

RH/2/A

**Appeal by Redrow Homes Ltd
Land to east and west of Warburton Lane, Trafford**

PINS reference APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720

LPA reference 98031/OUT/19

**Summary Proof of Evidence of Ian Grimshaw
BA(Hons) MA(LM) MSc CMLI MRTPI**

Landscape and Views

- S1. My name is Ian Jeffrey Grimshaw. I have a Bachelor of Arts degree with Honours in English, a Master of Arts degree in Landscape Management and a Master of Science Degree with Distinction in Environmental Planning. I am a Chartered Landscape Architect and Chartered Town Planner. I have many years' experience in assessing landscape and visual effects of development at a wide range of scales. I have presented expert evidence at public inquiries and hearings.
- S2. I am a Director of The Environment Partnership (TEP) Limited which undertook the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) reported in the Environmental Statement and its Addendum. My evidence addresses landscape matters, particularly effects on the proposed development on landscape character and on views.
- S3. The application is in outline with scale, layout, appearance and landscaping reserved. TEP has been involved in considering aspects of these reserved matters which relate to design but I defer to Mr Haralambous on those matters.
- S4. In Section 2.0 of my evidence I summarise the aspects of the appeal development which will give rise to effects on landscape character and on views. I summarise the landscape assessments that have been undertaken and to which my evidence refers.
- S5. I refer to the method used in the landscape character assessment and explain that I consider the appeal site has medium sensitivity to the development proposed and that judgement is consistent with Trafford Borough Council's expert's assessment and with the Greater Manchester Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment. I refer to the Environmental Statement and the judgements presented in it.
- S6. I explain how the assessment of effects on views has been undertaken and confirm that I agree with the assessments made in the Environmental Statement.
- S7. In Section 3.0 of my evidence I consider Trafford Borough Council's reasons for refusal relating to landscape and the concerns raised in its officer's reports and its Statement of Case. I summarise these as:
- the appeal site and its context has landscape sensitivity;
 - the LVIA has underplayed the impacts that would arise;
 - development would dramatically change the site's character and appearance;
 - effects would exert themselves on the wider landscape;

- existing rural views would be destroyed; and
- there would not be sufficient landscape buffers.

S8. I set out why I disagree with the judgements made, referring to the LVIA presented in the ES, the Statement of Common Ground between the parties and other information where relevant.

S9. I consider representations from the Rule 6 party Warburton Parish Council on landscape in Section 4.0. I summarise these as:

- The site comprises a very precious landscape;
- The proposals are not consistent with landscape policy guidelines in the Trafford Landscape Strategy adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance 30 (CD E9) and not consistent with the '*Guidance and opportunities for future development and management/enhancement*' in the Greater Manchester Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment (GMLCSA) (CD I5).
- There would be effects of Major adverse significance on the landscape from the proposals;
- There would be visual effects of Major adverse significance;
- Landscape mitigation is inadequate around the boundaries of the site, notably along the southern boundary;
- The HS2 route should not have been considered; and
- There should be a fully costed landscape management plan for at least 10 years.

S10. I address each of these points explaining with reference to the LVIA presented in the ES why I disagree. I refer to other assessments where appropriate. I explain that it seems that the Parish Council mistakenly considered ridge heights of buildings could extend to 13.1m which is notably taller than the tallest building form proposed. I address the matter of heritage value and how that relates to landscape value.

S11. I note in Section 5.0 of my main evidence that there were few other representations related to landscape. I explain my opinion that it is important to appropriately separate the matters of landscape and visual effects and effects on heritage assets.

S12. I draw conclusions in Section 6.0 of my main evidence, noting that the LVIA presented in the ES accompanying the appeal application is consistent with professional guidance and that Trafford Borough Council and Warburton Parish Council have

accepted that the method is appropriate. My review demonstrates that it is robust and reliable and an honest appraisal. The assessment applies proportionality to assist the decision-maker.

- S13. I note that the appeal proposals will lead to landscape change as occurs inevitably whenever almost all built form appears on land presently without it. The ES LVIA acknowledges that harm and accurately describes the scale of effects to be taken forward to the planning balance.
- S14. Landscape is a reserved matter to be detailed at a later stage. However the parameters plan has appropriate allowances for details to respect existing landscape character, work with relevant guidance. Appropriate landscape treatment will be applied to boundaries and I disagree with criticism that landscape buffers are required which will screen all built form from the wider landscape.
- S15. I conclude that I do not find Trafford Borough Council's objection to the appeal proposals on landscape grounds coherent or convincing.