

**PROOF OF EVIDENCE FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY IN RESPECT OF
ISSUES RELATED TO LANDSCAPE MATTERS**

RELATED TO

The outline planning application by Redrow Homes Ltd for residential development of up to 400 dwellings on land to the east and west of Warburton Lane, Trafford, Greater Manchester WA13 9TT. The application includes the creation of new points of access, provision of formal and informal open space, ancillary landscaping, car parking and highway drainage works, with all matters reserved with the exception of access.

Local Authority Ref: 98031/OUT/19

PINs Ref: APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720

Barnes Walker Ref: Landscape Proof of Evidence M3162-PoE-20.03-V6

**ON BEHALF OF
TRAFFORD METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL**

FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY OCTOBER 2020

BY

NICHOLAS IAIN FOLLAND BA (hons) DIP LA CMLI

OF

**BARNES WALKER LTD
UNIT 6
LONGLEY LANE
NORTHENDEN
MANCHESTER
M22 4WT**

TEL: 0161 946 0808

e-mail: design@barneswalker.co.uk

September 2020

CONTENTS

1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Appeal Site and the Surrounding Landscape.....	5
3. Environmental Statement Chapter 6 – Landscape and Visual Amenity.....	10
4. Conclusions Regarding the Proposed Development of the Unallocated Greenfield Site.....	27
5. Conclusions Regarding the Proposed Development of the Allocated Greenfield Site.....	29
6. Conclusion.....	32

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Proof of Evidence is submitted on behalf of Trafford Council in support of the Planning Appeal for non-determination of the outline planning application for up to 400 dwellings on land to the east and west of Warburton Lane, Trafford, Greater Manchester (LPA ref: 98031/OUT/19).
- 1.2 Within this Proof of Evidence I address landscape and visual matters related specifically to putative reasons for refusal 2, 5 and 6 (of six putative reasons for refusal).
- 1.3 Other aspects of the reasons for refusal (RFRs), are addressed by other witnesses for the Council.

Qualifications and Experience

- 1.4 I am Nicholas Folland. I am a Director of Barnes Walker Limited, a firm of landscape and urban designers with offices in Manchester. I hold a BA(hons) degree in Landscape Design (1990) and a post graduate Diploma in Landscape Architecture from Manchester Polytechnic (1992) and I qualified as a Chartered Member of the Landscape Institute in 1998. Having worked for two local authorities (Manchester City Council and Knowsley Borough Council) over a period of approximately three years early on in my career, I gained a further 10 years of experience at 3 large multi-disciplinary consultancies. For the last 15 years I have worked at Barnes Walker Ltd and became a director in 2009.
- 1.5 During my professional career I have provided landscape and urban design-related consultancy services to local authorities, public companies and private clients. I have been called upon for professional advice regarding the assessment of landscape and visual effects and the detailed design and management of a wide variety of developments.
- 1.6 Development projects include high quality residential and conservation related projects, public parks, roads, airports and regeneration projects. I have considerable experience in assessing the integration of various forms of development within the landscape and undertaken projects where new interventions have had to blend subtly and successfully within a variety of landscape and townscape environments.
- 1.7 Over the past 11 years I have gained considerable experience in the design and landscape and visual assessment of residential development in the North West and in a number of cases, have prepared and presented evidence as an expert witness at Public Inquiries and hearings.
- 1.8 I am instructed by Trafford Council and having visited the appeal site on a number of occasions, I am familiar with the site and the surrounding landscape and townscape.

Background

- 1.9 In early August 2019, Bethany Brown (Major Planning Projects Officer for Trafford Council) contacted me to ask if I had the capacity to assist Trafford Council with landscape related matters related to three connected applications submitted by Redrow Homes.
- 1.10 The applications comprised two full planning applications and one outline as follows:
- 98029/FUL/19 – 163 dwellings on land to east of Warburton Lane;
 - 98030/FUL/19 – 201 dwellings on land to west of Warburton Lane; and
 - 98031/OUT/19 – up to 400 dwellings on land to east and west of Warburton Lane (forming an amalgamation of the two full applications).
- 1.11 I was subsequently instructed in early September 2019 to undertake a review of the submitted landscape related information, which included a Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter (6) within the Environmental Statement (CD A25).
- 1.12 Initially, I was advised by Trafford Council to hold off progressing with the review as there was an ongoing design review process involving Places Matter and that as a result, there could be changes to the proposals that could in turn, impact upon the content of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter of the Environmental Statement.
- 1.13 On the 15th November 2019, Bethany Brown forwarded an updated Parameters Plan (CD A43 ref: A16942.010) and an associated letter from Indigo Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes Ltd (CD A44). The letter set out the key changes to the proposals as follows:

Site 1 (East)

- The pulling back of the proposed development area from adjacent Birch Farm;
- The introduction of a potential pedestrian crossing point along the northern boundary (across Red Brook) to connect to the existing footpath further north;
- The pulling back of the development area adjacent to the public right of way that crosses the site between Moss Lane and Chapel Lane to create a wider green infrastructure corridor; and
- Extension of the development area towards Moss Lane to reflect local character whilst retaining existing vistas to heritage assets.

Site 2 (West)

- The pulling back of the proposed development area from adjacent Heathlands Farm and preservation of the existing vista across to the Warburton Toll Bridge;
- The introduction of an additional north-south green infrastructure connection across the site;

- The introduction of a potential pedestrian crossing point along the northern boundary (across Red Brook) to connect to the existing footpath links further north;
 - Insertion of explicit references to Coroners Wood and area of Ancient Woodland to the north west of Site 2 in addition to references to Heritage Assets; and
 - Overall, the Parameters Plan omits reference to the residential development area accommodating 'up to 400 dwellings'.
- 1.14 The letter provided confirmation that the submitted EIA and ES had not been updated accordingly as it was not considered necessary to do so given they assessed the 'worse case' scenario in a number of environmental areas.
- 1.15 Furthermore, it confirmed Redrow's intention to submit an appeal against Non-Determination of the outline application pursuant to Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 1.16 Thereafter I undertook my review of the (outline) application and provided my landscape consultee's response to Trafford Council on the 3rd January 2020.
- 1.17 On the 4th February 2020, Trafford Council published its committee report (CD A59) in respect of the outline planning application, in advance of the planning committee's meeting on the 13th February 2020.
- 1.18 On 13th February 2020 the application was presented to Trafford's Planning and Development Management Committee to determine the Council's position to adopt at the inquiry. The Committee endorsed officers' recommended putative reasons for refusal.
- 1.19 Following the Planning Committee's endorsement of the recommended putative reasons for refusal, I was engaged to act as a witness on landscape for this inquiry.
- 1.20 In the meantime, two further related applications have been submitted by WSP Indigo on behalf of Redrow Homes Ltd. The applications are for new footbridges over Red Brook to the north of Site 1 (ref: 100093/FUL/20 - CD-C) and to the north of Site 2 (ref: 100074/FUL/20 - CD-C). I understand that these applications have since been withdrawn.
- 1.21 Furthermore, on the 5th March 2020, the appellant submitted an ES Addendum (CD B4). In short, the Addendum revisits ES Chapter 6 Landscape and Visual Amenity and states 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.

Content of this Proof of Evidence

- 1.22 Initially I provide a description of the appeal site, before considering the content of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter 6 of the ES Vol 2.
- 1.23 Thereafter I consider the findings of the Landscape and Visual Amenity Chapter of the ES and set out where and why I believe it understates the levels of landscape and visual effect that the development proposals will generate.
- 1.24 Finally, I consider my findings in relation to two scenarios, being the development of an unallocated greenfield site and the Appeal Site's potential to become a future allocated site under GM45. In doing so I explain why I consider the outline application for the development of the Appeal Site to be contrary to planning policy and confirm that I believe Trafford Council were correct in citing Core Strategy Policies L7 and R2 in the putative reasons for refusal 2, 5 and 6.

2. The Appeal Site and the Surrounding Landscape

2.1 Located close to the southern edge of Partington, the Appeal Site comprises two separate areas, which are located to the east (Site 1) and west (Site 2) of Warburton Lane (A6144).

Site 1

2.2 Site 1 covers an area of circa 12.3ha and incorporates three arable fields located between Red Brook to the north and Moss Lane to the south. The westernmost field abuts Warburton Lane and the eastern field extends to a field hedgerow forming the boundary between the Appeal Site and the neighbouring Birch Farm.

2.3 The three fields are for the most part, separated and contained by sections of managed native species hedgerow and associated trees and they form a relatively narrow tract of land that slopes gently down from Moss Lane to the south to Red Brook in the north.

2.4 To the north-west a small group of nine modern, detached properties are located on Brook Farm Close, which is accessed off Warburton Lane. These properties are to an extent, contained by mature trees, however they remain visually prominent within views from Site 1, Moss Lane and Warburton Lane, particularly when the trees are without any leaf cover.

2.5 To the south, a further small cluster of eight modern, detached properties are located on or close to Top Park Close, at the intersection of Moss Lane and Warburton Lane. Mature trees located along their boundary with Site 1 to the north, provide a backdrop to the houses and provide levels of visual separation from Site 1. This boundary also defines the alignment of a short public footpath that tracks across the south-western corner of Site 1, linking Moss Lane with Warburton Lane.

2.6 The southern boundary of Site 1 is formed by sections of managed hedgerow located along Moss Lane. Some parts of the boundary are devoid of any hedgerow, thus allowing clear and open views across Site 1 from Moss Lane. There are also two properties located on Moss Lane, adjacent to Site 1 (Pear Tree Cottage and Birch Cottage). Boundary hedgerows wrap around the sides and rear of these properties curtilages, thus forming indents within the site boundary along Moss Lane.

2.7 The middle and easternmost fields of Site 1 are separated by a managed hedgerow and an adjacent public footpath, connecting Moss Lane with Chapel Lane to the north, via a footbridge over Red Brook.

Site 2

- 2.8 Site 2 comprises the eastern part of a large, single arable field covering an area of circa 12.5ha. To the east, Site 2 abuts Warburton Lane and maintains a relatively open boundary with the road via a managed hedgerow containing one, large mature tree.
- 2.9 To the south, a farm track and a managed field hedgerow, containing occasional trees defines the southern boundary of Site 2. To the western end of the southern boundary, a dense copse containing a number of ponds provides an added level of containment to Site 2 at this location.
- 2.10 The west boundary of site currently forms an arbitrary line across the field, tracking from the north-west corner of the aforementioned copse, in a northerly direction until it meets Red Brook.
- 2.11 The northern boundary of Site 2 follows Red Brook for much of its length before becoming offset from the brook by circa 45m, on approach to its intersection with Warburton Lane.
- 2.12 Site 2 forms a level, open field that slopes gently down to Red Brook within its northern sections.
- 2.13 In addition, Site 2 occupies the north-eastern section of a former medieval deer park, known as Warburton Park. The former deer park was centred around Park Farm, which is located circa 600m to the north of Warburton Village and circa 600m from the south-west corner of Site 2.

The Adjacent Landscape and Townscape

- 2.14 Red Brook flows east to west along the northern edges of Sites 1 and 2. The meandering watercourse is accompanied by a linear belt of woodland, which merges into Coroner's Wood to the west of Site 2.
- 2.15 To the north of Site 1, the wooded corridor contains an informal pedestrian route known as Broadoak Meadow Walk linking Warburton Road with Chapel Lane and Cross Lane Park to the north-east. The path is slightly elevated above Red Brook and occasional breaks in the tree cover provide attractive rural views across Site 1 and beyond.
- 2.16 To the north of Broadoak Meadow Walk, the dense tree cover gives way to large open areas containing sports fields associated with Broadoak School/Partington Sports Village, which is located beyond the fields to the north.
- 2.17 The sports fields combined with the wooded corridor of Red Brook create a significant gap between the southern edge of the built form (comprising the Broadoak

School/Partington Sports Village buildings) and the northern edge of Site 1. Furthermore, the wooded corridor associated with the brook provides a robust physical and visual buffer between the settlement edge and Site 1 to the south.

- 2.18 To the west, Red Brook continues to provide a similarly robust landscape buffer between Site 2 and the settlement edge formed by houses on Oak Road. The watercourse is set at a lower level than the adjacent housing and Site 2, and the shallow valley corridor is occupied by numerous mature trees and a winding footpath known as the Red Brook Wildlife Trail. This footpath is set at a lower level than Site 2 and tracks close to the watercourse. Although views across Site 2 to the south are prevented by their lower elevation, walkers experience intermittent views, which contribute to a perceived openness associated with Site 2 whilst also experiencing the proximity of the adjacent housing on Oak Road via partial and clear views of their rear elevations.
- 2.19 To the west, the housing culminates at the north-western edge of Site 2 and the mature trees to the north of the watercourse become a deeper, more extensive block known as Coroner's Wood (ancient woodland).
- 2.20 To the east and west of Warburton Lane, the wooded corridor associated with Red Brook provides a robust landscape buffer between the settlement area to the north and the rural landscape to the south, which includes Sites 1 and 2. The trees do not completely screen the built form when looking back towards the southern edge of Partington, but they are of sufficient stature, number and density to provide an effective visual foil (even when without any leaf cover) that substantially filters views of the built form by assimilating it into a wooded landscape setting.
- 2.21 To the south of Site 1, Moss Lane has no road markings, kerbs or footways, and is contained by field hedgerows and associated trees. Travelling along Moss Lane is a pleasantly rural experience that involves passing intermittent, isolated farmhouses and cottages comprising a Listed Barn at Birch Farm to the east of Site 1, and non-designated heritage assets, interspersed with intermittent views of the adjacent rural landscape associated with agricultural land to the north (including Site 1) and to the south.
- 2.22 Land to the south of Sites 1 and 2 comprises a mixture of pastoral and arable fields often enclosed by field hedgerows and associated trees. Fields to the south of Site 1 are generally smaller and more irregular with fewer hedgerow trees than those to the west of Warburton Lane. In addition, there are a number of relatively small copses to the south and south-west of Site 2 located around field ponds (marl pits), whereas to the

south of Site 1, the woodland cover is more abundant and extensive with numerous linear belts of trees following field boundaries and drainage channels.

- 2.23 Examination of historic mapping, such as the 1757 map on the inside cover of 'Warburton Glimpses of a Rural Life' suggest that the former Warburton Deer Park originally incorporated a greater number of smaller fields and that former field boundaries, possibly including hedgerows and trees, have since been removed to create a smaller number of larger fields. That said, the isolated and reduced tree cover to the east of Warburton Lane, banking to the northern boundary, along with the copses and associated ponds provide some reference to the presence of the former Warburton Deer Park that was located around the existing farmstead, known as Park Farm.
- 2.24 Warburton Village is located approximately 1km to the south-west of Site 2 and forms a small village containing numerous period buildings (from the 17th, 18 and 19th Centuries) including farmsteads, converted farmsteads and residential properties, a number of which are of the Arts and Crafts style, along with more recent 20th Century residential development. A conservation area covers the more historic parts of the village.

Landscape Character

- 2.25 The Appeal Sites 1 and 2 and the surrounding landscape is located within Natural England's National Character Area (NCA) 60: River Mersey.
- 2.26 At a local scale, the Appeal Sites and the surrounding landscape (excluding the settlement area of Partington to the north) are, according to the Trafford Metropolitan Borough SPG Landscape Strategy 2004 (CD F9), located within the 'Settled Sandlands' Landscape Character Type and within the subdivision i) Warburton Park Farm/Mossland Fringe.
- 2.27 The relevant content of these Landscape Character Assessment documents regarding their key characteristics, strategies, pressures and opportunities, are set out within the submitted ES in 6.60 to 6.69 and form core documents for the Inquiry, so I have not repeated the content here. However, I confirm that the content reflects the nature and character of the landscape associated with the Appeal Sites 1 and 2 and the surrounding landscape.

Greater Manchester Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment.

- 2.28 LUC was commissioned by Manchester City Council on behalf of itself and the other nine Greater Manchester local authorities in November 2017 to produce up-to-date landscape evidence to support preparation of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework.

2.29 Its main objective is to inform the overall development strategy and provide the basis for the future management and enhancement of the conurbation's natural capital, green infrastructure network and the provision of a positive strategy for the future Green Belt.

2.30 This document appears to place at least part of the site/study area into the Mosslands and Lowland Farm LCT, specifically Area 44 – Warburton and Carrington Mosses and judges this land has a medium sensitivity to 2-3 storey residential development (which is consistent with Chapter 6 ES assessment and my findings). This document also forms a core document for the Inquiry, so I do not set its content out in any great detail here, however the relevant narrative contains sections titled Special Landscape Qualities and Key Sensitivities, some of which are pertinent to the site and the adjacent rural landscape. They include:

- *Small pockets of woodland in farmed areas, on small steep-side valleys, settlement edges or along motorways.*
- *The simple, open and ordered nature of the mosslands, which provides a contrast to surrounding dense urban and industrial development and is evidence of the cultural associations of the mosslands.*
- *The sense of separation that the landscape provides between distinct settlements, and role as a rural backdrop to development.*
- *Important pockets of relative remoteness and tranquillity – valued in the wider urban context.*

2.31 Furthermore, the document contains a section titled Guidance and Opportunities to Consider within this Landscape Character Type. The following extracts are of relevance to the appeal site and the adjacent rural landscape:

- *Ensure that the sense of separation the landscape provides between distinct settlements is retained.*
- *Consider additional woodland planting to enhance landscape structure, soften the urban fringe, screen industrial areas and reduce the noise and visual impacts of motorway corridors, where appropriate.*
- *Ensure that any development is in keeping with the mainly rural character of the landscape in terms of form, density and vernacular.*
- *Retain the quiet and tranquil character of the mosses by discouraging inappropriate land uses and development.*

3. Environmental Statement Chapter 6 – Landscape And Visual Amenity

- 3.1 In general, consider the planning policy context and baseline sections of ES Chapter 6 to be accurate and representative of the site and the associated study area, however I do have some reservations regarding the absence of any reference to the presence of the former Deer Park.
- 3.2 I consider the assessment methodology used within ES Chapter 6 to be consistent with the GLVIA 3rd Edition guidelines (CD J4) and appropriate given the scale of the proposed development and the landscape context of site and the associated study area.
- 3.3 I agree with the judgements made upon value (see 3.6 below), susceptibility to change and the resulting sensitivities attributed to the landscape and visual receptors. I note however, that ES Chapter 6 does not reference the historical landscape context to Site 2 associated with the former Warburton Deer Park.
- 3.4 The ES attributes the landscape associated with Appeal Sites 1 and 2 and the surrounding area with a value of 'local' using a GLVIA Box 5.1 assessment. The next, higher judgement in the hierarchical range would be 'regional' value (the range of values rises from 'community' at the lower end, to 'local', 'regional', 'national' and international' as described by ES Appendix 6.1 Volume IV).
- 3.5 Given that a GLVIA box 5.1 assessment is carried out within paragraph 6.84 of the ES (within Table 6.4), it is clear that the presence of the former Deer Park was not considered, or accounted for within the assessment of landscape value.
- 3.6 Warburton Park separates Warburton from Partington to the north and it provides historic context to the village whilst also influencing the appearance and character of the landscape in this locality (including Site 2). I accept that the former Deer Park is not subject to any designation, such as a Historic Park and Garden, however I would expect its presence to have been acknowledged within the ES, particularly in the context of undertaking a GLVIA Box 5.1 assessment of landscape value. I do not ascertain a higher value to the landscape in the vicinity of Site 2, than the local value identified within Chapter 6 of the ES. However, I believe that the presence of the former Deer Park increases the value of the landscape within Site 2 to the upper reaches of the range associated with a landscape of 'local' (medium) value.
- 3.7 Predominantly my concerns with ES Chapter 6 and the LVIA undertaken therein, are associated with some of the judgements made regarding the likely magnitude of effect, which considers the scale of change, its nature, duration and reversibility.

- 3.8 I accept that landscape and visual assessment is subject to matters of professional judgement, however I believe that in some instances, the findings within Chapter 6 of the ES understate the likely landscape and visual effects of the development proposals and that this is primarily down to the assessor's judgements regarding the likely 'magnitude of effect'.
- 3.9 As a result, I believe that Chapter 6 of the ES understates the likely magnitude of effect associated with some of the landscape and visual receptors, which in turn serves to underplay the overall significance of adverse effect in those instances.
- 3.10 Paragraph 6.52 of the ES states: *'A landscape or visual effect of Moderate/Major Adverse to Major Adverse significance would typically be considered to be of significance.'*
- 3.11 Chapter 6 of the ES finds the proposed development will generate only Minor Adverse landscape effects upon the landscape character of the study area during construction, the short to medium term and in the longer term (residual effects) and does not therefore ascertain any 'significant' adverse landscape effects.
- 3.12 In terms of visual effects, Chapter 6 of the ES does not identify any 'significant' adverse visual effects for Site 1 during construction and in the long term. However, it ascertains 'significant' adverse visual effects in the short to medium term upon two Representative Viewpoints associated with Site 1 (Viewpoints 1 and 6).
- 3.13 With reference to Site 2, Chapter 6 of the ES does not identify any 'significant' adverse visual effects resulting from the construction phase, in the short to medium term and in the longer term.
- 3.14 I have applied the ES LVIA methodology to the various landscape and visual receptors in order to ascertain the likely significance of the landscape and visual effect that, in my opinion, will be generated by the proposed development of Appeal Sites 1 and 2.

Assessing the Significance of Landscape Effects

Construction

- 3.15 Table 1 below sets out ES Chapter 6 findings for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated landscape effect upon the character of the landscape during the construction phase.
- 3.16 Table 2 sets out my findings for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated landscape effect upon the character of the landscape during the construction phase.

Table 1: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character – Construction Phase - ES Chapter 6 Findings

Landscape Receptor		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
The Character of the landscape within the Study Area	Site 1	Construction	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Site 2	Construction	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Overall Sites 1 and 2	Construction	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse

Table 2: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character – Construction Phase - My Findings

Landscape Receptor		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
The Character of the landscape within the Study Area	Site 1	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
	Site 2	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse

- 3.17 In ES Chapter 6 the assessor appears to justify their judgement of a *'low adverse magnitude of effect'* by relying upon the retention of existing boundary hedgerows and the wooded Red Brook corridor to *'contain'* and *'partly contain'* (ES paras 6.110 & 6.176) construction effects, whilst acknowledging a *'perceivable scale of change'* (ES paras 6.110 & 6.176) to the character of the landscape. Given the existing character of the site and the adjacent rural landscape, the scale of the changes during the construction phase and the uncharacteristic nature of those changes, I believe ES Chapter 6 vastly underestimates the effect upon the Settled Sandlands LCT.
- 3.18 I consider the construction magnitude of effect associated with both Sites 1 and 2 will be high and adverse due to the rural nature of the landscape, the large scale of the change and the adverse nature of those changes being wholly at odds with the character of the Settled Sandlands LCT. The construction phase would introduce features and elements that are inconsistent with the identified character of the landscape. Changes to the greenfield Appeal Sites 1 and 2 would likely include frequent movements of all types and sizes of vehicles in, out and around the sites and the introduction of construction features and activities such as cranes, spoil heaps, stored materials, cement silos, temporary buildings, heavy plant etc. These changes would be present, possibly to a varying extent, throughout the construction phase and would diminish as the development becomes complete. With a Medium Sensitivity and a High Adverse Magnitude of Effect, I consider the significance of Effect of both Sites 1 and 2 upon the

landscape character of the study area to be **Moderate/Major Adverse** for the construction phase.

Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)

- 3.19 Tables 3 and 4 set out ES Chapter 6 findings and my findings respectively, for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated landscape effect upon the character of the landscape for the short to medium term.

Table 3: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character – Short to Medium Term - ES Chapter 6 Findings

Landscape Receptor		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
The Character of the landscape within the Study Area	Site 1	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)	Medium	Low to Medium Adverse	*No effect determined
	Overall Sites 1 and 2	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)	Medium	Medium Adverse	**No effect determined

*- ES Chapter 6 para 6.183 does not determine the 'Significance of Effect', only the 'Magnitude of Change'. It is possible that the last section of the last sentence of para 6.183 mistakenly references 'magnitude of effect' rather than 'significance of effect. If this is the case, then I can assume that the overall effect upon Site 2 is assessed as Minor to Moderate Adverse.

** - ES Chapter 6 para 6.251 also does not determine the 'Significance of Effect', only the 'Magnitude of Change'. It is possible that the last section of the last sentence of para 6.251 mistakenly references 'magnitude of effect' rather than 'significance of effect. If this is the case, then I can assume that the overall effect upon Sites 1 and 2 is assessed as Moderate Adverse. However, an overall effect upon the character of the landscape in the short to medium term, of Moderate Adverse, does not appear to be consistent with the findings for the Individual sites above. Given the objective of the ES is to ascertain the nature of the landscape and visual effects, its findings related to short to medium term landscape effects are somewhat confusing and muddled.

Table 4: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character – Short to Medium Term - My Findings

Landscape Receptor		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
The Character of the	Site 1	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to	Medium	Medium to High	Moderate/Major

landscape within the Study Area		15)		Adverse	Adverse
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse

- 3.20 On completion, the development of Sites 1 and 2 will have transformed the character of the previously existing arable fields to residential development with access roads driveways, street lighting and associated areas of open space. As a result, a significant area (amounting to circa 24.8ha) of the Settled Sandlands LCT have had its character changed to housing or to associated open space. The undeveloped areas of open space within the northern sections of Sites 1 and 2 will have become contained and disconnected from the wider rural area. The character of these spaces is unlikely to remain consistent with the Settled Sandlands LCT as they will not prevail as rural, agricultural areas, rather they will become contained public open spaces with a character influenced profoundly by the proximity and presence of the adjacent new housing.
- 3.21 Site 1 is located to the south of the existing landscape buffer formed by Red Brook and its associated tree cover and at some distance from the existing built form of Broadoak School/Partington Sports Village due to the presence of the intervening sports fields to the north of the Red Brook corridor.
- 3.22 Site 2 is also located to the south of Red Brook, however the distance to the existing built form on Oak Road, which forms the southern edge of Partington to the north, is reduced when compared to Site 1.
- 3.23 Adjacent to Site 1, the width of the Red Brook wooded corridor varies from a central pinch point of circa 25m, up to well over 200m to the east. The Red Brook wooded corridor adjacent to Site 2 has, by comparison a more consistent width of between circa 45m and 80m. In both cases, the width of the corridor and the trees therein form layers of vegetation that combine to create an effective, robust buffer to the settlement edge.
- 3.24 The existing built form that constitutes the existing settlement edge is, in some instances quite visible, particularly when there is little or no leaf cover present. However, complete screening is not necessary as the built form is effectively assimilated into the landscape by the Red Brook corridor, thus ensuring that it is subservient to the character of the rural landscape to the south (being the Settled Sandlands LCT).
- 3.25 I consider that the development of Sites 1 and 2 will result in a medium/high magnitude of change for the following reasons:

- The large scale of the proposed development – a significant area of the Settled Sandlands LCT and the Mosslands and Lowland Farmland LCT will have its character completely transformed;
- Trafford Council SPG 30 'Settled Sandlands' notes that one of its main characteristics include '*dominant agricultural land use*' and the pressures include '*development on the fringes*';
- Trafford Council SPG 30 'Settled Sandlands' notes that '*The LCT is considered to have some of the largest high quality rural areas in the Borough, but subject to gradual deterioration in areas that abut the urban fringe.*';
- The development of Site 2 will introduce suburban built form into a significant section of the area occupied by the former Warburton Deer Park;
- The existing robust settlement edge formed by the Red Brook corridor will be breached by the development and will extend built form to the south by between circa 200m and 400m on Site 1 and by between circa 270m and 340m on Site 2, thus significantly reducing the physical and perceived gap between Partington and the village of Warburton to the south-west – The GM Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment identifies '*The sense of separation that the landscape provides between distinct settlements, and role as a rural backdrop to development.*' as a key quality, that is sensitive to change.
- Notwithstanding my view that the parameters plan does not incorporate landscape buffers of sufficient scale and depth to the eastern and southern edges of Site 1 (adjacent to Moss Lane) and the eastern, southern and western edges of Site 2, the proposed, embedded mitigation will not have become fully established/effective in the short to medium term. Given the scale, quality and robust nature of the existing southern edge to Partington, and the scale of the proposed development, I do not consider the form of the proposals outlined within the parameters plan will create an appropriately robust, new edge to the extended urban area. As a result, I believe that the proposed development will exert itself adversely upon the character of the adjacent rural landscape ie the Settled Sandlands LCT, to a greater extent than the existing settlement edge;
- With reference to Site 1, ES Chapter 6 para 6.114 states '*...a small area of vegetation next to Warburton Lane...*'; will be removed. I have considered the submitted Tree Survey by TBA (CD-A21), alongside the Parameters Plan (CD-A29) and the ES Addendum Appendix 1.4A (CD-B4) (the proposed Access Design) and it appears likely that a number of existing trees (some of particular stature and high quality) may require removal in order to construct the new access road into Site 1 off Warburton Lane. These include the following

trees/groups as referenced within the Tree Survey: 68T – 10m high early mature Oak, Retention Category B2, 69T – 9m high early mature Oak, Retention Category B2, 70T – 9m high early mature Oak, Retention Category B2, 71T – 13m high mature Oak, Retention Category A2, 70T – 9m high early-mature Oak, Retention Category B2, 69T – 9m high early-mature Oak, Retention Category B2, 74T – 18m high mature Oak, Retention Category A2, 73G – 14m high row of mature sycamore, Retention Category C2 and 77G – mature - remnants of Hawthorn Hedge, Retention Category C2. Chapter 6 of the ES does not therefore appear to properly assess or account for the impact the proposed development will have upon existing trees in this location.

- The revised DAS (CD A48, page 41) identifies the presence of four ‘important’ hedgerows on Site 1 and two ‘important’ hedgerows on site 2. The revised DAS states that these hedgerows *‘may be required to be retained as part of the development’*. The Addendum to the ES Appendix 15.2A 762048 (CD B4) identifies 3 important hedgerows, whereas the Historic Environment Assessment Summary Report by the University of Salford identifies numerous important hedgerows (primarily based on their historic presence), including the hedgerow that extends along the entire southern boundary between Site 1 and Moss Lane and the hedgerow that extends along Site 1’s west boundary between Site 1 and Warburton Lane, a section of which will need to be removed to construct the access road. The ES Chapter 6 does not appear to acknowledge the presence of ‘important hedgerows’ whereas page 58 of the revised DAS states that historic hedgerows will be retained. By contrast, ES Chapter 6 refers to the removal of a short section of hedgerow on the eastern edge of Site 2 to create the new site entrance, however it does not acknowledge its part removal or quantify the extent of the hedgerow to be removed. Furthermore, the proposals include 3no emergency access points into Site 1 located along Moss Lane. These access points could require the removal of further sections of important hedgerow that ES Chapter 6 does not acknowledge/assess;

Long Term (after Year 15)

3.26 Tables 5 and 6 set out ES Chapter 6 findings and my findings respectively, for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated landscape effect upon the character of the landscape for the long term.

Table 5: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character – Long Term - ES Chapter 6 Findings

Landscape Receptor		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
The Character of the landscape within the Study Area	Site 1	Long Term (after Year 15)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Site 2	Long Term (after Year 15)	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Overall Effect for Sites 1 & 2	Long Term (after Year 15)	Medium	Medium Adverse	***Moderate Adverse

***- The overall **Moderate Adverse** landscape effect described within ES Chapter 6, para 6.252 is inconsistent with the findings for the individual Sites 1 (see ES para 6.118) and 2 (see ES para 6.184). Given the objective of the ES is to ascertain the nature of the landscape and visual effects, its findings related to long term (residual) landscape effects are somewhat confusing and muddled.

Table 6: Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character – Long Term - My Findings

Landscape Receptor		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
The Character of the landscape within the Study Area	Site 1	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term (Year 1 to 15)	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse

- 3.27 I consider that the development of Sites 1 and 2 will result in a medium/high adverse magnitude of change and the reasons for this are set out within 3.23 above and within 3.26 to 3.34 below.
- 3.28 In the longer term, I would anticipate that the embedded mitigation proposals will have become established.
- 3.29 With reference to Site 1, ES Chapter 6, para 6.118 confirms the continuing maturity of the embedded mitigation, however the assessment does not ascertain any resulting change to the magnitude of effect between the short to medium term and the long term (Low Adverse in both cases).
- 3.30 With reference to Site 2, ES Chapter 6, para 6.184 confirms the establishment of the embedded mitigation and emphasises the effect of the landscape proposals to the perimeter of Site 2 in justifying a reduction in the magnitude of effect in the long term.
- 3.31 In my opinion, the parameters plan does not incorporate landscape buffers of sufficient scale and depth to the eastern and southern edges of Site 1 (adjacent to Moss Lane) and the eastern, southern and western edges of Site 2. Given the scale, quality and robust

nature of the existing southern edge to Partington, formed by the wooded Red Brook Corridor, and the scale of the proposed development, I do not consider the proposals outlined within the parameters plan will create an equivalent or effective new edge to the extended urban area. I consider that once established, the proposals indicated (Green Infrastructure and planting buffers) will not be of a sufficient scale and quality to moderate the landscape effects of the proposals upon the rural landscape within the study area (ie 'The Settled Sandlands LCT), primarily to the south, west and east;

- 3.32 The landscape proposals located along the southern boundary of Site 1 are very limited, almost non-existent in places and as a result, the proposed houses will be located very close to the existing rural context of Moss Lane.
- 3.33 The landscape proposals along the west, east and southern boundaries of Site two are also limited (almost non-existent in the case of Warburton Lane). Furthermore, the proposals do not appear to respond effectively to the existing landscape context; the large woodland block/copse located adjacent to the south-western corner of Site 2 could to an extent, reduce or negate the requirement for boundary landscape works within Site 2 at this location. The proposals however, apply a consistent width to the landscape corridor/green infrastructure all along the southern boundary.
- 3.34 Furthermore, a significant section of the former Deer Park within Site 2, will be permanently lost.
- 3.35 The character of Sites 1 and 2 will have changed significantly from a series of arable fields to residential development and I believe an appropriate design layout and associated embedded mitigation, once established, should be capable of effectively moderating the extent to which it exerts itself adversely upon the adjacent rural landscape.
- 3.36 However, with reference to Sites 1 and 2, I consider that even when established the proposed embedded mitigation will be deficient in moderating the effect of the significant change in character within the sites, upon the adjacent rural landscape. Weak, ineffective boundaries will therefore allow the urbanising character of the new housing to impose itself adversely upon the Settled Sandlands LCT to a greater extent than the existing urban edge.
- 3.37 Although I accept that the establishment of the proposed embedded mitigation will have an effect, I do not anticipate that the level of effect will be sufficient to moderate the magnitude of effect between the short to medium term and the long term. As a result, I do not ascertain any reduction in the significance of effect in the longer term.

Assessing the Significance of Visual Effects

3.38 The Representative Viewpoint Photographs are contained within the ES Appendix 6.1 (Volume IV) and the location of the Viewpoints is described by Figure 6.6.

Construction

3.39 Having reviewed the 12 Viewpoints and the associated visual effects ascertained by ES Chapter 6, I have reservations regarding the judgements associated with the magnitude of effect for the following Viewpoints:

- Site 1 – Viewpoints 1, 2, 6 and 10
- Site 2 – Viewpoints 2, 3 and 10

3.40 Table 7 sets out the ES Chapter 6 findings for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated visual effects upon public views during the construction phase. It only includes the Viewpoints where I consider the visual effects to be different to those ascertained by Chapter 6 of the ES.

3.41 Table 8 sets out my findings for the Viewpoints set out in Table 7, regarding the anticipated visual effects upon public views during the construction phase.

3.42 With regard to Site 2, I believe the ES assessment has mistakenly referred to Viewpoint 10, which is located adjacent to the northern boundary of Site 1 and is therefore unlikely to be affected by the development of Site 2. As a result, I have assessed the views experienced by people using the Red Brook Wildlife Trail, which is located to the north of Red Brook.

3.43 In addition, by only considering public views, I have not assessed changes to views experienced by the residents of properties.

Table 7: Assessment of Visual Effects– Construction Phase - ES Chapter 6 Findings

Viewpoint (VP) & Visual Receptors		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
VP1 -People using the PRoW which crosses the eastern part of Site 1	Site 1	Construction	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP2 - People using the PRoW linking Warburton Lane with Moss Lane in Site 1	Site 1	Construction	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
	Site 2	Construction	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP3 – People using PRoW nr Jack Hey Farm	Site 2	Construction	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
VP6 – Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Moss Lane	Site 1	Construction	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse

VP10 – People using Broadoak Meadow Walk along Red Brook to the north (Redbrook Wildlife Trail in the case of Site 2)	Site 1	Construction	Medium	Minor Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Site 2	Construction	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse

Table 8: Assessment of Visual Effects– Construction Phase - My Findings

Viewpoint (VP) & Visual Receptors		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
VP1 -People using the PRow on the eastern part of Site 1	Site 1	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
VP2 - People using the PRow linking Warburton Lane with Moss Lane in Site 1	Site 1	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
	Site 2	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
VP3 – People using PRow nr Jack Hey Farm	Site 2	Construction	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP6 – Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Moss Lane	Site 1	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
VP10 – People using Broadoak Meadow Walk along Red Brook (Redbrook Wildlife Trail in the case of Site 2)	Site 1	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
	Site 2	Construction	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse

3.44 I have identified a number of instances where I consider the levels of adverse significance of effect during the construction phase, to be higher than those ascertained within Chapter 6 of the ES (as set out within Table 8 above). I have not identified any instances where my assessment ascertains lower levels of adverse effect, than those identified by ES Chapter 6.

3.45 In each case, this is due to the judgements made in respect of the magnitude of effect.

3.46 I believe the construction phase will introduce uncharacteristic features into the landscape that will exert large-scale adverse effects upon the public views experienced by the various receptors. In all the instances considered in Tables 7 and 8, the construction activity and associated features will be prominent in the view. Activities and elements include the movements of all types and sizes of vehicles in, out, around and on the site, cranes, spoil heaps, stored materials, cement silos, temporary buildings,

heavy plant, parking areas, a secure access and part constructed buildings and associated infrastructure etc.

On Completion, Short and Medium Term

3.47 Having reviewed the 12 Viewpoints and the associated visual effects ascertained by ES Chapter 6, I have reservations regarding the judgements associated with the magnitude of effect for the following Viewpoints:

- Site 1 – Viewpoints 2 and 10
- Site 2 – Viewpoints 2, 3 and 10

3.48 Table 9 sets out the ES Chapter 6 findings for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated visual effects upon public views during the Short to Medium Term. It only includes the Viewpoints where I consider the visual effects to be different to those ascertained by Chapter 6 of the ES.

3.49 Table 10 sets out my findings for the Viewpoints set out in Table 9, regarding the anticipated visual effects upon public views during the Short to Medium Term.

Table 9: Assessment of Visual Effects– Short to Medium Term - ES Chapter 6 Findings

Viewpoint (VP) & Visual Receptors		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
VP2 - People using the PRow linking Warburton Lane with Moss Lane in Site 1	Site 1	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium Adverse reducing to Minor Adverse	Moderate Adverse (on completion and short term) and Minor Adverse (medium Term)
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium Adverse reducing to Medium to Low Adverse	Moderate Adverse (on completion and short term) and Minor to Moderate Adverse (medium Term)
VP3 – People using PRow nr Jack Hey Farm	Site 2	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP10 – People using Broadoak Meadow Walk along Red Brook to the north	Site 1	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse (on completion and short term) and Negligible (medium Term)
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse

Table 10: Assessment of Visual Effects– Short to Medium Term - My Findings

Viewpoint (VP) & Visual Receptors		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
VP2 - People using the PRoW linking Warburton Lane with Moss Lane in Site 1	Site 1	Short to Medium Term	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse (reducing in the medium term)
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term	Medium	High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
VP3 – People using PRoW nr Jack Hey Farm	Site 2	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse
VP10 – People using Broadoak Meadow Walk along Red Brook to the north (Redbrook Wildlife Trail in the case of Site 2)	Site 1	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate/Major Adverse (reducing in the medium term)
	Site 2	Short to Medium Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse (reducing in the medium term)

3.50 I have identified a number of instances where I consider the levels of adverse significance of effect during the short to medium term, to be higher than those ascertained within Chapter 6 of the ES. I have not identified any instances where my assessment ascertains lower levels of adverse effect, than those identified by ES Chapter 6.

3.51 In each case, this is due to the judgements made in respect of the magnitude of effect.

3.52 In the medium term, the embedded mitigation will become increasingly prominent and established. In some cases, where views incorporate the areas of open space located to the north of the proposed housing areas, I anticipate that the establishment of the planting therein, is likely to begin to reduce the significance of effect in the medium term (ie Viewpoint 2 – Site 1 & Viewpoint 10 – Site 1 and Site 2).

3.53 Viewpoints 2 and 3 comprise views of Site 2 over and through its boundaries to the south and east. In both instances there is a strong sense of openness, given the scale and nature of the field Site 2 occupies (in part).

3.54 In the case of Viewpoint 2, the development of the site will introduce housing as a new element into the view and the houses will be located close to the boundary. The existing sense of openness will be lost.

3.55 People using the footpath to the south of Site 2 (Viewpoint 3) will experience a sense of the built form extending forwards within the view and the existing perceived openness, distance and separation to the settlement edge will be significantly reduced.

3.56 Viewpoint 10 – Site 1 – The existing view is an attractive, rural view that extends across Site 1 and beyond; its qualities are acknowledged by the presence of a bench. People on Broadoak Meadow Walk will experience clear views of the new houses, set beyond the intervening open space located between Red Brook and the housing to the south. In the medium term, I anticipate the embedded mitigation will begin to moderate the level of adverse visual effect experienced, however the rural quality of the view will be lost and it will be curtailed by the housing and new tree planting within Site 1.

3.57 Viewpoint 10 – Site 2 – People using Red Brook Wildlife Walk to the north of Site 2 will experience filtered views of the new housing located to the south. The clarity of the views will vary seasonally based on the levels of foliage present on the intervening trees. The new houses will be set back within the views, however the existing perceived openness associated with Site 2 will be lost.

Long Term (residual effects)

3.58 Having reviewed the 12 Viewpoints and the associated visual effects ascertained by ES Chapter 6, I have reservations regarding the judgements associated with the Long Term magnitude of effect for the following Viewpoints:

- Site 1 – Viewpoints 1, 2, 6 and 10
- Site 2 – Viewpoints 2, 3, 5 and 10

3.59 Table 11 sets out the ES Chapter 6 findings for Sites 1 and 2 regarding the anticipated visual effects upon public views during the Long Term. It only includes the Viewpoints where I consider the visual effects to be different to those ascertained by Chapter 6 of the ES.

3.60 Table 12 sets out my findings for the Viewpoints set out in Table 11, regarding the anticipated visual effects upon public views during the Long Term.

Table 11: Assessment of Visual Effects– Long Term (residual effects) - ES Chapter 6 Findings

Viewpoint (VP) & Visual Receptors		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Residual Significance Effect on Views (after 15 years)
VP1 -People using the PRoW which crosses the eastern part of Site 1	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP2 - People using the PRoW linking Warburton Lane with Moss Lane in Site 1	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse
	Site 2	Long Term	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse

	Overall Effect for Sites 1 & 2	Long Term	Medium	?	****Moderate to Minor Adverse
VP3 – People using PRoW nr Jack Hey Farm	Site 2	Long Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP5 – Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Warburton Lane	Site 2	Long Term	Low	Low to Medium Adverse	Moderate to Minor Adverse
VP6 – Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Moss Lane	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP10 – People using Broadoak Meadow Walk along Red Brook to the north	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	?	Negligible
	Site 2	Long Term	Medium	Low Adverse	Minor Adverse

****- The overall **Moderate to Minor Adverse** visual effect described within ES Chapter 6, para 6.282 Table 6.12 is inconsistent with the findings for the individual Sites 1 (see para 6.141 Table 6.8) and 2 (see para 6.208 Table 6.10).

Table 12: Assessment of Visual Effects- Long Term (residual effects) - My Findings

Viewpoint (VP) & Visual Receptors		Assessment Phase	Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Residual Significance Effect on Views (after 15 years)
VP1 -People using the PRoW which crosses the eastern part of Site 1	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate to Major Adverse
VP2 - People using the PRoW linking Warburton Lane with Moss Lane in Site 1	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Medium Adverse	Moderate Adverse
	Site 2	Long Term	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate to Major Adverse
VP3 – People using PRoW nr Jack Hey Farm	Site 2	Long Term	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate to Major Adverse
VP5 – Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Warburton Lane	Site 2	Long Term	Low	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate Adverse
VP6 – Motorists, cyclists and pedestrians using Moss Lane	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Medium to High Adverse	Moderate to Major Adverse
VP10 – People using Broadoak Meadow Walk along Red Brook to the north (Redbrook Wildlife Trail in the case of Site 2)	Site 1	Long Term	Medium	Low to Moderate Adverse	Minor to Moderate Adverse
	Site 2	Long Term	Medium	Low to Moderate Adverse	Minor to Moderate Adverse

- 3.61 I have identified a number of instances where I consider the levels of adverse significance of effect during the long term, to be higher than those ascertained within Chapter 6 of the ES. I have not identified any instances where my assessment ascertains lower levels of adverse effect, than those identified by ES Chapter 6.
- 3.62 In each case, this is due to the judgements made in respect of the magnitude of effect.
- 3.63 In the long term, the embedded mitigation will become increasingly prominent and established. In some cases, where views incorporate the areas of open space located to the north of the proposed housing areas, I anticipate that the establishment of the planting therein, is likely to reduce the significance of effect in the long term (ie Viewpoint 2 – Site 1 and Viewpoint 10 – Site 1 and Site 2).
- 3.64 Viewpoint 1 – People walking across the site on the public footpath located within the eastern part of Site 1 currently experience attractive open views of the surrounding rural landscape. The proposed housing will envelop the footpath and contain it within a narrow corridor. As a result, the existing views will be adversely and permanently affected. Proposed tree planting within the footpath’s corridor may moderate the adverse effect in the longer term, however I do not consider that this will ameliorate the anticipated adverse nature of the residual effect to any great extent.
- 3.65 Viewpoint 2 – Site 1 - People walking through Site 1 on the public footpath located on its south-western edge, currently experience attractive open views of the fields that form Site 1. The new housing will be prominent within the view, as will the new access road and proposed areas of open space to the foreground and to the left side of the view towards Red Brook. Established tree planting within the intervening open space will reduce the visual prominence of the new houses, thus reducing the long-term residual effect to Moderate Adverse.
- 3.66 Viewpoint 2 – Site 2 - Incorporates views of Site 2 over and through its eastern boundary with Warburton Lane. There is a strong sense of openness given the nature of the field Site 2 occupies (in part). The development of the site will introduce housing as a new element into the view and the houses will be located close to the boundary. The existing sense of openness will be lost.
- 3.67 Viewpoint 3 – Site 2 – Walkers on the Public Footpath located to the south of Site 2 experience views of its southern boundary, which extend across Site 2 to the settlement edge defined by the Red Brook wooded corridor. The proposed development will bring the built form forward significantly within the view and the sense of openness, distance and separation to the settlement edge will be lost.

- 3.68 Viewpoint 5 – Site 2 – People using Warburton Lane will, on approach from the south, experience similar effects to those described for Viewpoint 3 above. I ascertain a lower level of adverse visual effect of Moderate Adverse in this case, by virtue of the lower sensitivity of the receptor.
- 3.69 Viewpoint 6 – Site 1 – I believe people travelling along Moss Lane will experience a Moderate to Major Adverse visual effect in the long term, due to the proximity of the new houses to the lane and their urbanising effect upon this rural lane, the loss of openness associated with Site 1, that currently occurs intermittently from Moss Lane and the insufficient depth and quantity of the landscape proposals along its southern boundary with Moss Lane.
- 3.70 Viewpoint 10 – Site 1 – The existing view attractive, rural view extends across Site 1 and beyond. People on Broadoak Meadow Walk will experience partial views of the new houses, set amongst established tree planting located within the intervening open space located between Red Brook and the housing to the south. Once established, I anticipate the embedded mitigation will moderate the level of adverse visual effect experienced, however the rural quality of the view will be lost and curtailed by the housing, and the new tree planting within Site 1. As a result, I predict a tangible level of adverse visual effect will prevail in the longer term.
- 3.71 Viewpoint 10 – Site 2 – People using Red Brook Wildlife Walk to the north of Site 2 will experience filtered views of the new housing located to the south. The clarity of the views will vary seasonally based on the levels of foliage present on the intervening trees. The new houses will be set back within the views, however the existing perceived openness and the rural outlook associated with Site 2 will be degraded. Once established, I anticipate the embedded mitigation will moderate the level of adverse visual effect experienced.

4. Conclusions Regarding the Proposed Development of the Unallocated Greenfield Site

- 4.1 Having undertaken a detailed review of the LVIA contained within Chapter 6 of the ES, I have determined that in a number of instances the assessment has in my opinion, understated some of the landscape and visual effects that are likely to result from the implementation of the development proposals.
- 4.2 Paragraph 6.52 of the ES states *'A landscape or visual effect of Moderate/Major Adverse to Major Adverse significance would typically be considered to be of significance.'*
- 4.3 ES Chapter 6 identifies a landscape effect of **Minor Adverse** consistently across the three time periods assessed (construction, short to medium term and long term), when considering Site 1. In relation to Site 2 it appears to ascertain landscape effects of **Minor Adverse, Minor to Moderate Adverse** and **Minor Adverse** in the construction, short to medium term and long term respectively. However, when considering the overall effect of Sites 1 and 2 (see para 6.252) the ES ascertains a **Moderate Adverse** long term (residual) landscape effect. As a result, it is confusing as to what the ES determines the residual landscape effect to be.
- 4.4 In terms of landscape effect, ES Chapter 6 determines the anticipated residual effect is either **Minor Adverse** or **Moderate Adverse**, so it does not therefore ascertain any effects considered to be 'of significance'.
- 4.5 The greenfield Appeal Site forms part of an attractive rural landscape, with a medium sensitivity and it forms part of a recognised Landscape Character Type 'Settled Sandlands' within SPG30 and also forms part of a historic deer park. The proposed development is of a large scale and it is my view that the landscape effects will be of a higher adverse nature than those identified by ES Chapter 6. In fact, I have ascertained that the landscape effects will be **Moderate/Major Adverse** consistently across the three time periods assessed (construction, short to medium term and long term).
- 4.6 In terms of visual effects, ES Chapter 6 considers 12no Representative Viewpoints and each viewpoint considers the views of at least one visual receptor group.
- 4.7 ES Chapter 6 does not ascertain any Construction Phase or Long Term (residual) visual effects 'of significance', however it does identify two Short to Medium Term visual effects associated with Site 1, Viewpoints 1 and 6 as Major Adverse (ie 'of significance').
- 4.8 I agree with some of the levels of visual effect identified by ES Chapter 6, however it is my opinion that in a number of instances, higher levels of adverse visual effect will be

generated by the development proposals associated with Sites 1 and 2, some of which, will be visual effects 'of significance', as follows:

- Construction Phase: **Moderate/Major Adverse** – Viewpoints 1, 2, 6 & 10;
- Short to Medium Term: **Moderate/Major Adverse** – Viewpoints 2, 3 & 10;
- Long Term - **Moderate/Major Adverse** – Viewpoints 1, 2, 3 & 6.

- 4.9 Trafford Core Strategy Policy L7: Design requires development to be appropriate in its context, make best use of opportunities to improve the character and quality of an area and enhance the street scene or character of an area by appropriately addressing scale, massing, layout, soft landscape works and boundary treatments, amongst others.
- 4.10 Trafford Core Strategy Policy R2 requires developers to demonstrate how their proposals will protect and enhance the landscape character of its countryside assets, one of which is its open countryside landscape character areas.
- 4.11 The development proposals comprise a large scale development of up to 400 houses on an unallocated greenfield site, within a defined Landscape Character Type (Settled Sandlands LCT) that acknowledges sensitivities to development on the fringes of its high quality rural areas and to modern development that is out of character with the vernacular.
- 4.12 Having ascertained the above higher levels of adverse landscape and visual effect, which are more adverse those identified by ES Chapter 6, and in a number of cases, 'of significance', I believe Trafford Council were correct in citing Core Strategy Policies L7 and R2 in the putative reasons for refusal 2, 5 and 6.

5. Conclusions Regarding the Proposed Development of the Allocated Greenfield Site

5.1 It is possible that at some point in the future, the Appeal Site could be allocated under GM45.

5.2 In the event that this was to happen, it is imperative that the identified sensitivities associated with the Appeal Site and its adjacent rural landscape, are carefully considered by the design process, to ensure that the proposals respond appropriately to their landscape context, thus minimising any resulting landscape and visual harm.

5.3 The Greater Manchester Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment appears to place at least part of the site/study area into the Mosslands and Lowland Farm LCT, specifically Area 44 – Warburton and Carrington Mosses. The document contains a section titled Guidance and Opportunities for Future Development and Landscape Management and Enhancement. The following extracts are considered to be of relevance to the appeal site and the adjacent rural landscape:

- *Ensure that the sense of separation the landscape provides between distinct settlements is retained.*
- *Consider additional woodland planting to enhance landscape structure, soften the urban fringe, screen industrial areas and reduce the noise and visual impacts of motorway corridors, where appropriate.*
- *Ensure that any development is in keeping with the mainly rural character of the landscape in terms of form, density and vernacular.*
- *Retain the quiet and tranquil character of the mosses by discouraging inappropriate land uses and development.*

5.4 Having undertaken a detailed review of the LVIA contained within Chapter 6 of the ES, I have determined that in a number of instances the assessment has in my opinion, understated some of the landscape and visual effects that are likely to result from the implementation of the development proposals (see section 4 above).

5.5 One of the key elements of the development proposals that I believe is repeatedly responsible in contributing to higher levels of adverse landscape and visual effect, is the inadequacy of the boundary treatments, particularly to the southern edge of Site 1 and to the western, southern and eastern boundaries of Site 2.

5.6 The wooded Red Brook corridor provides effective visual and physical separation between the rural landscape and the existing urban area to the north. In doing so, it moderates the effect of the settlement area upon the character of the surrounding rural landscape (ie the Settled Sandlands LCT) and the presence of Warburton Lane

emphasises the perception of arriving at and leaving the built up area/open agrarian landscape. Furthermore, the wooded Red Brook Corridor also enhances the sense of separation between Partington to the north and the historic village of Warburton to the south-west.

- 5.7 The proposed development will breach this established settlement edge and extend development beyond it, to the south.
- 5.8 The presence of the wooded Red Brook corridor combined with an existing wide services easement, present significant constraints to development within the northern parts of Sites 1 and 2. As a result, the parameters plan describes large areas of open space to the north, which offset the developable areas within the two sites, to the south.
- 5.9 This effectively pushes the built form to the south and in the case of Site 1, extends the development very close to its boundary with Moss Lane.
- 5.10 The parameters plan and associated Indicative Layout contained within the revised Design and Access Statement do not incorporate landscape buffers (Green Infrastructure) of sufficient scale and depth to the eastern and southern edges of Site 1 and the eastern, southern and western edges of Site 2.
- 5.11 The proposed development will breach the existing robust landscape edge to the settlement, extend development into the Settled Sandlands LCT and occupy a significant section of the former deer park, thus closing the rural gap between Partington and Warburton Village, whilst adversely affecting its rural and historic context.
- 5.12 As a result, I believe the southern, eastern and western edges of the proposed development should incorporate more significant, deeper landscape buffers in order to create a new high quality, robust edge that will soften the transition between the new settlement edge and the rural landscape beyond. In turn, this will help to moderate the effect of the development upon the rural character of the wider agrarian landscape (ie the Settled Sandlands LCT), whilst moderating any perceived narrowing of the gap between Partington and Warburton Village.
- 5.13 These measures have the potential to moderate some of the higher levels of landscape and visual effect that I have ascertained and in doing so, proposals would better respond to the guidance recommended within the Greater Manchester Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment.
- 5.14 I do not however suppose that the proposed boundary treatments generate all adverse landscape and visual effects and I do not believe that the site can be developed without

harm to the character of the area and the visual amenity of people using and moving through the landscape.

- 5.15 In addition, the requirement for more substantial landscape buffers to the western, southern and eastern boundaries of Sites 1 and 2 will naturally exert a pressure upon the potential quantum of development within the site.
- 5.16 Given the existing constraints located to the northern sections of both Sites 1 and 2, the incorporation of landscape buffers with an appropriate depth would likely significantly jeopardise the site's ability to deliver the quantity of houses proposed (up to 400).

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 Having undertaken a detailed review of the LVIA contained within Chapter 6 of the ES, I have determined that in a number of instances the assessment has in my opinion, understated some of the landscape and visual effects that are likely to result from the implementation of the development proposals.
- 6.2 I believe the development proposals will generate levels of adverse landscape and visual effect, which are of a higher adverse nature than those identified by ES Chapter 6 and in a number of cases, these adverse effects are 'of significance'.
- 6.3 I therefore believe Trafford Council were correct in citing Core Strategy Policies L7 and R2 in the putative reasons for refusal 2, 5 and 6 and respectfully request that the Inspector considers my findings, in deciding the outcome of this Inquiry.