

Specific Locations Policy 4 – Green Lane, Salford (Alternative Site)

Context

1. During the process of developing the Waste Plan, the Nasmyth Employment Area, in which the Green Lane site (also known as the former Mitchell Shackleton site) is located, was considered as an area allocation (see Issues and Options Built Facilities consultation 2008 CDC006). Following this consultation, the landowners, Sky Properties, put forward a reduced area, the Green Lane site, for consideration as a potential site allocation. This was then taken forward as part of the consultation on the Preferred Approach (CDC019).
2. Following the Preferred Approach stage of consultation, two planning applications for waste and related developments were submitted on the Green Lane site by Sky Properties. These proposals included the development of a gasification plant with operators Energos on board. These applications were refused by Salford City Council on 2 June 2011.

i) Performance in sustainability appraisal

3. The Green Lane site was initially appraised in May 2009 and graded as Band B. Salford City Council, in responding to the Preferred Option consultation, requested that the site be reappraised to take account of the following issues:
 - Restrictions to vehicular access due to a limited bridge height on Green Lane;
 - Proximity to a likely future housing development on the former Great Universal Stores (GUS) site; and
 - Proximity to the Bridgewater Canal, which is an identified site of Biological Interest.
4. The site was subsequently reappraised and again awarded a 'Band B' in April 2010. The revised Sustainability Appraisal (SA) found the site to be potentially suitable for the following enclosed waste uses: Materials Recycling Facility, Mechanical Heat Treatment, Mechanical Biological

Treatment, Anaerobic Digestion and In-Vessel Composting. Conventional Thermal Treatment (CTT) and Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT) were also listed as potentially being suitable, although the SA recognises that such uses would only be suitable if appropriate mitigation were to be employed. The SA also indicates that should the GUS site be redeveloped for housing the proximity to housing "*could lead to potential conflicts if the site is used for a waste management facility*". Salford City Council subsequently granted outline planning consent for residential development on the GUS site in March 2011.

5. Full details of the site performance can be found in the Sustainability (Re)Appraisal Proforma, which is attached as Appendix 1 to this statement.

ii) Preference for alternative uses of the site

6. CDE010 – Summary of Publication Representations and GMGU Responses sets out the detailed response from the councils to the representations made at Publication Stage (Regulation 27 and 28). In relation to the Green Lane site, pages 21 -26 of this document provide a summary of the representation made by Sky Properties and 59 – 65 the councils' response to this.
7. The following section sets out the current position with regards to the Green Lane site and potential future uses for it.

Bridgewater Canal Masterplan

8. The Bridgewater Canal Masterplan was approved by Salford City Council in March 2011. The document was approved by the city council's Lead Member for Planning as a regeneration strategy for the canal corridor and as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications¹.
9. The purpose of the study is to set out a Vision and Masterplan to establish the canal as a regional tourist attraction and to support the regeneration of

¹ Salford City Council, *Report to Lead Member for Planning – Approval of Bridgewater Canal Masterplan* (8 March 2011).
http://services.salford.gov.uk/solar/showmeeting.asp?ID=4896&MGP_ID=115

the surrounding areas². The strategy for the canal as outlined in the Masterplan is based on encouraging specific improvements and gradually developing its tourism potential with the eventual aim of creating a major visitor attraction.

10. The stretch of the canal that runs between Monton and Patricroft lies immediately to the west of Green Lane, and lies within 8m (at its nearest point) of the Green Lane site itself. The Masterplan recognises that this stretch of the canal has limited public access due to its former and remaining employment uses³. The Masterplan identifies that opportunities should be taken to promote forms of development which permit and encourage public access to the canal, with development facing on to the canal in order to animate and overlook the space.
11. The desire to develop the tourism role of the canal has been established for some time. Policy ST4 of Salford's Adopted Unitary Development Plan (initially adopted in June 2006 and saved in 2009) identifies the canal (together with the associated Worsley Village and Barton Swing Aqueduct) as one of three key tourism destinations within Salford where tourism development is to be focussed. Policy HE3 of Salford's Draft Core Strategy, published in November 2009, also promotes the development of the canal's tourism role and seeks major improvements to pedestrian and cycling facilities along its length. Salford City Council is undertaking consultation on some Pre-Publication changes to the Core Strategy, commencing on 20 June 2011, but the consultation document does not suggest any change in overall approach to the canal and its key tourism role.
12. The Masterplan does recognise that most of the employment sites to the east of the canal (i.e. within the Nasmyth employment area in which the Green Lane site is located) are operating efficiently and, given neighbour amenity constraints, it anticipates that any redevelopment opportunities will be for continued employment use. Notwithstanding this, it is critical that the redevelopment of these sites should support the Masterplan objectives in terms of enhancing the canal setting, creating positive overlooking and where possible enabling public access to and along the canal.

² Salford City Council, *Bridgewater Canal: Vision and masterplan for a regional tourist attraction* (March 2011).

³ Salford City Council, *Bridgewater Canal: Vision and masterplan for a regional tourist attraction* (March 2011), p43.

Eccles West Study

13. The Eccles West Study is being undertaken by Salford City Council in order to set out recommendations in relation to the future use of a range of existing employment sites within the Eccles area. The Green Lane site and the wider Nasmyth employment area lie within the specific scope of the study and it will therefore set out recommendations in terms of whether the site and surrounding area should remain in employment use in the short to medium term, or whether it may be appropriate to allow or encourage alternative uses to be brought forward.
14. The Eccles West Study remains to be finalised and whilst early work on the study would suggest that the wider Nasmyth area is seen as an important source of local employment worthy of protection, the Study will require political approval before it is published.

Recent Planning Activity

15. Salford City Council has cited conflict with the Bridgewater Canal Masterplan as a reason for refusal in relation to four recent planning applications (3 of which were for waste development) on or within the immediate vicinity of the Green Lane site (see Appendix 2 for details).
16. The 3 waste applications were considered against existing policies in the UDP and PPS10. All three applications were refused contrary to officer recommendations.
17. It should be noted that in refusing the applications the Panel accorded particular weight to the Bridgewater Canal Masterplan and the aspirations to develop the canal's tourism potential. Waste development was considered to be inconsistent with the canal's tourism development both in terms of its potential impact on the amenity of visitors to and users of the canal, and with regards to its conflict with the overall vision for the canal to create a major tourism and recreation attraction, as set out in the Masterplan. It is understood that the decisions on the Green Lane site are likely to be appealed by the applicant.

Summary

18. Having regard to the information above, there are clearly a number of concerns regarding the allocation of the Green Lane site within the Waste Plan as a site for waste development. These may be broadly summarized as follows:

- There are clearly major concerns at Member level within Salford regarding the potential impact waste uses could have on the city council's aspirations to promote the Bridgewater Canal as a major tourism destination;
- Bearing in mind the Bridgewater Canal Masterplan and the emerging Eccles West Study, a debate is still to be had on what is the most appropriate use for the site and surrounding Nasmyth employment area; and
- The city's Planning and Transportation Regulatory Panel has refused planning permission for waste uses on the Green Lane site, albeit against officer recommendations, citing conflicts with the Bridgewater Canal Masterplan as a reason for refusal.

These decisions are likely to be appealed by the applicant and the outcome of those appeals remains to be known.

19. Against this background a formal allocation of the Green Lane site within the Waste DPD is considered to be inappropriate as it would prevent consideration being given to a broader range of land uses that might be more acceptable and appropriate in the context of the Bridgewater Canal and the wider needs of the city. In particular a specific waste allocation has the potential to prevent any other form of development, such as general employment provision that might be more in keeping with the Bridgewater Canal, from coming forward by virtue of the fact that waste allocations must be safeguarded against non-waste uses for the lifetime of the Waste Plan.

20. The Councils' preference would therefore be not to allocate the site for waste uses but rather for it to remain unallocated so that a broader range of uses can come forward, once the way forward for this particular part of Salford has been agreed at a political level and the outcome of any appeal against refusal of planning permission is known. Notwithstanding this preference, should the Inspector consider that there is merit in allocating the site for waste development then it is recommended that any such allocation be carefully worded so as to require that any such development

have regard to the proximity of the Bridgewater Canal, to be of an appropriate design quality and to both complement and, where appropriate, assist in the canal's development as a key tourism destination.

iii) Would inclusion of the additional site make the DPD unsound

21. The plan has already made provision over and above the specific capacity requirements for built waste management facilities as identified by the Needs Assessment (TD009 & TD010) through policies 4 and 5 of the Waste Plan. This provision is to allow for the following:

- the emergence of new technologies to come forward;
- flexibility in provision of facilities across the conurbation to meet local needs; and
- a choice of locations to potential developers in order to meet their requirements.

22. Chapter 2 of the Submitted Waste Plan identifies the waste capacity requirements in Greater Manchester over the plan period. In terms of built facilities which could come forward at Green Lane, the plan has an identified capacity gap for energy recovery and this is set out under Policy 1, page 37.

23. Policy 4 Site Allocations and Policy 5 Area Allocations identify locations across Greater Manchester where such facilities could come forward over the plan period, this includes locations close by within Trafford Park where talks with landowners have been held to bring forward similar technologies as those proposed in the current planning application on the Green Lane site. The locations within Trafford Park are less constrained by access and more compatible with surrounding uses than the Green Lane site and could therefore be considered as more appropriate locations for such development, as well as being closer to the waste producers. Furthermore, Policy 5 identifies areas where waste development may be suitable (4 of which are within Salford), therefore this is considered sufficient to meet the needs of Greater Manchester and the local area of Salford over the plan period without the need to allocate additional sites within the plan.

Appendix 1: Green Lane SA Proforma

Greater Manchester Joint Waste Development Plan Document – Sustainability Appraisal of Sites

The proforma is structured as follows:

1. **Introduction** (provides basic information including site name, location, size etc.)
2. Appraisal against **Level 1 criteria** - the performance of the site in relation to national and international considerations (e.g. wildlife and landscape designations). The failure of a site to 'pass' Level 1 may mean that the site is discounted from further consideration and no further information on it is assembled.
3. Appraisal against **Level 2 criteria (constraints)** - the performance of the site in relation to local considerations including the environmental, social and economic setting (e.g. local conservation designations).
4. Appraisal against **Level 2 criteria (opportunities)** – the performance of the site in relation to considerations which lend weight to its potential allocation (e.g. potential water or rail access, proximity to waste source etc.)
5. Appraisal against **deliverability criteria** – the performance of the site in relation to various practical aspects of bringing the site forward (e.g. land ownership, contamination etc.)
6. **Conclusions** on the site (conclusions on the relative merits of the site for landfill or waste management and, in the case of the latter, the potential uses for the site in terms of different waste technologies). A traffic light classification for overall site performance is used. However, this is *indicative* and does not represent the final decision on whether or not the site will be taken forward for consultation / allocation.

Key issues

- It should be noted that the various criteria will not be weighted (although a failure to pass Level 1 will mean that the site is unlikely to be taken forward).
- For some sites, the proforma will be filled in on a gradual basis as more information emerges about the site and its suitability for particular waste management uses. Some criteria may therefore be scored initially as 'not assessed'

INTRODUCTION	
Site name: Mitchell Shackleton Site	Map(s) (including inset map showing location in district / County context)
Site reference number: SL10	
Town: Eccles	
District: Salford	
Description of site (inc. existing land use): Site located within the wider Nasmyth and Lyntown Industrial Estate (JWDPD Site Ref SL4) which was assessed during Stage Two Issues and Options: Built Facilities.	
Description of surrounding uses: Canal running north to south on western boundary, motorway flyover on the northern boundary with industrial units to the south.	Photo(s)
OS grid reference: Easting: 376396 Northing: 399077	
Size (ha): 3.6	
Date of appraisal: 26 th May 2009 (re-appraised 13/04/10)	
Appraised by: Lyndsey Regan (re-appraised by Sam Rosillo)	
Source of site suggestion (e.g. third party): Indigo Planning Ltd on behalf of Chester Developments	

LEVEL 1 CRITERIA	
<p>1. Is the site in proximity to and / or likely to impact on internationally designated sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation, RAMSAR Sites)?</p> <p>[For the purposes of completing the proforma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 5km of a European Site. Impact will be determined through a separate Habitats Regulations Assessment / Appropriate Assessment.]</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 13</p>	<p>Determined through Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) / Appropriate Assessment (AA)</p> <p>No</p>
<p>2. Is the site in proximity to a Site(s) of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)?</p> <p>[For the purposes of completing the proforma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 2km of a SSSI. The proforma will record any reasonably anticipatable impacts arising from waste management activities on the site on SSSIs within 2km.]</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 12</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>3. Is the site located within or in proximity to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or National Park?</p> <p>[For the purposes of completing the proforma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 5km of an AONB or a National Park (except in relation to impacts arising from the transportation of waste where, in some cases, it may be appropriate to examine impacts over a greater distance). The proforma will record any reasonably anticipatable impacts arising from waste management activities on the site on AONB or National Park within 5km.]</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 10</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>4. Is the site in proximity to a site or building with a nationally recognised designation (Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Historic Battlefields and Registered Parks and Gardens)?</p> <p>[For the purposes of completing the proforma, proximity will be taken to mean that the site is within 250m of a site with a nationally recognised designation. The proforma will record any reasonably anticipatable impacts arising from waste management activities on the site on sites with a nationally recognised designation within 250m.]</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 9, 18, 20 & 22</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Monton Green Conservation Area lies approximately 250m north of site boundary on other side of M602. This is protected under Policy CH3/7 of the UDP and its boundary is defined on the proposals map. Unnamed Grade II Listed Building lies 250m south of site boundary on other side of railway line.</p>
<p>5. Is the site located within or in proximity to a Major Aquifer or Source Protection Zone 1 or 2?</p> <p>This criterion only applies to sites that could be allocated for landfill or land raising</p> <p>[For the purposes of completing the proforma, any site proposed for use as landfill located within or near to a Major Aquifer or SPZ Zone 1 or 2 will not be taken forward.]</p> <p>[Note that there are three types of landfill: inert, non-hazardous or hazardous. There is unlikely to be any difference in the location criteria for new non-hazardous and hazardous landfill, as they will have to be located in areas which present no risk to groundwater.]</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 6 & 7</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Southern half of site lies over a major aquifer.</p>
<p>Should the site be taken forward for further consideration?</p> <p>Are there any issues arising from Level 1 which need to be carried forward?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Site is not suitable for Landfill due to close proximity to major aquifer.</p> <p>Any development will have to consider the impacts on the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Building.</p>

LEVEL 2 CRITERIA - CONSTRAINTS	
Communities	
6. Is the site within 250m of individual houses / dwellings?	<p>Yes</p> <p>Approximately 80m north of site boundary separated from site by M602.</p> <p>Approximately 180m west of site boundary separated from site by canal.</p> <p>Approximately 250m south of site boundary separated from site by railway track.</p>
7. Is the site within 250m of a settlement?	<p>Yes</p> <p>The site is within the urban area, surrounded by residential areas of Monton (approx 300m to centre), Patricroft and Winton (approx 400m to centre) all within 250m from the site boundary.</p> <p>Eccles town centre also close by.</p>
8. Is the site within 250m of any other sensitive receptors existing or proposed (e.g. schools, hospitals, sensitive business uses, airfields, public or outdoor recreation uses, public rights of way, tourist / visitor attractions)?	<p>Yes</p> <p>Patricroft Railway Station is located approx 250m south of the site.</p> <p>There is a recreation area / public open space located immediately to the north east of the site (separated from the site by the M602), which comprises a locally equipped area for play (LEAP) at Shackleton Street</p> <p>The Bridgewater Canal (towpath/recreation route) lies within 20m of the site, to the west of Green Lane.</p>
Protection of water resources and managing flood risk	
9. Is the site within zones 2 or 3 of the floodplain or in an area with a history of groundwater flooding?	<p>No</p>
GIS Constraints Plan 5	
10. Are there likely to be other impacts on the quality and quantity of groundwater or on surface water drainage?	<p>Possibly needs testing – Bridgewater Canal runs along the western boundary of the estate.</p>
Land instability	
11. Is the site subject to any known stability issues? [In completing the proforma, this criterion is likely to have a standard response in almost all cases – 'Possibly – no known problems but needs to be investigated later in the planning process']	<p>Possibly – no known problems but needs to be investigated later in the planning process.</p>

Landscape and visual intrusion	
<p>12. Is the site located within or in proximity to any area designated for its local landscape importance* or is it likely to have adverse impacts on the landscape?</p> <p>* According to PPS7, the Government recognises and accepts that there are areas of landscape outside nationally designated areas that are particularly highly valued locally. The Government believes that carefully drafted, criteria-based policies in LDDs, utilising tools such as landscape character assessment, should provide sufficient protection for these areas, without the need for rigid local designations that may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas.</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 11</p>	<p>Yes – the site lies adjacent to the Bridgewater Canal which is identified within the UDP as a Site of Biological Importance (Policy EN8/2) for its priority habitat.</p>
<p>13. Does the site have public footpaths and rights of way?</p>	<p>No</p>
Green Belt and Strategic Gaps	
<p>14. Is the site in the Green Belt? If so, would location of a facility here be consistent with the proximity principle, would it cause harm to the objectives of Green Belt designation, and are there alternative sites?</p> <p>GIS Constraints Plan 17</p>	<p>No</p>

Nature conservation	
<p>15. Is the site home to protected species and / or habitats? [In completing the proforma, this criterion is likely to have a standard response in almost all cases – 'Uncertain – needs to be investigated later in the planning process']</p>	<p>Uncertain – needs to be investigated later in the planning process.</p>
<p>16. Is the site in proximity to areas designated to be of local nature conservation importance? GIS Constraints Plan 24 & 25</p>	<p>Yes – the site lies adjacent to the Bridgewater Canal which is identified within the UDP as a Site of Biological Importance (Policy EN8/2) for its priority habitat.</p>
<p>17. Is the site in proximity to woodlands including ancient woodlands? GIS Constraints Plan 23</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>18. Is the site in proximity to Regionally Important Geological / geomorphological Sites (RIGS) and other sites identified for their geological or geomorphological importance?</p>	<p>Possibly – needs testing Data not currently available. This will be updated when data is available.</p>

Historic environment and built heritage	
19. Is the site in proximity to archaeological sites or remains?	Possibly – needs testing Unlikely
Traffic and access	
20. How suitable is the road network to accommodate the transportation of waste / products from resource recovery to and from the site? [In practice, sites should be excluded if they are known to have inadequate local access which cannot reasonably be improved (for engineering or environmental reasons) to the standard required for handling substantial numbers of lorries.]	Record details of the nature / classification of the relevant roads and any potential problems (e.g. in terms of lack of road capacity or existing congestion) Site is locally quite accessible; however links to nearby main routes such as the M602 would be though already congested residential/commercial areas. The height of the bridge to the south of the site is restricted.
21. Are lorries likely to pass through settlements on their way to the primary road network and are adverse impacts on amenity likely?	Yes Site is locally quite accessible; however links to nearby main routes such as the M602 would be through already congested residential/commercial areas. The restricted height of the bridge that crosses Green Lane (the Liverpool – Newton – Manchester rail line) to the south of the site would prevent heavy goods vehicles/high sided vehicles accessing the site from the south. All HGVs would therefore need to access the site via B5229. In combination with large vehicles using neighbouring industrial/business uses, this would increase the amount of traffic using this route.
Air emissions, including dust	
22. Impact of dust, fumes and emissions to air on nearby residents / sensitive receptors	Record potential impacts Any dust, fumes and air emissions could impact the nearby households, railway station, Bridgewater Canal and the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II listed building. Dust, fumes and air emissions may also have a negative impact on the Shackleton Street Recreation Area and the LEAP close to the site. The cumulative effects of the dust, fumes and air emissions from a potential new waste management facility and traffic from the M602 is an issue.
23. Is the site located in or close to an existing Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)? GIS Constraints Plan 21	Yes Site covered by AQMA due to proximity to M602 and A57.

Disruption to amenity	
24. Potential for adverse impact of odours on nearby residents / sensitive receptors	Record potential impacts Nearby households, railway station, Bridgewater Canal, the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Building, the Shackleton Street Recreation Area and the LEAP may be impacted by odours from the site.
25. Potential for adverse impact of vermin and birds on nearby residents / sensitive receptors	Record potential impacts Nearby households, railway station, Bridgewater Canal, the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Building, the Shackleton Street Recreation Area and the LEAP may be impacted by vermin and birds from the site.
26. Potential for adverse impact of noise and vibration on nearby residents / sensitive receptors	Record potential impacts Nearby households, railway station, Bridgewater Canal, the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Building, the Shackleton Street Recreation Area and the LEAP may be impacted by noise and vibration from the site.
27. Potential for the creation of a litter hazard	Record potential impacts Nearby households, railway station, Bridgewater Canal, the nearby Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Building, the Shackleton Street Recreation Area and the LEAP be impacted by the creation of litter.
Aircraft hazard	
28. Could waste management facilities at the site attract birds and pose a hazard to aircraft?	Record potential impacts Site lies within safeguarding zone for Manchester Airport therefore airport should be consulted. Site lies approximately 2.5km west of City Airport (formerly Barton Aerodrome) and should be consulted.
Agricultural land	
29. Is the site located on the best and most versatile agricultural land? GIS Constraints Plan 8	No

Cumulative Impacts	
30. Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on the perceived environmental quality or character of the area?	Possibly Some forms of waste facility would impact upon the environmental quality and character of the area, but built, enclosed facilities will have no more adverse impact than the industrial uses close to the site.
31. Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities?	No The use of the site for waste facilities is unlikely to inhibit social cohesion or inclusion in nearby communities.
32. Will locating a new landfill / waste management facility on the site, in conjunction with other development including waste-related development in the vicinity, be likely to inhibit or to promote the economic potential of the area?	No A well managed built waste facility is unlikely to inhibit the economic potential of the area.

LEVEL 2 CRITERIA - OPPORTUNITIES	
Accessibility and sustainable transport	
33. Does the site have good accessibility from existing urban areas or major new or planned development (i.e. the major sources of waste arisings)?	Yes
34. Is there a navigable waterway or wharf adjacent or very close to the site?	No
35. Is there a railway line suitable for freight traffic adjacent or very close to the site? [It may also be useful to consider if there is also a railway siding adjacent or very close to the site.]	Yes However, there is no opportunity to introduce sidings which would be required for loading/unloading of materials.
Existing use for waste management	
36. Is the site already in use for waste management?	No
37. If the site is already in use for waste management, does it have good transport connections?	N/a

Co-location and compatible land uses	
38. Is the site located in an area of major new developments?	<p>Yes</p> <p>The Salford Employment Land Review reported that the former Great Universal Warehouse site (bounding the Bridgewater Canal to the west) could be redeveloped for non-employment / housing use. If this new development goes ahead, then there could potentially be a new housing development close to the site.</p>
39. Would the site allow for the co-location of waste management facilities?	<p>Yes</p> <p>The size of the site and its rectangular layout means that a combination of uses could be accommodated.</p>
40. Would the site allow for the co-location with complementary activities?	<p>No</p> <p>Site is unlikely to be big enough.</p>
41. Is the site an active mineral working site?	<p>No</p>
42. Is or has the site been subject to an employment land use?	<p>Yes</p>
43. Is the site contaminated or derelict land?	<p>Possibly due to the nature of the industrial past in the area</p>
44. Is the site used for sewage treatment works or adjoin a sewage treatment works?	<p>No</p>
The efficient use of land	
45. Is the site previously developed land?	<p>Yes - Previously developed land</p>
Heat and / or power generation	
46. Could development at the site generate heat and / or power?	<p>Possibly – needs testing</p> <p>Agent suggests that owners are investigated potential for AD.</p>

ISSUES OF DELIVERABILITY	
Potential land use conflict	
47. Are there any potential land use conflicts (e.g. active or permitted mineral sites, where the location of a waste facility would sterilise permitted mineral reserves)?	No
Land ownership	
48. Are there any issues of land ownership that could prevent development on the site being delivered?	No – site put forward by current owners.
Planning history	
49. Does the planning history of the site caution against its allocation?	No
50. Has the site previously been used for waste management if it is not currently being used as such?	No
Water supply and wastewater treatment	
51. Can adequate provision be made for water supply and wastewater treatment?	Possibly – needs testing but likely as this is existing industrial estate.

CONCLUSIONS ON THE SITE

Record conclusions on the general merits of the site for accommodating waste management facilities

This large site is clearly derelict and subject to vandalism. As part of the wider Nasmyth and Lyntown industrial estate this site would benefit from a suitable waste management facility.

Agent submitting site suggests clients are investigating several waste uses on the site, including materials Recovery Facility, Mechanical Biological Treatment and Anaerobic Digestion. Agent also suggests that the site offers locational benefits for a waste treatment and power plant as it is located within the urban area but at a distance from houses.

Issues relating to surrounding residential area, Grade II Listed Buildings, railway station, Bridgewater Canal, nearby Conservation Area and Shackleton Street recreation area and public open space. Access to the primary road network is an issue, as there are restrictions due to the low bridge to the south of Green Lane. This will mean that there is likely to be a small percentage of vehicles that will not be able to access the site under the bridge along Green Lane.

The Salford Employment Land Review reported that the former Great Universal Warehouse site (bounding the Bridgewater Canal to the west) could be redeveloped for non-employment / housing use. If this new development goes ahead, then there could potentially be a new housing development close to the site. This could lead to potential conflicts if the site is used for a waste management facility.

POTENTIAL WASTE MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGIES

According to PPS10, WPAs should identify the type or types of waste management facility that would be appropriately located on the allocated site or in the allocated area, taking care to avoid stifling innovation in line with the waste hierarchy.

In light of this, an appraisal of the suitability of the site for accommodating a range of waste management facilities has been undertaken with reference to Government guidance - ODPM (2004) Planning for Waste Management Facilities – A Research Study. The suitability of the site in relation to a range of facility types has been indicated using a series of symbols (✓✓, ✓, X etc.) and a commentary provided.

Facility type	Broad suitability	Comments
A Landfill / Landraise	X	The southern part of the site is located on a major aquifer and the site is too close to settlements / residential to be considered appropriate for landfill.
B Open Air Waste Management Recycling Facilities	X	Open facilities inappropriate due to proximity to settlements / residential, Conservation Area, Grade II listed building, Bridgewater Canal and employment.
C Open Windrow Composting (OWC)	X	Open Windrow Composting is not suitable on this site due to the proximity to settlements / residential, Conservation Area, Grade II listed building, Bridgewater Canal and employment.

D Conventional Thermal Treatment (CTT)	✓	The site is large enough (3.6 ha) to accommodate a CTT facility however the site is not ideal due to proximity to housing. Should the above constraints be overcome / mitigated for, CTT may be appropriate on this site if a CHP facility were incorporated that could provide heat and power for nearby areas.
E Advanced Thermal Treatment (ATT), including Gasification and Pyrolysis	✓	The site is large enough (3.6 ha) to accommodate a ATT however the site is not ideal due to proximity to housing. Should the above constraints be overcome / mitigated for, ATT may be appropriate on this site.
F Material Recycling Facility (MRF)	✓✓	If a MRF were situated on-site as far as possible from nearby housing and other sensitive receptors, a MRF may be appropriate on this site. Given that it is an enclosed facility, use of the site as such would have a minimal impact on nearby sensitive receptors.
G Mechanical Heat Treatment (MHT)	✓✓	If a MHT facility were situated on-site as far as possible from nearby housing and other sensitive receptors, it may be considered appropriate on this site. Given that it is an enclosed facility, use of the site as such would have a minimal impact on nearby sensitive receptors.
H Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)	✓✓	If a MBT facility were situated on-site as far as possible from nearby housing and other sensitive receptors, it may be considered appropriate on this site. Given that it is an enclosed facility, use of the site as such would have a minimal impact on nearby sensitive receptors.
I Anaerobic Digestion (AD)	✓✓	The enclosed nature of an AD facility means that only very limited impacts are likely on sensitive receptors.
J In-Vessel Composting (IVC)	✓✓	The enclosed nature of an IVC facility means that this site is appropriate for IVC, with only very limited impacts on sensitive receptors likely from such a facility.

Potential mitigation measures	
<p>In light of the appraisal above, are there any potential mitigation measures which might be necessary for development on the site?</p>	<p>Record any potential mitigation measures and the rationale behind these</p> <p>Planning conditions may be needed in respect of the licensing regulations for waste facilities; the transport route to be used and hours of operation (important for this site due to proximity of houses).</p>

Overall site performance			
Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D
<p>Record which band A – D the site has been categorised as being under</p> <p>Band B</p> <p>It is considered that this site should be classified as Band B. There are some amenity issues facing the site such as the close proximity of residential development, the Bridgewater Canal, Grade II Listed Building, the railway station, the nearby Conservation Area and the recreation area encompassing a LEAP, all of which mean that the site is not suitable for external facilities. There are also issues in relation to the restricted height of the bridge to the south of the site and the potential new use for the former Great Universal Warehouse site.</p> <p>However, the size of the site (3.6 ha) means that there is potential for the location of enclosed facilities, subject to the amenity considerations mentioned above.</p> <p>Open Windrow Composting, Open Air Waste Management facilities and Landfill are all inappropriate due to proximity of sensitive receptors.</p> <p>The site should be taken forward for consideration for built enclosed WMFs.</p>			
<p>Should this site be taken forward for further consideration?</p> <p>Yes</p>			

Appendix 2: Planning History

24. Salford City Council has cited conflict with the Bridgewater Canal Masterplan as a reason for refusal in relation to four recent planning applications on or within the immediate vicinity of the Green Lane site (see appendix 2 for details).
- i) 09/58155/OUT – Former GUS Home Shopping Warehouse, Worsley Road: Outline application including means of access for the redevelopment of part of former GUS Site to provide new business units B1 (C) / B2 retention and refurbishment of existing warehouse, car parking and landscaping⁴.
 - ii) 10/59552/FUL – Units F3 to F5 Nasmyth Business Centre, Green Lane: change of use to a waste transfer centre, part demolition and alterations to existing warehouse to form new workshop and office facility with space for the crushing and stockpiling of crushed and uncrushed materials with ancillary car parking⁵.
 - iii) 10/59092/FULEIA – Former Mitchell Shackleton site, Green Lane: erection of an energy from waste gasification plant, turbine generation room, air cooled condensers and associated plant together with site access, weighbridge and security building, car parking and landscaping⁶.
 - iv) 10/59093/OUTEIA – Former Mitchell Shackleton site, Green Lane: outline application for the development of a non-hazardous waste treatment and recovery centre comprising of buildings and ancillary infrastructure for the recycling of up to 100,000 tonnes of waste and the anaerobic digestion of up to 60,000 tonnes of waste, bulking and transfer of waste, the production of refuse derived fuel, the generation of energy together with associated offices, site access, weighbridge, service and parking area, water treatment, internal roadways, lighting and landscaping⁷.
25. It should be noted that the two most recent decisions relate to the Green Lane / Mitchell Shackleton site itself, and the application for Units F3 to F5 on Nasmyth Business Centre relate to a site located immediately to the south.

⁴ Application refused by Salford City Council Planning and Transportation Regulatory Panel on 18 February 2010.

⁵ Application refused by Salford City Council Planning and Transportation Regulatory Panel on 19 May 2011.

⁶ Application refused by Salford City Council Planning and Transportation Regulatory Panel on 2 June 2011.

⁷ Application refused by Salford City Council Planning and Transportation Regulatory Panel on 2 June 2011.