

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Appeal by: Redrow Homes

**Site Address: Land to the East and West Warburton Lane
Warburton Lane**

Warburton

WA13 9TT

LPA reference: 98031/OUT/19

PINS reference: APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720

PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF MR JOHN MORLEY
REGARDING HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT
MATTERS ON BEHALF OF
THE LOCAL HIGHWAY AND PLANNING AUTHORITIES

10 September 2020

- 0.1 *My name is John Morley and I am a Principal Engineer with Amey Consulting and provide support to Amey's One Trafford partnership with Trafford Council on Highways and Transport related issues. I have almost 35 years of experience in Transport Engineering and Planning with much of this spent working for, or on behalf of Public Sector organisations in the North West of England since 1985.*
- 0.2 *I have undertaken Transport Assessments for developments of varying size and complexity and managed a Transport Planning team. I have developed highway infrastructure schemes, evaluated Transport Assessments for proposed developments and prepared evidence for Liverpool City Council at public inquiries on two major infrastructure schemes. I have significant expertise in traffic signal, systems design, transport planning, and modelling, both area wide and local modelling, being familiar with various modelling software including: Transyt, Linsig, Arcady Picady, Saturn, Paramics and Vissim.*
- 0.3 *I have been a Chartered Member of the Institute of Logistics and Transport since 2000 and a Member of the Institution of Highways and Transportation since 1989. I have a Bachelor of Science (BSc) Honours Degree in Civil Engineering from the University of Surrey (1981) and a Master of Science (MSc) degree in Transport Engineering and Planning from the University of Salford (1992).*

1.0 Background

- 1.1 This proof covers issues related to highways, traffic and transport. I append a report on public transport produced by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and I and other witnesses draw on that. I am close to agreeing an extensive statement of common ground on Highway, Traffic and Transport. In particular, there is an extensive list of improvements/ mitigations which are required.
- 1.2 We understand that SCP accept that the scheme requires mitigation of its impacts at Flixton Road junction (Flixton crossroads). If that mitigation is to be carried out there, the scheme is agreed. I therefore do not need to address the need for these works in any detail – but see below.
- 1.3 The need for all the other mitigation works is agreed and the ability to deliver appropriate works in those locations is also agreed.
- 1.4 The Council has recently written to the Appellant explaining its new approach to securing the Carrington Relief Road (CRR) in the light of legislative changes and the increased focus on Carrington as a location for strategic development. Discussions are ongoing as to whether the proposed solution is acceptable.
- 1.5 Assuming that para 1.2 above is correct, then all highway specific issues are resolved. The only issue being whether the proposal should contribute to the CRR rather than carry out ad hoc improvements which will quickly become redundant at Flixton crossroads. I therefore do not address those issues in detail.

1.6 Plainly, that resolution does not cover the Council’s concerns on: (1) the suitability of this location for development now in terms of sustainability of the location in transport terms; or (2) the public transport needs of the development.

2.0 The Need for the highway works

2.1 A significant amount of work has been undertaken by SCP in discussion with the Local Highway Authority (LHA), TfGM and Highways England (HE), and the primary references in my evidence will refer to this work.

2.2 Trip Generation

The trip generation and proposed vehicular distribution from the development has been agreed with the developer as reasonably representative for this development. I have appended a detailed explanation of the trip generation at Appendix 3 to this proof. The trip generation is discussed in section 7.0 of the revised TA (Doc ref SC/16544/TA/9 dated Dec 19, CD A54). Trics has been used for the trip generation (ref TA sect 7 and Appendix 6).

2.3 Total person trips, 400 dwellings

Total Trips		Person Trips
AM	Arrivals	85
AM	Departures	352
PM	Arrivals	241
PM	Departures	146

The 2011 Journey to Work Census data for Trafford 017 MSOA has been used to establish the mode share. Whilst all modes are not presented in the

TA, the mode share for car driver is quoted as 63%. It has been agreed by the LHA that this proportion is acceptable for the highway impact analysis of this development (refer to appendix 3 of this proof).

This is higher than in other areas of Trafford and Greater Manchester, understandably because of the limited public transport provision in Partington.

2.4 Total car trips, 400 dwellings

Total Trips		Car Trips
AM	Arrivals	53
AM	Departures	222
PM	Arrivals	152
PM	Departures	92

2.5 The other mode shares of JTW trips is presented in the Travel Plan (ref para 6.4, and table 6.1) together with the travel plan targets.

Table 6.1: Mode Share for Residents of Trafford 017

Mode	Trafford 017	Targets
Single Occupancy Car	63%	58%
Walk / Cycle	12%	14%
Public Transport	16%	19%
Car Share	8%	8%
Motorcycle	1%	1%
Taxi	0%	0%

2.6 If this development generates the same mix as Partington generally, the proposed development of 400 dwellings is anticipated to generate 53 inbound car trips in the AM peak hour and 222 outbound car trips in the same period. In the PM peak hour, 152 inbound and 92 outbound car trips are estimated.

2.7 This is accepted by the LHA as a reasonable representation of the car trips likely to be generated by the proposed Warburton Lane development, (refer to

Appendix 3 of this proof). The TA distributes these car trips on the highway network according to the MSOA JTW output data for MSOA017 (ref 7.7 & 7.8 of the TA and Appendix 2). Appendix 2 of the TA contains the traffic flow diagrams for the road network surrounding the development.

2.8 The development distribution percentages are shown on the 3rd figure in Appendix 2, with the vehicle numbers quoted on the 4th figure.

2.9 Mitigation is required at three junctions to mitigate the development traffic, thereby avoiding severe impact. These junctions are:

1. Warburton Lane/ Central Roundabout junction
2. Manchester Road/ Moss Lane Roundabout Junction
3. Flixton Crossroads (The junction of Manchester Road, Flixton Road and Isherwood Road)

2.10 I have extracted the traffic flow diagrams from the TA, appendix 2 for these three junctions and included in my proof at Appendix 1.

3.0 Junctions Requiring Mitigation

3.1 Section 3 in the TA explains the existing site context and provides traffic model summaries for the individual junctions modelled using traffic flow data as explained in sect 3.13 of the TA, some traffic counts being taken on Thursday 15 March 2018.

3.2 Sect 8.6 in the TA explains the 2 main scenarios considered in the junction modelling. I am focussing on Scenarios 2 and 2a since these consider all the committed development and associated mitigation.

3.3 Considering each junction in turn:

3.4 Warburton Lane/ Central Roundabout junction

The Transport Assessment (TA) considers this junction (section 8.17) and the results of the appellant's junction modelling indicate that this junction is forecast to suffer some queuing in the PM peak hour as a result of committed development. The addition of the development related traffic will exacerbate the queuing and would create severe residual impact without improvement, therefore an improvement to the junction is required as part of the appeal scheme. The exact nature of this scheme is still to be agreed but a solution is feasible, and an initial plan has been proposed by the developer. This improvement is required even if the CRR is provided.

3.5 Sect 8.17 in the TA considers this junction and the results of SCP's junction modelling for the existing junction layout is quoted in table 8.10. This shows a substantial increase in the queues on Manchester New Road in the PM peak from 79 to 141, almost double. Examining the respective delay on this arm from the model, for the same period this is modelled at 300 seconds (5 minutes) on Manchester New Road to 568 seconds (almost 9.5 minutes) when the development traffic is added without mitigation. The relevant summary table is presented in the TA Appendix 8 (pages 340 to 359 of pdf file).

3.6 Section 8.22 and Table 8.12 of the TA then quotes the results of the modelling with the proposed mitigation included. No supporting model outputs appear to be provided in the Revised TA to support these results. These are however presented in the original TA (page 519 on pdf file, appendix 9) and summarised in table 8.12, of the original TA. This shows maximum delay of

less than 30 seconds in both AM and PM peaks with Committed Development and the proposed Warburton Lane Development (400 units). Implementation of this scheme is thus necessary and if implemented will ensure that the development does not harm but improves the position at this junction. This is thus a benefit of the development.

3.7 Manchester Road/ Moss Lane Roundabout Junction

The Transport Assessment considers the operation of this junction. The results of the appellant's junction modelling is summarised in table 8.14 of the Transport Assessment. These results show that there will be substantial queues and delays in the '2029 with Committed Development scenarios' and that when the Warburton Lane development traffic is added without mitigation, these get significantly higher and would create severe residual impact. An improvement to this junction is planned as part of the Lock Lane committed development scheme. That proposed improvement has been agreed also to mitigate the impact of the appeal proposals.

3.8 This junction improvement is required to mitigate against the Warburton Lane development traffic. It needs to be provided before any occupation of the development (whether provided by the Lock Lane development or by this site) or both.

3.9 Table 8.14 in SCP's amended TA shows the congestion at this junction. The detailed Arcady model results are presented in Appendix 8 of the revised TA. This shows that there are substantial queues and delays in the 2029 with Committed Development scenarios, but that when the development traffic is added, without mitigation, these get significantly higher. 11 minutes delay in

AM peak on Manchester New Road increases to approximately 20 minutes when the Warburton Lane development traffic is added. In the PM peak, 13.5 minutes delay on Manchester Road North increases to approximately 19 minutes delay when the development traffic is added. (Reference model results as presented in Appendix 8, amended TA (pages 360 to 379 in pdf file)). The proposals more than mitigate the development traffic and thus, if secured by the development rather than Lock Lane, constitute a benefit of the development. This mitigation is required whether or not the CRR is constructed.

3.10 Flixton Crossroads (The junction of Manchester Road, Flixton Road and Isherwood Road)

- 1 The Council's view is that, unless the construction of the CRR is committed, no dwelling on the appeal site can be occupied until an improvement to Flixton Crossroads has been completed.
- 2 In that situation it has been agreed that the works indicated on SCP drawing ref: SCP 16544-SK13C (ref: Appendix 2, 3d) would appropriately mitigate the impacts on that junction. They would also provide some improvement to the current situation although they would not obviate the need for the CRR in association with SL5 or GM45.
- 3 Of course, any improvement to Flixton Crossroads would be unnecessary if the provision of the Carrington Relief Road is secured (according to the Council's own program) such that there should be a payment to the CRR instead. The CRR is close to being implemented such that any highway improvement funding should be directed to the

implementation of the Carrington Relief Road and that there should be no resistance to the commencement of development on the appeal site during the construction phase of the Carrington Relief Road.

In the absence of CRR, the justification for the Flixton Crossroads works:

- 1 The current congested nature of the network which has been demonstrated by the developers own Transport Assessment. Under policy, the CRR remains necessary in association even with just SL5;
- 2 Absent it, carrying out significant development without the CRR would be contrary to the logic of SL5 and the additional traffic generated by the development at the Flixton Crossroads junction without mitigation would create a severe impact justifying the refusal of planning permission. It has been shown in other cases where the road network is currently congested that even small increases in traffic can lead to a severe impact.
- 3 Trafford Council and Amey (via the OneTrafford partnership) have been working together with SCP, and TfGM and SCP have developed an alternative junction improvement which does not require third party land. We accept that the preferred solution is the implementation of the Carrington Relief Road, and that the improvement of the Flixton crossroads junction would not be necessary if the Carrington Relief Road were implemented.

3.11 Table 8.18 in the amended TA presents the Linsig results for the modelling of this junction under scenario 2 with the Carrington Village mitigation implemented. This does not include the suppressed demand and if this were

to be included the results would show higher oversaturation, queues and delays.

- 3.12 Just considering the Manchester Road west approach to this junction with the Carrington Village mitigation scheme in place the modelling shows for the 2029 scenario with Committed Development but no Warburton Lane Development traffic, a degree of saturation in the AM peak of 108.7 % and of 108.7% in the PM peak with associate mean maximum queues of 280 passenger car units (pcus) and 118 pcus for each peak period respectively.
- 3.13 When the Warburton Lane development traffic is added, without any further mitigation, the degree of saturation increases to 133.6% in the AM peak and to 112.5% in the PM peak with mean maximum queues of 337 and 148 for the AM and PM peak periods, respectively.
- 3.14 The above figures are quoted in table 8.18 of the amended TA and the full model outputs are presented in the appendix 8 of the amended TA. These also quote the average delays in seconds per pcu experienced on each of the model links. Again, focussing on the Manchester Road west approach, in the 2029 scenario with the Committed Development traffic but not the Warburton Lane development traffic, the average delay is 464 seconds per pcu in the AM peak and 201 seconds per pcu in the PM peak. When the Warburton Lane Development traffic is added, without any further mitigation, the modelled delays increase to 535 seconds per pcu in the AM peak and to 260 seconds per pcu in the PM peak.

- 3.15 Without mitigation any development of the site would result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network and mitigation would have to be implemented before the occupation of any of the proposed dwellings.
- 3.16 The LHA and TfGM accept that the proposed mitigation on SCP drawing ref: SCP 16544-SK13C (ref: Appendix 2, 3d) would mitigate against the traffic generated by the Warburton Lane development and should the development be allowed would require a financial contribution to the implementation of CRR calculated on the basis of the formula discussed previously, or a Grampian condition to implement the mitigation at the Flixton crossroads junction.

4.0 The Carrington Relief Road – Policy and Delivery

- 4.1 It has been recognised for some time that the usual weekday peak hour traffic demands on the Flixton junction are beyond its capacity, leading to significant queuing on the approaches (particularly on the Manchester Road west arm). The true extent of the problem is masked by what I term suppressed demand, i.e. a queue of traffic that builds up because the traffic demand is beyond the capacity of the junction. This demand will not be captured by the traffic counts since they only record traffic which manages to pass through the junction in the assessment period.
- 4.2 This is acknowledged in the Transport Assessment (ref: sections 8.34 to 8.45 in revised TA, CD A54) and accepted as an existing problem on the highway network in this location.

- 4.3 The estimated volume of current traffic, on the Manchester Road west approach that is not expected to be counted though the junction during peak hours because it is kept in a queue at the junction and cannot pass through it in those hours is 481 vehicles in the am peak and 305 vehicles in the pm peak. These figures are presented in Appendix 2 of the TA and extracted at Appendix 1, 3 of this proof. There is thus a major existing problem at Flixton Crossroads.
- 4.4 Trafford's Local Plan: Core Strategy was adopted in 2012 (ref: CD E2). It states in Policy SL5 – Carrington, SL5.2, that the Location can deliver, inter alia: *“New road infrastructure to serve the development area to relieve congestion on the existing A6144; Significant improvements to public transport infrastructure by improving access to Partington, the Regional Centre and Altrincham with links to the Metrolink system”*.
- 4.5 It then goes on, in SL5.4, to identify a list of requirements for development in this location to be acceptable, which include: *“Contributions towards schemes to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by the development on the Strategic, Primary and Local Road Networks; these include public transport and highway infrastructure schemes.”*
- 4.6 Trafford's Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) then states in sections 8.73 to 8.75:
- “8.73 Proposals to improve the highway and public transport infrastructure serving the area will improve the sustainability of the Location as a focus for development, making it accessible by a choice of transport modes. This will create and significantly improve transportation links to the Strategic Road*

Network, Metrolink and cross conurbation to Salford (a Manchester Ship Canal crossing will be subject to further investigation). The alignment of the link road to serve the development area and ease congestion along the A6144 will be determined by the Carrington Area Action Plan.¹

8.74 The outcomes of the Greater Manchester Transport Modelling Assessment indicate that significant schemes are required to mitigate the impact of this development on the Strategic Road Network and the Primary and Local Authority Network.

- 4.7 This demonstrates that the Carrington Relief Road is required by policy in order to accommodate even just SL5 development and to unlock severe existing conditions on the A6144.
- 4.8 It was initially hoped that the CRR would be funded by a mix of funding sources including anticipated CIL and s.106 contributions. SPDs were adopted which would have enabled contributions to be secured. However, the CIL regulations prevented both pooled funding via s.106s and any overlap between the reg 123 list and the requirements of s.106 agreements. Further, whilst the CRR was in the CIL List, no funding via that route was secured because the first CIL priority was investment in Metrolink. In that context, the Council reluctantly accepted ad hoc improvements to junctions on the A6144 rather than contributions to the CRR because delivery of the CRR was so uncertain.
- 4.9 In 2019, the CIL regulations were amended, and both restrictions referred to above were removed. Much more recently, the Council has identified the

¹ The link road referred to is the Carrington Relief Road
John Morley (LHA/LPA) proof of Evidence PINS reference: APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720

opportunity to dedicate CIL funding to the CRR as its strategic infrastructure priority to unlock development at SL5 and GM45. A report is anticipated to go to committee very shortly which proposes a clear and settled route for the early delivery of the CRR and for funding contributions for it.

- 4.10 The intended approach is therefore that: (1) existing funding streams will deliver around ½ the cost; (2) CIL receipts will be dedicated to the CRR; and (3) s.106 contributions will be required in accordance with the extant SPDs under a formula. This will obviate the need for ad hoc improvements to the Flixton Junction which would become redundant when the CRR is delivered. Diverting investment to the Flixton junction could also have the effect of prejudicing the delivery of the CRR by limiting funding streams for it.
- 4.11 The preferred approach of the Council in accordance with policy is therefore likely to imminently be that there are contributions to the CRR rather than ad hoc improvements. The Council will take the construction and costs risks and will not require phasing of developments tied to highway improvements – in other words the onus will be on it to deliver the CRR as quickly as possible to prevent any time lag between when new development comes on stream and the completion of the CRR. This is a major change in approach by the Council as part of its proactive efforts to unlock the development potential and housing provision in SL5 and later GM45.
- 4.12 Given, as now agreed and in any event as demonstrated below, the proposed development requires improvements to Flixton junction or delivery of the CRR to make it acceptable, and given the new approach of the Council, it is proposed that the highway reason for refusal be addressed by a condition and

s.106 obligation requiring delivery of the Flixton Road improvements only if the Council does not first confirm that the CRR is to be constructed; and if such confirmation is to be given for the developer to contribute to the CRR rather than have to carry out the Flixton works.

4.13 If the CRR is not deliverable in a timely manner, there would be a severe impact at Flixton crossroads which could be addressed by a junction improvement scheme which has been put forward by SCP (ref: Appendix 2, 3 - Proposed Mitigation – (SCP 16544_SK13C)) to be funded by the Warburton Lane Developer. The increases to queues and delays, particularly on the Manchester Road West arm are sufficient to create residual severe impact should no further mitigation be provided other than that to be implemented to mitigate the Carrington Village development.

4.14 However, such an incremental improvement would be wholly sub-optimal, effectively a “short-term sticking plaster”, in advance of any potential future implementation of CRR. Whilst this junction improvement would mitigate against the Warburton Lane development traffic, it does not address the primary strategic issue of congestion along the A6144 recognised in, and required to be mitigated by, policy and more substantial infrastructure improvements including the CRR would still be necessary in association with SL5/GM45 development.

4.15 I hope that by the time the inquiry commences the report to committee setting out this position in detail will be available. In highway terms, it makes perfect sense to secure the CRR rather than to make increasingly complicated adjustments to existing junctions because: (1) nothing less will resolve the

inherent existing and future accessibility issues for Carrington – see SL5; (2) those issues will be even more significant with GM45; (3) ad hoc improvements will become redundant when CRR is complete; and (4) ad hoc improvements will divert investment from CRR and thus make its delivery less likely.

5.0 Location and Accessibility

5.1 I accept that if the Council’s proposals with CRR are adopted and come forward, the accessibility issues for SL5 will be overcome. I also accept that the provision of CRR removes a major impediment to the wider GM45 because it provides the first stage of the necessary transport infrastructure. Of course, it does not secure the further infrastructure within GM45 itself necessary to make the wider GM45 a sustainable development.

5.2 However, that does not overcome the current concerns with accessibility of the site in sustainable transport terms. I still regard the site as currently unacceptably “out on a limb” for the reasons which follow.

5.3 The Appellant’s Transport Assessment indicates that the primary vehicular access is via A6144 Manchester Road from the north east of the site. Traffic to and from the proposed development thereby passes through an already congested network which experiences significant queuing and delays at junctions. The site is thus at effectively the end of a highly congested transport corridor. It has poor PT infrastructure. It is thus out on a limb and even with

the above mitigation, will remain so. In transport planning terms this is currently a poor location for development.

- 5.4 The proposed development does not allow for the Master-Planning work undertaken by Himor. The Master-Plan is now being developed by Trafford's Planning Department. In particular, the proposed development does not provide for the envisaged Southern Link Road which allow the full potential of the Carrington GMSF allocation to come forward. It has not been addressed in the Appellant's proposals and there is no alternative (non-GB) route for it.
- 5.5 Whilst it may be possible to mitigate the direct development traffic of the proposed Warburton Lane development as set out above, it has the potential to prejudice other development in the Carrington area because the proposed development (East side) is on the site that the Southern Link Road may use and only provides an access route which may not be of sufficient width for through traffic. Even if wide enough, it will determine an alignment before the Masterplan is complete. The proposed development is in the area of the Carrington GMSF allocation that is furthest away from the most viable access routes.
- 5.6 Access to shops and other facilities in Partington is unsuitable. Even with new pedestrian footbridges, most residents in the proposed development would likely drive, either into Partington, or because of the limited facilities offered in Partington, further afield, where a greater range of shops and other leisure activities is available. The TA indicates in Appendix 2 that only 6% of the trips are likely to remain local to Partington with destinations via Central Road and that 63% of trips generated are likely to be by car.

- 5.7 It is understood that the planning applications for the footbridges have now been withdrawn. The Local Highway Authority were extremely concerned that these proposed footbridges and associated infrastructure would not provide safe, inclusive, convenient and attractive pedestrian and cycle access, there being particular issues with excessively steep gradients, proposed construction, materials, widths, and the steps near the western footbridge.
- 5.8 The evidence of Bethany Brown discusses 'Integration and Accessibility' and identifies the distances to various attractors in Partington and the deficiencies in provision for pedestrians. In particular, there is a narrow footway on the eastern side of Warburton Lane north of the proposed site accesses towards Partington, and on the western side of Warburton Lane there is an 80 metre stretch where there is no footway provision.
- 5.9 The distances and inadequacy of footway provision will discourage walking from the proposed development to the amenities in Partington. The infrequent bus services and location of the bus stops will also discourage the use of buses, particularly for local trips, and will encourage further use of motorised vehicles for local and longer distance trips.

6.0 Public Transport

- 6.1 The existing bus services in the area are so seriously deficient as to require significant improvements funded where necessary by developer contributions. The need for significant improvements in public transport are made clear in existing policy just for SL5 and will be even greater for GM45. This site is

attempting to come forward in advance of much of SL5 and its public transport improvements, and in advance of a consolidated approach to public transport under GM45. It is necessary for it to provide additional services and fund them pending the further development which will itself provide further funding and contribute to longer term viability of these services.

6.2 The position relating to public transport is discussed in the Transport Assessment, sections 5.12 to 5.19, and in considerably more detail in the Public Transport report prepared by TfGM and appended to this proof (ref Appendix 4). This report sets out the public transport conditions in the settlement of Partington, Trafford, and how they relate to the proposed application for residential development

The following bus services are available in Partington:

Service	Route	Frequency	Timetabled peak journey times (from stop nearest application site)	Closest bus stop to site
247	Altrincham – Partington – Trafford Centre	Every 30 minutes (every 60 minutes evenings and Sundays)	Partington to Altrincham: 32 minutes Partington to Trafford Centre: 28 minutes	Warburton Lane
248	Partington – Trafford Park	Peak times only	Partington to Trafford Park: 56 minutes	Oak Road
253/255	Partington – Manchester	Every 30 minutes (every 60 minutes on Sundays)	Partington to Manchester: 82 minutes.	Oak Road
260	Partington – Sale	Every 60 minutes (every 120 minutes on Sundays)	Partington to Sale: 31 minutes	Oak Road
Cat 5a	Altrincham – Partington - Warrington	Every 60 minutes (weekday only)	Partington to Warrington: 76 minutes Partington to Altrincham: 26 minutes	Warburton Lane
Note that services 248, 260 and Cat5a above are wholly funded by TfGM, and services 247 and 255 are also funded by TfGM early mornings and evenings 7 days a week.				

Therefore any continued provision of the above is subject to funding availability.

- 6.3 The report estimates the likely number of bus passengers per day generated by the appeal site and converts this to an estimated annual revenue (ref: table 3 in appendix 4 to this proof). This estimated revenue per year generated for public transport by bus passengers from the appeal site would amount to a maximum of around £78,000, and more realistically a figure of less than £40,000. This falls considerably short of the cost to TfGM of subsidising a single bus service (the cost of which can vary depending on the nature of the vehicle but is seldom less than £150,000 for a daytime only service).
- 6.4 TfGM's position is that given the poor public transport provision and current traffic conditions, development in this location cannot be supported unless in the context of a holistic, masterplanned development of the wider New Carrington site. However, if this point is rejected, and if it is concluded that housing here can go ahead in advance of masterplanned new public transport infrastructure, the report identifies the minimum necessary improvements that would be required (ref: section 7, appendix 4 to this proof).
- 6.5 In a similar manner to the CRR, Trafford's Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) outlines the requirement for significant improvements to public transport infrastructure in association with even just SL5 development. Those improvements have not yet been delivered. The appeal site is even less well served by public transport than areas further east/north and the policy need for significant public transport improvements is even starker here. It is considered necessary in accordance with NPPF Paras 102 to 105 and Core

Strategy policies SL5, L4 and L8 for the public transport improvements identified below and in TfGM's Public Transport note (ref: section 7 of Appendix 4 to this proof) to be implemented to serve to the Warburton Lane development and therefore a significant contribution of £2.025m towards public transport is required in addition to the necessary local bus stop infrastructure improvements.

6.6 This is required to ensure that the site is adequately served by public transport pending the delivery of significant further housing development in SL5 and GM45 which it is envisaged will make viable and/or continue funding of these necessary services. This is since the Warburton Lane development and the resultant population would not be sufficient in themselves to sustain the bus service provision— for example - without reliance on external subsidies and without resorting to public funding when the contribution is exhausted.

6.7 The required improvements would be as follows:

6.7.1 Improvements to the bus stops on Warburton Lane, as set out by the applicant. These are required in order to bring the waiting environment up to a minimum standard. Currently these stops are used infrequently but would become focal points for bus passengers to and from the appeal site. They are needed to provide for all bus passengers from these stops. This will secure inclusive access to buses as required by TfGM's public transport and bus policies and strategies with regard to DDA, and assist in providing essential sustainable access to the development, which would be essential for this development.

6.7.2 Continued support of the existing Cat 5a service (which TfGM currently subsidises), amounting to £150,000 per year, for five years, in order to provide a guaranteed service until such a time when wider development in the Carrington/ Partington area might conceivably enable the service to run without subsidy. Currently this service is supported by TfGM who cannot guarantee continued funding. Increasing the numbers of bus passengers by developing the Warburton Lane site means that guaranteed funding for this service is required until such time as it would become self-supporting, either financed from further development or significantly increased mode share. This service provides a limited service to an area poorly served by public transport and therefore funding is required to ensure it can serve the proposed development in accordance with Core Strategy policies SL5, L4. As such this is an essential service for the development.

6.7.3 Underwriting of an additional bus per hour to Altrincham interchange, potentially the Partington-Altrincham section of the existing Cat 5a, including an evening service, at a cost of £200,000 per annum, for five years. This is required to provide a level of service to the nearest trip attractor – Altrincham – to make public transport a potentially attractive option. The improved frequency of service would half the average waiting time and help to increase bus mode share. It would provide improved links to Altrincham per Core Strategy SL5.2 which requires significant improvements to public transport infrastructure by improving access to Partington, the Regional Centre and Altrincham with links to the Metrolink system. 5 years funding is necessary because the service will not become self-financing until other developments have been built and occupied.

6.7.4 Support of a school service from Partington to meet demand for secondary school children wishing to attend schools elsewhere in the Borough, at a cost of £55,000 per year, for five years. This is required to meet the educational transport needs of development. Only one secondary school is available in Partington. 5 years of funding is required to enable sufficient time for funding to be sought to enable the service to continue beyond that period. This would provide choice and capacity for potential secondary school age children resident in appeal site. It would potentially reduce the impact of car trips from the appeal site

6.8 The costs relating to these contributions have been calculated by TfGM. The timescale for implementation of nearby development is uncertain, therefore, the financial support for the above services is necessary for a five-year period to provide sufficient time for these services to be financially viable or to determine contributions from elsewhere. TfGM's analysis of likely demand for passengers from the proposed development indicates that this is not sufficient to make the service provision financially self-supporting and therefore the services will require continued subsidy until such time as demand increases either by greater mode share or by more development being undertaken.

6.9 Without these public transport contributions, and improved service provision, there would be an even greater demand for car trips putting an unacceptable burden on an already congested highway network, leading to further congestion and road safety issues. Therefore, without these contributions the development would be unacceptable on highway grounds.

7.0 Unsustainable Location/Wrong time

- 7.1 The proposal for development at this site is coming forward before the necessary infrastructure, public transport provision and masterplanning is complete. On the latter, a Masterplan for the area “New Carrington” is currently being developed by Trafford MBC and this application has the potential to prejudice other development since the transport infrastructure necessary to realise the full development potential of “New Carrington” is likely to require a distributor road through the eastern Warburton Lane development site.
- 7.2 The high-level Masterplan will ensure a joined-up approach to development. The Masterplan will support the proposed allocation in the GMSF 2020 and will inform the revised GM45 site allocation policy. Trafford Council has commissioned the Masterplan, but it is being prepared with input from the key landowners, including Redrow in the early stages of its development. The masterplan draws upon evidence base documents which have been prepared for the GMSF and it will determine an appropriate development quantum and high-level phasing of the New Carrington site. The Draft GMSF 2019 policy requires the preparation of a detailed Masterplan / SPD to support the allocation and it is envisaged that the Masterplan currently under preparation will form the basis of this further work.
- 7.3 Draft policy GM45 also sets out the high-level policy requirements which will overcome the infrastructure barriers that currently prevent the appeal site from coming forward. The development parcels within the New Carrington site will need to contribute to and have regard to the infrastructure which is required for the wider site. There is a significant risk that if sites, such as the land at

Warburton Lane, come forward in advance of the Masterplan then they could threaten the wider integration of the sites into the New Carrington site, or preclude the delivery of a key infrastructure route. For example, the early high level masterplanning and transport work has indicated a potential requirement for a southern link road running through the eastern land parcel of the appeal site. The application makes no allowance for the development to accommodate infrastructure of this significance, nor does it give consideration to a connection to be made beyond the application site. The absence of provision for this link could mean that the development of this site would prejudice the delivery of wider strategic infrastructure needed to support the New Carrington site.