-G8 ‘Standards for Greener Places’ and JP-G11 – ‘Safeguarded Land’ have been noted as significant to the plan. Due to their removal, they have not been assessed as part of this round of the IA. However, the impact of their removal has been considered within the site, including the identified likely significant effects from these two policies.

33 thematic policies have been re-assessed as part of this round of IA work due to all including a ‘potentially significant’ or ‘significant’ proposed main modification, with 1 new assessment. The complete list of allocation policies is included within Appendix C.

## **4.3 Summary of Assessment**

The following section summarises the outcomes from the 2023 IA assessment of the main modifications. Therefore, where amendments to policy text have not been made, the scoring from the previous IA assessment has been carried across to this 2023 IA of the policy. Where this occurs, this has been explained within each assessment table. It is important to note that the plan is expected to be read in its entirety, with the allocation policies picking up site specific requirements.

To allow comparison with the submission plan and the 2023 PfE Composite Plan, each 2023 IA assessment includes the relevant previous IA assessment with the updated 2023 IA assessment for each policy that has been reassessed for transparency in how the policy and the IA assessment has evolved. Some policies were assessed in 2020 and some reassessed in 2021 with the withdrawal of Stockport where relevant, therefore some policies have been assessed at different dates.

The PfE policy main modifications and their resultant effect on IA scoring are summarised in Appendix C.

### **Removed Policies**

Due to the removal of the three thematic policies from the plan, they have not been assessed as part of this round of the IA. However, the impact of their removal has been considered, including the identified likely significant effects from these three policies.

#### **JP-S4 Resilience**

The 'JP-S4 – Resilience' policy would have provided support for future resilient cities, communities and centres and therefore as part of its assessment within the IA, likely positive effects were identified against objectives 1 to 13 in supporting infrastructure, accessible spaces, affordable homes and healthy lifestyles. Likely neutral effects were identified against objectives 15, 17 and 18 due to the policy not being relevant to the policy.

However, despite the removal of the thematic policy from the plan, these likely identified effects are felt to continue to occur. This is because all aspects of Policy JP-S4 were already incorporated within the plan, as noted in GMCA 21.1, with the exception being criterion 1 of Policy JP-S4, which has now been incorporated into JP-P1 'Sustainable Places' within criterion 8. Therefore, when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives are still met.



## **JP-G8 Standards for Greener Places**

The 'JP-G8 – Standards for Greener Places' policy would have provided support for enhancing the green infrastructure and therefore as part of its assessment within the IA, likely positive effects were identified against objectives 6, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15 in supporting the delivery and enhancement of green infrastructure. Likely neutral effects were identified against objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 16, 17 and 18 due to the policy not being relevant to the policy.

However, despite the removal of the thematic policy from the plan, these likely identified effects are felt to continue to occur due to text being incorporated within the plan and specifically into JP-G2 'Green Infrastructure Network'. Therefore, when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives are still met.

## **JP-G11 Safeguarded Land**

The 'JP-G11 – Safeguarded Land' policy would have provided support for safeguarded land and therefore as part of its assessment within the IA, likely positive effects were identified against objectives 1, 7, 9, 10 and 11 in supporting the delivery of development in sustainable locations. Likely neutral or uncertain effects were identified against objectives 2 to 6 and 12 to 18 due to the policy not being relevant to the policy.

However, despite the removal of the thematic policy from the plan, these likely identified effects are felt to continue. This is because while the policy has been removed to avoid confusion, with only one area of land being safeguarded, the land is covered by its own relevant allocation policy, JPA-3.2. Therefore, when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives are still met.

## **Strategy**

Ten thematic policies within the Strategy Chapter were re-assessed. A number of the strategic thematic policies removed the specific number of identified available land supply and instead moved this to the reasoned

justification text. Whilst reference to the specific number has been removed from the policy, it is considered that these policies do not change against the assessment criteria when the plan is read as a whole, as the wording remains in the reasoned justification text. Therefore, the scoring has not changed against Objective 1 or 2.

In addition, all of the strategic thematic policies have amended wording to ensure consistency of approach across the strategic policies in relation to general matters such as infrastructure provision and quality of design. For example, JP-Strat 1 has changed the reference to homes being supported by social infrastructure with a signpost of JP-D1. However, it is considered that these policies do not change against the assessment criteria when the plan is read as a whole. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended across the strategic thematic policies. Table 2 below outlines where the amended policy wording is considered to be covered in the plan.

Table 2: Amended wording and related policy

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Covered by Policy</b>
Air Quality	JP-S6 – Clean Air
Education	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places JP-P5 – Education, Skills and Knowledge
Flood Risk	JP-S5 – Flood Risk and the Water Environment
Green Infrastructure	JP-G1 – Landscape Character JP-G2 – Green Infrastructure Network
Historic Environment	JP-P2 – Heritage

Mix of size, type and tenure of new housing	JP-H3 – Type, Size and Design of New Housing
Natural Environment	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places JP-G9 – A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Necessary Infrastructure	JP-H1 – Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing JP-D1 – Infrastructure Implementation JP-C2: Digital Connectivity
Previously Developed Land	JP-S1 – Sustainable Development
Reducing Poverty and being Inclusive	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places
Social Infrastructure	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places JP-P5 – Education, Skills and Knowledge JP-P6 – Health JP-P7 – Sport and Recreation
Transport	JP-C1 – An Integrated Network JP-C7 – Transport Requirements of New Development

**Policy JP-Strat 4 – Port Salford** has been amended with added text stating *"the growth of Port Salford will be managed to reflect the creation of additional capacity in the transport network and in accordance with the requirements of policy JPA29"*. The added policy text could ensure that

employment land is well connected and well served by infrastructure and therefore has the scoring increased against Objectives 2, 3 and 9.

**Policy JP-Strat 6 – Northern Areas** and **Policy JP-Strat 9 Southern Areas** have been amended from prioritising the re use of brownfield land to *'making as much use as possible of suitable previously-developed land'* to make as much use as possible of suitable previously-developed (brownfield) land through urban regeneration. The added policy text strengthens to requirement for using previously developed and therefore the scoring has changed to very positive against Objective 17.

Policy text has also been amended removing reference to the selective release of Green Belt and safeguarded land, to *'the allocation of sites for development identified in Chapter 11 of this plan'* to ensure consistency with Green Belt changes being as those set out in Chapter 11. The amended policy text strengthens consistency of Green Belt boundaries within the plan. Therefore, the scoring has increased against Objective 11 and 17.

### **Sustainable and Resilient Places**

Six thematic policies within the Sustainable and Resilient Places Chapter were re-assessed, following the removal of JP-S4 – 'Resilience' policy.

**Policy JP-S1 – Sustainable Development** has amended the wording relating to previously developed land. The policy text now includes reference to making as much use as possible of suitable previously developed land, strengthening the requirements for using brownfield land. Therefore, the scoring has increased against Objective 17.

**Policy JP-S2 – Carbon and Energy** has had a number of main modifications to provide more clarity on expectations, be more consistent with national policy and avoid repetition within the policy. The policy text has been amended with additional wording referencing Part S of the Buildings Regulations and therefore, clarifying expectations for the number of electric vehicle charging points to be delivered. Therefore, the scoring has increased against Objective 9 and 15.

Policy text has been added with a requirement to work towards net zero carbon, including calculating unregulated emissions from 2025. The added criterion references all emissions, to clarify the approach to net zero development. Therefore, the scoring has increased to positive in the short term and very positive in the medium and long term against Objective 10.

Policy text has been added with a requirement for residual carbon emissions to be offset if they cannot be fully mitigated on-site, in agreement through a financial contribution to a carbon offset fund. Policy text has also been removed referencing keeping fossil fuels in the ground, as this is inconsistent with national policy. The added criterion provides greater clarity and aligns with national policy. Therefore, the scoring has increased against Objective 12 and 15.

Policy text has removed reference to new dwellings seeking a minimum 19% carbon reduction against Part L of the 2013 Building Regulations. However, the policy instead states that as an interim measure, development should be consistent with the 2022 Part L Building Regulations unless superseded by changes to building regulation or local/national policy. It is considered that this strengthens the policy by ensuring requirements follow the most up to date regulations. Therefore, the scoring has increased to positive in the short term against Objective 1.

**Policy JP-S3 – Heat and Energy Networks** has been amended with added wording referencing new development should be designed to enable future connection to heat/energy networks, to ensure the policy is effective. This could support the energy efficiency and resilience of the housing stock and therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive against Objective 1.

Policy wording has also been added in relation to Heat and Energy Network Opportunity Areas stating 'unless it can be demonstrated that there are more effective alternatives for minimising carbon emissions'. The added criterion references the potential for more effective alternatives for minimising carbon emissions, which allows scope for new technology in

energy efficiency and makes the policy more effective. Therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive in the long term against Objective 15.

**Policy JP-S5 – Flood Risk and the Water Environment** has been amended by added wording stating that local plans should consider setting more detailed surface water drainage policies to reflect local circumstances. Furthermore, policy wording has been added referencing the mandatory and suggested water efficiency standards. The added wording could ensure new developments are resilient to climate change. Therefore, the scoring has increased against Objective 12, 13, 14 and 18.

In addition, policy wording has been removed stating '*securing further investment in wastewater treatment to reduce the frequency of intermittent discharges of storm sewage*' to avoid duplication with Policy JP-D1. As reference to investment in wastewater treatment has been removed from the policy, the scoring has reduced from positive and very positive in the medium and long term respectively, to uncertain positive against Objective 14. However, it is considered that the assessment criteria are met when the plan is read as a whole, in particular in Policy JP-D1. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended.

**Policy JP-S6 – Clean Air** has been amended with added text to criterion 3 stating '*adverse impacts on air quality can be fully assessed and development only permitted where they are acceptable and/or suitable mitigation can be provided*'. Policy text has also been added to criterion 9 referencing '*other locations that are particularly sensitive to air quality*'. The added criteria could contribute to improving air quality within Greater Manchester. Therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive in the long term against Objective 10.

In addition, policy text has been amended to reference the Clean Air Plan, replacing the Clean Air Zone which is under review. This has not had an impact on the scoring against Objective 10.

**Policy JP-S7 – Resource Efficiency** has been amended removing reference to new development incorporating storage space to facilitate efficient recycling, to avoid duplication with policy JP-P1 criterion 10 and ensuring the plan is effective. Therefore, the scoring has changed from very positive to positive against Objective 18 and from positive to uncertain positive against Objective 12. However, it is considered that the assessment criteria are met when the plan is read as a whole, in particular in Policy JP-P1. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended.

### Places for Jobs

Three thematic policies within the Places for Jobs Chapter were re-assessed, within the context of the removal of the ‘Global Logistics’ allocation policy.

**Policy JP-J2 – Employment Sites and Premises** has been amended removing reference to working with Government and other stakeholders to increase the delivery of previously developed sites for employment use and minimise the need for Green Belt release. This change is to clarify that it is not the intention of Policy JP-J2 to suggest that district local plans will need to remove land from the Green Belt to allocate employment sites. As the policy no longer makes reference to previously developed land for employment use, the scoring has changed from very positive to neutral. However, it is considered that the assessment criteria are met when the plan is read as a whole, in particular in Policy JP-S1. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended.

**Policy JP-J3 – Office Development** has been amended, adding reference to Part M (Volume 2) Building Regulations. This addresses previously recommended mitigation on including accessibility standards in the policy. Therefore, the scoring has increased to positive in the short, medium, and long term against Objective 5.

**Policy JP-J4 – Industrial and Warehousing Development** has been amended removing specific requirements for new industrial and warehousing floorspace, to avoid repetition in the Plan. This includes

removing reference to promoting access by sustainable modes of transport. Therefore, the score has changed from positive to neutral against Objective 9. However, it is considered that the assessment criteria are when the plan is read as a whole. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended.

### **Places for Homes**

Three thematic policies within the Places for Homes Chapter were re-assessed.

***Policy JP-H1 – Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Developments*** has been amended to include text that outlines that each local planning authority will be required to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites in their district to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against the minimum delivery rates. This would ensure an appropriate quantity of housing land to meet the objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing; therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive medium term and positive long term against Objective 1.

In addition, policy text has been removed from Table 7.1's description referencing brownfield land as the predominant source of land supply over the plan period. This was to ensure consistency within policies. Therefore, the score has remained as uncertain. Furthermore, it is considered that the assessment criteria are met when the plan is read as a whole, in particular in Policy JP-S1. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended.

***Policy JP-H2 – Affordability of New Housing*** has removed wording outlining the specific figures for delivery of affordable homes has been removed. However, policy wording has been added which outlines maximising the delivery of additional affordable homes, including through local plans setting targets for the provision of affordable housing for sale and rent as part of market-led developments based on evidence relating to need and viability. Whilst reference to specific figures for the delivery of



affordable homes has been removed from the policy, the added wording provides more clarity on target setting for affordable homes. However, the scoring is already very positive and so the scoring remains the same against Objective 1.

**Policy JP-H4 – Density of New Housing** has been amended to include the requirement to achieve efficient use of land however, no amendments have been made to the policy text which considers previously developed land. Therefore, the scoring remains the same against Objective 17.

### Greener Places

Five thematic policies within the Greener Places Chapter were re-assessed, following the removal of the JP-G8 ‘Standards for Greener Places’ and JP-G11 – ‘Safeguarded Land’ policies.

**Policy JP-G2 – Green Infrastructure Network** had policy text amended that outlines how the protection, management and enhancement of green infrastructure will contribute to the development of a Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Greater Manchester, which will feed into the development of a Nature Recovery Network locally and nationally. The added criteria references protection, management and enhancement of green infrastructure and therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive long term against Objective 11a.

In addition, policy wording has been added outlining that development which involves the removal of land from the Green Belt will be required to offset the impact through identifying and delivering compensatory improvements the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt in the vicinity of the site. However, as the score was very positive against Objective 11c, the scoring remains the same.

**Policy JP-G5 – Uplands** has been updated a new criterion to ensure that new development does not have an adverse impact on protected habitats of the South Pennine Moors SAC, the Peak District Moors SPA and the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 SPA. The added criteria references policy wording to mitigate adverse impact on protected habitats. Therefore, the

scoring has increased to positive short term and very positive medium term against Objective 11.

**Policy JP-G6 – Urban Green Space** has been amended removing reference to green spaces meeting accessibility standards. Yet it is important to ensure equal opportunity for all. Therefore, the scoring changed from neutral to uncertain against Objective 5. However, it is considered that the assessment criteria are met when the plan is read as a whole, particularly Policy JP-P1 and therefore no residual impacts were recommended.

**Policy JP-G7 – Trees and Woodland** has been amended to include the requirement for development resulting in the loss of existing trees to incorporate measures that would result in a net enhancement in the character and quality of the treescape and biodiversity value in the local area, as an alternative to replacement on the basis of two trees for each tree lost. Therefore, the scoring has increased to positive in the short term against Objective 11. The scoring is already very positive in the long term and so the scoring remains the same.

**Policy JP-G9 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity** has been added to include a requirement for development to mitigate air pollution impacts on Manchester Mosses SAC and to assess and potentially mitigate boat movement, water pollution and lighting spillage and shading impacts on the Rochdale Canal SAC. Therefore the scoring has increased against Objective 10 and 14 in the medium to long term.

Policy wording has also been amended to ensure development achieves a measurable net gain in biodiversity and that development proposals should be informed by biodiversity/ecological assessments. Therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive against Objective 11 in the medium to long term.

## Places for People

Two thematic policies within the Places for People Chapter were re-assessed.

**Policy JP-P2 – Heritage** has been amended to remove specifics regarding designated heritage assets, archaeological assets and conservation areas. However, the policy now includes reference to national planning policy when considering proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets and/or their settings; therefore, it is considered that the added wording strengthens the policy by ensuring it is more consistent with national planning policy. However, the scoring is already very positive and so the scoring remains the same against Objective 16.

**Policy PJ-P7 – Sport and Recreation** has been amended removing reference to new sports facilities meeting accessibility standards. Yet it is important to ensure equal opportunity for all. Therefore, the scoring changed from neutral to uncertain against Objective 5. However, it is considered that the assessment criteria are met when the plan is read as a whole, particularly Policy JP-P1 and therefore no residual impacts were recommended.

### Connected Places

Four thematic policies within the Connected Places Chapter were re-assessed and the additional new policy, within this chapter, had a complete IA assessment.

**Policy JP-C3 – Public Transport** had policy text removed referencing the ‘Our Five Year Transport Plan’ to clarify that the reference is appropriately phrased. However, it was considered that this policy does not change against the assessment criteria when the plan is read as a whole, as the wording remains in the reasoned justification text. Therefore, the scoring has not changed against Objectives 3 and 9.

**Policy JP-C5 – Walking and Cycling** had policy text removed referencing new developments should be planned and constructed with walking and cycling as the primary means of local access, and fully integrated with walking and cycling infrastructure, to avoid duplication of the policy criterion. However, it is considered that this policy does not change

against the assessment criteria when the plan is read as a whole, in particular in Policy JP-C7 and the remaining criterion in JP-C5. Therefore, the scoring has not changed.

**Policy JP-C6 – Freight and Logistics** had a criterion added to the policy enabling the provision of overnight parking and rest areas for heavy goods vehicle drivers. It was considered that the added criterion supports infrastructure improvements that could ensure safer driving conditions. Therefore, the scoring has increased from neutral to positive against Objective 6 and from positive to very positive against Objective 3.

**Policy JP-C7 – Transport Requirements of New Development** had text added that references the layout, design and landscaping of development should prioritise the provision of safe, secure and attractive access to local services and facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and people with a disability. Therefore, the scoring has increased from positive to very positive against Objective 5. This change would also improve against Objective 9, but as the scoring was already very positive, the scoring remains the same.

In addition, main modifications have been proposed stating that “*Planning applications which are required to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment will need to consider air quality impacts on Holcroft Moss, within the Manchester Mosses Special Area of Conservation (SAC).*” The added criteria references mitigations to improve air quality; therefore, the scoring has increased to very positive across medium term and long term against Objective 10. The criterion also has a requirement for contributions towards restoration measures in accordance with the Holcroft Moss Habitat Mitigation Plan, which improved the scoring from neutral to very positive against Objective 11.

As above, Policy JP-C7 also includes an added criterion referencing overnight parking for HGV drivers increasing the scoring against Objective 3 and 6.

The new Policy – **The Strategic Road Network** outlines a requirement to work with key stakeholders to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the

planning and delivery of potential interventions on the Strategic Road Network. This had a positive score against Objective 3 by ensuring that the transport network can support and enable the anticipated scale and spatial distribution of development and improve transport connectivity. However, it scored uncertain against Objectives 9, 10, 12 and 15 due to the policy making no reference to sustainable transport, climate change or mitigation measures to improve local air quality. It also scored uncertain against Objective 4 and 5 due to the policy making no reference to equal access to transport or fuel poverty. As a result, the assessment recommended mitigation measures to address these concerns. However, it was also recognised that these recommended measures are addressed when the plan is read as a whole, in particular through policies JP-S1, JP-S2, JP-S6, JP-P1, JP-D1, JP-C1, JP-C6 and JP-C7.

### **Delivering the Plan**

One thematic policy within the Delivering the Plan Chapter was re-assessed. **Policy JP-D1 – Infrastructure Implementation** has been amended to remove specific actions for applicants regarding identification of and planning for infrastructure demand. In particular, removing referencing to minimising demand for energy, water and utility services and requiring sustainable building design. Therefore, the scoring changed to positive/uncertain or neutral against Objectives 1, 3, 9 and 15. However, it is considered that this policy does not change against the assessment criteria when the plan is read as a whole. Therefore, no residual impacts have been recommended.

## 5 IA of Allocation Policies

---

### 5.1 Introduction

This section presents a review of the main modifications made to the plan's allocation policies and the outcomes from the 2023 IA assessment of the main modifications.

The allocation policies primarily focus on the site-specific topics, and the thematic policies, summarised in Section 4, pick up the general topics. Therefore, some of the IA objectives are less relevant for most allocations as they are picked up in the thematic policies. The cross-references have generally been flagged within the assessment tables in Appendix D. Where the IA objective is not relevant to the allocation, it has been given a neutral score.

### 5.2 Summary of Amendments

The following section summarises the main modifications in the 2023 PFE Composite Plan in the context of the IA.

#### **'Minor' main modifications to the allocation policies:**

The majority of main modifications made to the allocation policies that were considered to be 'minor' were to ensure they were in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, to ensure consistency and clarity with amendments to phrasing or removal of sentences to avoid duplication across the plan. These main modifications were considered minor as they did not materially alter the effect of the Plan on the IA objectives. As a result in these instances, the 2020 or 2021 IA assessments were still valid and did not need to be changed.

#### **'Potentially significant' main modifications to allocation policies:**

The majority of main modifications made to the allocation policies that were considered to be 'potentially significant' were to ensure consistency of approach across the allocation policies in relation to infrastructure delivery, affordable housing requirements and heritage assets, to provide

clarity and remove duplication were covered by a thematic policy across the plan. Such main modifications were considered 'potentially significant' as they had the potential to change key policy drivers, messages and could materially alter the Plan. As a result in these instances, the policies were re-assessed.

**'Significant' main modifications to allocation policies:**

The majority of main modifications made to the allocation policies that were considered to be 'significant' were to provide clarity on policy requirements and consistency with thematic policies and other allocation policies across the plan. Such main modifications were considered 'significant' as they changed key policy drivers, messages and materially altered the Plan. As a result in these instances, the policies were re-assessed.

**'Significant' main modifications to allocation policies following amended boundaries:**

All boundary changes proposed to the allocations within the Plan have been considered 'significant' and therefore have been re-assessed. The following boundaries of these allocations were changed:

- JPA1.2 - Simister and Bowlee
- JPA14 - Broadbent Moss
- JPA18 - South of Rosary Road
- JPA26 - Land at Hazelhurst Farm
- JPA32 - South of Hyde

The following allocations have been noted as having their Green Belt boundary changed within the allocation boundary:

- JPA 3.2 – Timperley Wedge
- JPA7 – Elton Reservoir

We have considered the change in Green Belt boundaries within the allocations as part of the reassessment of these policies. It was found that within the re-assessments of JPA 3.2 and JPA7, the change of Green Belt boundary within the allocation boundaries did not result in changes to assessment criterion as part of this round of IA assessment.

The boundary changes considered as part of this round of the IA are included within Appendix E. The other allocation policies did not have site boundary changes.

### **Removed allocation policies:**

The removal of the site allocations 'JPA10 – Global Logistics' and 'JPA28– North of Irlam Station' have been noted as significant to the plan.

However, due to their removal, they have not been assessed as part of this round of the IA. However, the impact of their removal has been considered within the site, including the identified likely significant effects from these two policies.

All 33 allocation policies have been re-assessed as part of this round of IA work due to all including a 'potentially significant' or 'significant' proposed change. The complete list of allocation policies is included within Appendix D.

## **5.3 Summary of Assessment**

The following section summarises the outcomes from the 2023 IA assessment of the main modifications. Therefore, where amendments to policy text have not been made, the scoring from the previous IA assessment has been carried across to this 2023 IA of the policy. Where this occurs, this has been explained within each assessment table.

There have been no new site allocations added to the 2023 PfE Composite Plan as part of this process.

The plan is expected to be read in its entirety, with several thematic comments picking up wider themes and general topics. This is noted



throughout all the assessments however every individual cross reference is not specified due to the number of these. Where there is something of note, or an exception, this has been identified.

To ensure consistency between each stage of the IA, the same approach has been taken where there is no mention of a particular assessment criterion in the policy, the scoring is neutral, as it is acknowledged that it is not appropriate for every allocation to specifically address each individual assessment criteria. Additionally, IA objectives 10, 11 and 16 have several allocations where the score is both positive and negative. The negative score is due to the allocation being within or in close proximity to an AQMA, flood risk area or listed asset and the positive score given because mitigation is provided in the policy.

To allow comparison with the 2021 submission plan and the 2023 PfE Composite Plan, each 2023 IA assessment includes the relevant previous IA assessment with the updated 2023 IA assessment for each policy that has been reassessed for transparency in how the policy and the IA assessment has evolved. Some policies were assessed in 2020 and some reassessed in 2021 with the withdrawal of Stockport where relevant, therefore some policies have been assessed at different dates.

The PfE policy main modifications and their resultant effect on IA scoring are summarised in Appendix D.

### **Removed Policies**

Due to the removal of the two allocation policies from the plan, they have not been assessed as part of this round of the IA. However, the impact of their removal has been considered within the site, including the identified likely significant effects from these two policies.

### **JPA-10 Global Logistics**

The 'JPA-10 – Global Logistics' policy would have provided 25,000sqm of employment space and therefore as part of its assessment within the IA, likely positive effects were identified against objectives 2, 4 and 8 in

providing opportunities for employment, learning and skill development. Other likely positive effects included supporting the delivery of renewable energy, ecology, landscape and transportation with supporting infrastructure planned. Likely negative effects were identified against objective 17 due to the site being greenfield land.

With the allocation policy now removed from the plan, these likely identified effects would now not occur on the site. Despite its removal from the plan, it is felt this does not impact the spatial strategy of the plan with other allocations providing enough employment space to meet its identified needs, including two allocations within the Manchester Airport area, JPA-3.1 'Medipark' and JPA-3.2 'Timperley Wedge' to provide other opportunities for local residents and the Greater Manchester area. It is also felt that whilst JP-Strat 10 'Manchester Airport' is supported by one less allocation, it is still considered that this policy helps meet current and future demand for employment land. Therefore, when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives are still met.

### **JPA-28 North of Irlam Station**

The 'JPA-28 North of Irlam Station' policy would have provided around 800 dwellings with associated supporting infrastructure and therefore as part of its assessment within the IA, likely positive effects were identified against objectives 1, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Other likely positive effects included supporting the delivery of green infrastructure and supporting the surrounding priority habitats identified against objectives 11, 14 and 16. Likely negative effects were identified against objective 17 due to the site being greenfield land.

With the allocation policy now removed from the plan, these likely identified effects would now not occur on the site. Despite its removal from the plan, it is felt this does not impact the spatial strategy of the plan with other allocations providing enough residential dwellings to meet its identified needs, including two other residential allocations within Salford (JPA-26 'Land at Hazelhurst Farm' and JPA-27 'East of Boothstown'). It is

also felt that whilst JP-H1 'Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development' is supported by one less allocation, it is still considered that this policy helps meet current and future demand for residential dwellings. Therefore, when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives are still met.

### Recurring Themes

Policy wording has been amended across a number of topics across the site allocation policies to ensure consistency and clarity with amendments to phrasing or removal of sentences to avoid duplication across the plan.

For example, policies have rephrased the delivery of primary and secondary school education and introduced the signpost to Policy JP-P5. Another frequent change was policy text to have been rephrased regarding the delivery of transportation infrastructure, with the signpost to Policy JP-C7 and Appendix D included as part of the plan. In these instances, policies have often scored well due to the included signposting and therefore when the plan is read as a whole, the assessment criteria are still met.

Exceptions to this have been made where appropriate, for example where flood risk mitigation wording has been removed or modified but an allocation may be within a flood zone therefore scoring uncertain. This has occurred in the following allocations:

- JPA1.1 – Northern Gateway
- JPA7 – Elton Reservoir
- JPA12 – Beal Valley
- JPA24 – Roch Valley

No residual impacts have been recommended for these allocation policies for these main modifications. This is because the areas within each site within flood risk zones are small with flood risk matters covered by Policy JP-S5. In addition, the allocation policies outline the requirement for

comprehensive masterplanning of each site which could include proactively managing flood risk.

Table 3 outlines where the rephrased policy wording is covered within the plan.

Table 3: Rephrased wording and related policy

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Covered by Policy</b>
Air Quality	JP-S6 – Clean Air
Education	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places JP-P5 – Education, Skills and Knowledge
Flood Risk	JP-S5 – Flood Risk and the Water Environment
Green Infrastructure	JP-G1 – Landscape Character JP-G2 – Green Infrastructure Network
Historic Environment	JP-P2 – Heritage
Mix of size, type and tenure of new housing	JP-H3 – Type, Size and Design of New Housing
Natural Environment	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places JP-G9 – A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Necessary Infrastructure	JP-H1 – Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing JP-D1 – Infrastructure Implementation

	JP-C2: Digital Connectivity
Previously Developed Land	JP-S1 – Sustainable Development
Reducing Poverty and being Inclusive	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places
Social Infrastructure	JP-P1 – Sustainable Places JP-P5 – Education, Skills and Knowledge JP-P6 – Health JP-P7 – Sport and Recreation
Transport	JP-C1 – An Integrated Network JP-C7 – Transport Requirements of New Development

Text has been added and provided greater detail for some elements within the allocation policies. For example, Policy JPA30 ‘Ashton Moss’ has provided new additional policy text signposting the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Development Plan and to support the sustainable use of minerals. Therefore, the scoring for IA objective 18 criteria 1 has improved from neutral to positive. No residual recommendations were found following this policy addition. This is a common modification made to many allocation policies included within the plan. This change in scoring has been consistently applied to all allocation policies where this wording has been included.

Another example of this has been in Policy JPA22 ‘Land North of Smithy Bridge’ where new policy text has provided additional detail on the requirements to mitigate any disturbance impacts on the South Pennine Moors SAC/SPAs near to the site. Therefore, the scoring for the IA objective 11 criteria’s 1 and 2 has improved from positive/uncertain to positive. No residual recommendations were found following this policy

addition. This is a common modification made to many allocation policies included within the plan. This change in scoring has been consistently applied to all allocation policies where this wording has been included.

However, some policies have removed previously detailed references, therefore the scoring has reduced across a few objectives in some cases. For example, Policy JPA8 'Seedfield' has removed policy text regarding utility provision. Therefore, the scoring for IA Objective 3 criteria 3 has decreased from very positive to neutral. However, no residual impacts have been recommended because the plan read as a whole, and this topic is covered by policy JP-D1 'Infrastructure Implementation'. This is a common modification made to many allocation policies included within the plan. This change in scoring has been consistently applied to all allocation policies where this wording has been removed.

Another example of this has been in Policy JPA3.2 'Timperley Wedge' the removal of text regarding training and employment opportunities during the construction phases. Therefore, the scoring for IA Objective 8 criteria 2 has decreased from positive to neutral. However, no residual impacts have been recommended because the plan read as a whole, and this topic is covered by policy JP-P5 'Education, Skills and Knowledge'. This is a common modification made to many allocation policies included within the plan. This change in scoring has been consistently applied to all allocation policies where this wording has been removed.

Overall, it was found that no residual recommendations were made for the allocation policies in this round of IA assessment. This is because when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives and assessment criteria are met.

## 6 Summary

---

In summary, this 2023 IA addendum report has provided an update to the previous rounds of IA assessment as the PfE plan progresses. This report ensures that the main modifications the GM Authorities have made to the Plan through the proposed main modifications have been considered as part of the IA iterative process. Furthermore, this report provides a clear narrative on how the policies have been reassessed at this stage of the plan making process and why these conclusions have been reached.

Section 3 of this report sets out that it is considered unnecessary to undertake a further round of assessment of reasonable alternatives of the Plan's growth and spatial options. This is because the proposed main modifications are felt to not impact the growth and spatial option strategies of the Plan. Therefore, the appropriate reasonable alternatives have already been considered by the IA process within 2020 and 2021.

Sections 4 and 5 set out the results of the IA of thematic and allocation policies. Overall, it was found that no residual recommendations were made for the reassessed thematic and allocation policies in this round of IA assessment. This is because when the plan is read as a whole, the IA objectives and assessment criteria are met. Some of the scoring against the IA framework assessment criteria has changed following the proposed modifications, however it was found that no recommendations are needed to strengthen the plan policies.

The assessment of the new Policy 'Strategic Road Network' included recommended mitigation measures. However, it was also recognised that these recommended measures are addressed when the plan is read as a whole, in particular through policies JP-S1, JP-S2, JP-S6, JP-P1 and JP-C6.

# Appendix A

## Equalities Impact Statement



## Appendix B

# Assessment of Main Modifications to the Places for Everyone Submission Plan

## Appendix C

### Thematic Policies – Assessment Tables

## Thematic Policies – Assessment Tables

---

The following thematic policies have been assessed against the IA Framework in 2023:

- JP-Strat 1 – Core Growth Area;
- JP-Strat 2 – City Centre;
- JP-Strat 3 - The Quays
- JP-Strat 4 - Port Salford
- JP-Strat 5 - Inner Areas
- JP-Strat 6 - Northern Areas
- JP-Strat 7 - North - East Growth Corridor
- JP-Strat 8 - Wigan Bolton Growth Corridor
- JP-Strat 9 - Southern Areas
- JP-Strat 11 - New Carrington
- JP-S1 – Sustainable Development
- JP-S2 - Carbon and Energy
- JP-S3 - Heat and Energy Networks
- JP-S5 - Flood Risk and The Water Environment
- JP-S6 - Clean Air
- JP-S7 - Resource Efficiency
- JP-P2 - Heritage
- JP-P7 – Sport and Recreation
- JP-C3 - Our Public Transport
- JP-C5 - Cycling and Walking
- JP-C6 - Freight and Logistics
- JP-C7 - Transport Requirements of Development
- JP-J2 - Employment Sites and Premises
- JP-J3 - Office Development
- JP-J4 - Industrial Warehousing Development

- JP-H1 - Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
- JP-H2 - Affordability of New Housing
- JP-H4 - Density of New Housing
- JP-G2 - Green Infrastructure Network
- JP-G5 - Uplands
- JP-G6 – Urban Green Space
- JP-G7 - Trees and Woodland
- JP-G9 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- JP-D1 - Infrastructure Implementation
- Strategic Road Network

To allow comparison with the submission plan and the 2023 PfE Composite Plan, each 2023 IA assessment includes the relevant previous IA assessment with the updated 2023 IA assessment for each policy that has been reassessed for transparency in how the policy and the IA assessment has evolved. Some policies were assessed in 2020 and some reassessed in 2021 with the withdrawal of Stockport where relevant, therefore some policies have been assessed at different dates.

## Appendix D

### Allocation Policies – Assessment Tables

## Allocation Policies – Assessment Tables

---

The following allocation policies have been assessed against the IA Framework in 2023:

- JPA1.1 and JPA1.2 - Northern Gateway
- JPA2 - Stakehill
- JPA3.1 - Medipark
- JPA3.2 - Timperley Wedge
- JPA4 - Bewshill Farm
- JPA5 - Chequerbent North
- JPA6 - West of Wingates
- JPA7 - Elton Reservoir Area
- JPA8 - Seedfield
- JPA9 - Walshaw
- JPA12 - Beal Valley
- JPA13 - Bottom Field Farm
- JPA14 - Broadbent Moss
- JPA14 - Chew Brook Vale (Robert Fletchers)
- JPA16 - Cowlshaw
- JPA17 – Land south of Coal Pit Lane (Ashton Road)
- JPA18 - Rosary Road
- JPA19 - Bamford and Norden
- JPA20 - Castleton Sidings
- JPA21 - Crimble Mill
- JPA22 – Land north of Simthy Bridge
- JPA23 - Newhey Quarry
- JPA24 - Roch Valley
- JPA25 - Trows Farm
- JPA26 - Hazelhurst Farm

- JPA27 - East of Boothstown
- JPA29 - Port Salford Extension
- JPA30 - Ashton Moss West
- JPA31 - Godley Green
- JPA32 - South of Hyde
- JPA33 – New Carrington
- JPA34 - M6 J25
- JPA35 - North of Mosley Common
- JPA36 - Pocket Nook
- PA37 - West of Gibfield

To allow comparison with the submission plan and the 2023 PfE Composite Plan, each 2023 IA assessment includes the relevant previous IA assessment with the updated 2023 IA assessment for each policy that has been reassessed for transparency in how the policy and the IA assessment has evolved. Some policies were assessed in 2020 and some reassessed in 2021 with the withdrawal of Stockport where relevant, therefore some policies have been assessed at different dates.

## Appendix E

### PfE Allocation Boundary Changes