

**APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720: LAND OFF WARBURTON LANE**

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND: LANDSCAPE**

**AGREED BETWEEN TRAFFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL,  
REDROW HOMES AND WARBURTON PARISH COUNCIL  
AND SIGNED ON 4<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2020**

**APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720: LAND OFF WARBURTON LANE****STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND: LANDSCAPE**

1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) addresses matters relating to landscape character and views. It has been agreed between Redrow Homes North West (herein referred to as 'the Appellant'), Trafford Borough Council (herein referred to as 'TBC' or 'the Council') and Warburton Parish Council (herein referred to as 'WPC'). It sets out the matters on which the parties agree and where there are matters of difference between the parties.
2. The appellant submitted an Environmental Statement (ES) with the application and Chapter 6 prepared by The Environment Partnership (TEP) Limited addresses Landscape and visual amenity. This SoCG refers to the ES Chapter 6; the method of assessment set out at ES Appendix 6.1; the LVIA Tables in ES Appendix 6.2; and the accompanying Figures which are in the ES Appendix 6.2.3.
3. The ES was prepared to support three planning applications and considered the effects of developing Site 1, the effects of developing Site 2 and the effects of developing Sites 1 and 2 together. For the purposes of this appeal, the assessment of effects of developing Site 1 and Site 2 together (with up to 400 homes) are most relevant (from paragraph 6.241 in the middle of page 60 to the end of the Chapter).
4. On the 5th March 2020, an ES Addendum (CD B4) was submitted. The Addendum revisits ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual Amenity in order to consider changes to the proposals that had occurred since the ES was prepared. It is agreed that the changes would not be so great as to give rise to different conclusions when applying the LVIA Methodology. On this basis, the addendum confirms that the effect on landscape character and visual receptors are unchanged from the conclusions set out in Chapter 6 of the original ES.
5. The topics covered below are presented in the same order as they appear in the ES Chapter 6.

### Assessment Method

6. The parties agree that the Assessment Method summarised at paragraphs 6.44 – 6.53 of the ES Chapter 6 and in ES Appendix 6.1 is appropriate, consistent with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3) 2013 and has been applied appropriately in the appellant's assessment, with the exception that WPC considers that GLVIA3 paras 5.33 and 5.9 have not been applied correctly to Site 2.
7. The Appellant and TBC agree that the Study Area shown at Figure 6.5 is appropriate for the consideration of the likely important effects on landscape character and on views. WPC disagrees with the extent of the study area and suggests that it should have included Warburton Bridge (to the west), Paddock Lane (to the south) and Dunham Road (to the south).

### Visual Receptors

8. The parties agree that the visual receptors identified in Table 6.3 on pages 25-26 of the ES are appropriate. The parties agree that the Representative Viewpoints 1–12 are appropriate to consider the likely effects on the receptors identified.

### Designations and 'Valued Landscape'

9. The parties agree that there are no statutory or other designations of landscape quality that apply to the site or the study area.
10. The Appellant and TBC agree that the site, study area and land adjacent the study area do not comprise a valued landscape to which National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 170 applies.
11. WPC disagrees and maintains that the site, study area and land adjacent comprise a valued landscape to which NPPF Paragraph 170 applies.

### Published Landscape Character Assessments

12. The parties agree that the following published landscape character assessments are relevant to the site and surrounding area:

- Greater Manchester Landscape Character Assessment's Landscape Character Area 44: Warburton and Carrington Mosses;
- National Character Area Profile 60: River Mersey;
- Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 Landscape Character Type Settled Sandlands Sub-Area Warburton Park Farm/Mossland Fringe.

13. The parties agree that the Greater Manchester Landscape Character Assessment was not considered in the appellant's ES Chapter 6. The parties agree the summary of the other two published landscape character assessments in the ES Chapter 6 paragraphs 6.59 – 6.69. WPC notes that the National Character Area Profile 60: River Mersey covers a substantial area and is considerably less specific than the other two Landscape Character Assessments.

#### Site Description and Study Area

14. With the exception of the absence of any reference to the historic Warburton Deer Park, which is located to the west of Warburton Lane, and reference to the presence of Important Hedgerows, the parties agree the description of the site and study area presented in the ES Chapter 6 at paragraphs 6.70 – 6.81.
15. WPC's position is that they recognise the Park as an historic 'designed landscape', which whilst not statutorily designated as such is a valued landscape and, in their view, an exceptionally important heritage asset and heritage setting for most of the village of Warburton.

#### Landscape Value, Susceptibility to Change and Sensitivity

16. The Appellant and TBC agree that the site and the study area are of local landscape value. WPC agrees with this position in so far as land to the east of Warburton Lane (Site 1) but considers that the land to the west of Warburton Lane (Site 2) is of regional landscape value.
17. WPC also disagrees with Table 6.4 Landscape Value on the basis that in their view, it does not recognise a designed landscape, its rarity or influence in the morphology of the village etc. TBC agrees that Table 6.4 should acknowledge the presence of the historic Deer Park.

18. The Appellant and TBC agree that the site and the study area are of medium susceptibility to change of the nature comprised in the appeal proposals. WPC agrees with this position in so far as Site 1 but considers that Site 2 is of high susceptibility to change.
19. The Appellant and TBC agree that overall the landscape of the site and the study area is of Medium sensitivity. WPC agrees with this position in so far as Site 1 but considers that Site 2 is of medium to high sensitivity to change.

#### Baseline Views

20. The parties agree the description of baseline views set out in the ES Chapter 6 at paragraphs 6.88 – 6.98.

#### Value of Views, Susceptibility to Change and Sensitivity

21. The Appellant and TBC agree that the value and susceptibility to change of views, and the visual receptors' sensitivity is as set out in Table 6.6 on pages 36 and 37 of the ES Chapter 6.

WPC does not agree to the values, susceptibility to change and of views and visual receptor sensitivity as set out in Table 6.6 on pages 36 and 37 of the ES Chapter 6.

#### Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character

22. There is disagreement between the parties on the assessment of effects on landscape character. The disagreement relates to the magnitude and significance of effects on landscape character (with WPC concerned about baseline assessments) and evidence will address these matters.

#### Assessment of Effects on Views

23. The parties agree the assessment of effects on views presented in Table 6.11 on pages 62 and 63 of the ES (Construction, Short-Term and Medium Term) and in Table 6.12 on pages 67 – 69 of the ES (Residual Effects) in respect of the following:
  - Viewpoint 4;
  - Viewpoint 7;
  - Viewpoint 8

- Viewpoint 9;
- Viewpoint 11 and
- Viewpoint 12.

24. There is disagreement between the parties on the assessment of effects on:


- Viewpoint 1;
- Viewpoint 2;
- Viewpoint 3;
- Viewpoint 5;
- Viewpoint 6; and
- Viewpoint 10.

25. The disagreement between the parties relates to the magnitude and significance of effects on views from these viewpoints and evidence will address these matters.


Cumulative Effects (Effects of Site 1 and 2 with other Committed Developments)

26. The parties agree that the effects of the appeal development with other committed development are as described at paragraphs 6.294-6.314 on pages 69 – 72 of the ES Chapter 6.

27. WPC disagrees with the cumulative effects assessment in respect of High Speed Two (HS2) in paragraphs 6.308 – 6.314 on pages 71-72 of the ES insofar as WPC has strong indications from HS2 that the visual impact from HS2 will be greater than when the applicant undertook the assessment for the ES.

Signed:  \_\_\_\_\_  
Nic Folland (for TBC)

Signed:  \_\_\_\_\_  
Ian Grimshaw (for the Appellant)

Signed:  \_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Beckmann (for WPC)