

Warburton Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary Regulation 16 Consultation Representations

A total of 76 representations have been received, including 10 organisations/consultees and one landowner/developer. A total of 65 responses were received from members of the public, the majority of these (59) supported the Neighbourhood Plan, whilst six residents objected to the Neighbourhood Plan. Although it is noted that three of the objections also submitted a letter in support of the Neighbourhood Plan – both have been recorded. Further, none of the objections made by local residents provided any commentary.

The following table summarises the comments made during the Regulation 16 stage of the Warburton Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
Active Travel England (ATE)	WP1	ATE noted that it is not a statutory consultee. Guidance provided via links.
Historic England	WP2	HE did not wish to comment on this version of the Warburton Neighbourhood Plan and consider that Trafford Council is best placed to assist in relation to the historic environment.
National Gas Transmission (Avison Young)	WP3	National Gas Transmission identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) (Fisher German LLP)	WP4	<p>NGET identified an asset (ZO ROUTE TWR (O11R – 197) 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: DAINES-DEESIDE 1 & DAINES – DEESIDE 2) within the neighbourhood plan area and provided a plan showing the details of NGET assets.</p> <p>Currently there are no known new infrastructure interactions within the area, however demand for electricity is expected to rise as the way NGET power our homes, businesses and transport changes.</p> <p>The way NGET generate electricity in the UK is changing rapidly, and NGET are transitioning to cheaper, cleaner and more secure forms of renewable energy such as new offshore windfarms. NGET need to make changes to the network of overhead lines, pylons, cables and other infrastructure that transports electricity around the country, so that everyone has access to clean electricity from these new renewable sources. These changes include a need to increase the capability of the electricity transmission system between the North and the Midlands, and between the Midlands and the South. It is also needed to facilitate the connection of proposed new offshore wind, and subsea connections between England and Scotland, and between the UK and other countries across the North Sea.</p> <p>Accordingly, NGET request that the Council is cognisant of the above. Further advice and guidance also provided</p>
National Highways	WP5	Given the scope of the draft policies, National Highways will not look to comment at this time.

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
Natural England	WP6	<p>NE does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. NE therefore recommend that advice is sought from your ecological, landscape and soils advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local soils, best and most versatile agricultural land, landscape, geodiversity and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by the plan before determining whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment is necessary.</p> <p>General advice and guidance provided.</p>
Sport England	WP7	<p>SE provided general advice and guidance on the role of Sport England in the planning process, and guidance provided on evidence base requirements.</p> <p>Trafford is in the process of drafting a Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sport Strategy as part of its Local Plan evidence base and this should be used to inform planning decisions and assessments of playing field land.</p>
Redrow Homes (North West) Ltd (Stantec)	WP8	<p>Redrow Homes starts by providing context for representations including an overview of Redrow's land interest at Warburton Lane, overview of the adopted planning policy context and planning history; and their involvement in the preparation of the WNDP.</p> <p>Redrow Homes note and welcome the extent of positive changes which have been made since the Regulation 14 Draft in response to Redrow's changes; in particular the deletion of Policy W10 and the Warburton Lane Masterplan from the Submission Plan. Their reservations in relation to the inclusion of a Design Code (Appendix 4 of the WNDP) remain similar to those set out in our Regulation 14 representations. Other comments include points which relate to unnecessary duplication of strategic and national policy, as well as overly prescriptive policy. In summary:</p> <p>Redrow Homes land interests relate to the greenfield land in the north of the Neighbourhood Plan area, known as 'Warburton Lane' area of PfE allocation for New Carrington.</p> <p>Redrow set out the policy context of the above site, including PfE JPA30 and the requirement for a masterplan. The planning history of site includes an application (98031/OUT/19) for development of up to 400 dwellings with access and infrastructure, which was refused and dismissed at appeal; and two undetermined planning applications: 115154/FUL/24 (155 dwellings) & 115155/HYB/24 (full permission sought for 103 dwellings plus outline for up to 300 dwellings).</p> <p>Redrow report a lack of engagement with preparation of WNDP. Redrow considers the preparation of a Design Code which crosses over with a Masterplan and Design Code being prepared by the LPA runs a risk of undermining the requirements of the strategic policies of the PfE and should be avoided; however, if those documents are to be produced, Redrow should be engaged for reasons set out in Paragraph 048 of the NPG.</p> <p>Section 2: Paragraph 2.15 of the WNDP writes that the document was updated following the Regulation 14 consultation. The updated version of</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p>the Archaeological and Historic Buildings Assessment has not been published as part of the Regulation 16 consultation.</p> <p>The heritage referenced within Section 2 of the Assessment is not entirely consistent with the heritage presented in Map 3 of the WNDP in terms of the features described. It is also more contentious in discussing the legibility and survival of the park features.</p> <p>Redrow requests that the Assessment is reconsidered against Map 3 of the Plan and, for consistency, amended so that the two elements are aligned in their approach.</p> <p>Redrow also continue to suggest that reference to HS2 is omitted entirely (from the plan and its mapping) from Paragraph 2.22 as this is no longer relevant.</p> <p>Section 3: Paragraph 3.4 states that there is evidence that a large area of the northwest of the parish around Warburton Park was occupied by a medieval deer park, believed to date from the 1200s. It states that this is a significant heritage asset with potential for further archaeological interest.</p> <p>It is vital that language used in relation to heritage (a carefully considered part of planning law and policy) is accurate and clear. Warburton Park is not a designated heritage asset but reference to it as a significant heritage asset is confusing and implies as such.</p> <p>Redrow consider that this part of the Plan should be amended to clarify that the Warburton Park is a non-designated heritage asset of local value (as confirmed at the previously mentioned Planning Appeal).</p> <p>Section 4: Redrow propose that the wording of Section 4.0 (Draft Vision and Objectives) is amended to support the forthcoming development at Warburton Lane, in accordance with NPPF p13 and basic condition e).</p> <p>Redrow consider that the successful delivery of Warburton Lane will play an integral role in achieving the vision outlined within the draft plan.</p> <p>Policy W1: The level of protection offered to different landscapes is set out within national policy and the WNDP must have regard to that policy approach.</p> <p>With regard to national policy and the Appeal decision, Redrow cannot agree with paragraph 5.1.1 of the WNDP which claims “Warburton has a very distinctive landscape character”. As outlined within our previous representations, this reference should be removed.</p> <p>Whilst it is the requirement of the NPPF that the intrinsic value of the landscape is recognised (and policy encourages that the landscape is enhanced), it is not compatible with national policy that Policy W1 requires protection or ‘conservation’ of the landscape as per the title of draft Policy W1. Redrow suggest that the policy is re-titled to ‘Respecting Local Landscape Character’.</p> <p>Redrow also object to the part of W1 which requires “Development proposals should have regard to the design principles for Landscape and Views set out in Part 3.3 of the Warburton Design Guidance and Codes...”. Redrow consider that the landscape character type is adequately defined by existing landscape character assessments which have been referenced</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p>within the supporting text of the WNDP. We do not support the WNDP reference to landscape features being identified within the Landscape Character Assessment for Warburton.</p> <p>The supporting Landscape Character Assessment makes generalised sweeping statements about landscape sensitivity, that are not reconciled against a clear methodology for different levels of sensitivity (e.g. low/medium/high), nor do they stipulate what types of development these landscapes may be sensitive to.</p> <p>The requirements for a substantial landscape buffer to the south of the allocation is set out within Policy JPA30 of PfE and it is therefore unnecessary for Policy W1 to duplicate the strategic policy; the former deer park forms part of that southern boundary. There is no requirement within PfE to reduce the density of a scheme to accommodate such a buffer. The details of the buffer should be determined by a development proposal with full regard to a landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) prepared by the Applicant.</p> <p>Policy W2: Redrow object to the approach taken by Policy W2 and consider it conflicts with the development plan and national planning policy which provides guidance on how non-designated heritage assets should be considered.</p> <p>The assets contained within Map 3 do not accord with the historic environment record entry, and do not reflect the Warburton Archaeological and Historic Buildings Assessment Overview report referenced in Section 2. Redrow object to reference to the deer park as being a historic ‘landscape’ asset, within Policy W2.</p> <p>Redrow consider Policy W2 fails to meet the basis conditions and should be deleted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that, we do accept that planning policy should require development to take account of non-designated heritage assets such as the former Warburton Deer Park (which the NPPF and PfE Policy do require). If the WNDP is to retain Policy W2, we suggest that the policy reflects the approach taken in existing policy and avoids seeking to apply undue protection to individual features with unevidenced significance.</p> <p>Policy W3: Redrow supports the principle aims of Policy W3. However, object to the inclusion of Maps 4 and 5 (and reference to them) within the Policy which identify areas of ‘high distinctiveness habitats’ and Wildlife Corridors.</p> <p>Whilst the habitats in Map 4 may be ‘distinctive’ the proper assessment of the ecological value of a Site should be undertaken within 2 years of considering a proposal. The information contained within Map 4 would be out of date by virtue of time elapsed quickly after adoption of the plan. Instead, Redrow would support a policy requirement which requires development to assess the habitats and their importance.</p> <p>The latter paragraphs of Policy W3 are too prescriptive as to how ecological enhancement is to take place; Redrow consider the best approach for mitigation is done on a case-by-case basis, following advice from suitably qualified ecologist.</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p>The Wildlife Corridors presented within Map 5 extend further to that shown within adopted Core Strategy Policy R2. The Protecting and Enhancing Warburton’s Natural Environment evidence base states that a 15 metre buffer has been placed to protect the ‘notable habitats’. Natural England Guidance¹ writes that a buffer zone of 15 metres should only be applied to Ancient Woodland, which is defined within the Standing Advice as being an ‘irreplaceable habitat’.</p> <p>Furthermore, the buffer includes a triangular parcel of land north of Red Brook and south of Chapel Lane, which is outside of the WNDP plan area and thus should not be prescribing development or identifying constraints here.</p> <p>Redrow suggest the latter 2 paragraphs of Policy W3 are relocated to the supporting text.</p> <p>Policy W5: Redrow object to the wording of Policy W5 (Part 2) which requires development proposals within allocation area JPA30 to <i>‘respond positively to Warburton Design Guidance and Codes Part 4.3.1 Using Historic Farmstead Character to Guide Design’</i>. Although the wording of Policy W5 has been revised, Redrow consider the underlying principles remain unchanged.</p> <p>Warburton Masterplan Design Guidance (WMDG) seeks to apply principles which are overly prescriptive. It would not be considered desirable to replicate density, building and layout forms of agricultural buildings across the allocation area at Warburton Lane.</p> <p>It would fail to make efficient use of land and would be unsustainable in that regard, contrary to basic condition d).</p> <p>Policy W6: designated heritage assets and their settings are already appropriately protected through national planning policy. Policy W6 seeks to introduce design principles contained within Part 3.2 of [WDG&C], which is high level and prescriptive as to how impacts on heritage assets are to be mitigated. The combination of a summary approach at Policy W6 and prescriptive approach within Part 3.2 serves to undermine the effectiveness of applying that national policy. Redrow considers, therefore that Policy W6 should be removed in its entirety.</p> <p>In addition, Redrow take specific issue with reference to cumulative impacts. Paragraph 13 of the Historic Environment NPPG writes that <i>‘local planning authorities may need to consider the implications of cumulative change’</i>. This responsibility is therefore with Trafford Council, not the Parish Council to set out.</p> <p>Policy W7: the WNDP needs to be clear as to the status of the list of buildings and structures at Appendix 3. Policy W7 states that they are identified as non-designated heritage assets, but earlier parts of the Plan state that the list reflects non-designated heritage asset ‘candidates’ which are to be considered by Trafford Council (and adopted or otherwise). The WNDP should make clear which eventuality is the case.</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p>Notwithstanding, Redrow consider it is the role of LPA to identify Non-designated Heritage Assets and therefore WNDP should reference Trafford Council's adopted Local List, rather than producing their own list. Redrow have no objection to reference the PfE in assessing development proposals affecting non-designated heritage assets; albeit we do not consider it is necessary to replicate existing policy. If the PfE policy is to be referenced, they suggest that for completeness, the NPPF should equally be referenced.</p> <p>Policy W9: NPPF Paragraph 203 recognises the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets (including those with archaeological interest), however there is no strict requirement for development proposals to 'enhance' said asset, nor does national policy require the preservation of 'potential' assets, as currently detailed in draft Policy W9. Furthermore, the final sentence of the policy writes '<i>lack of current evidence of sub-surface archaeology must not be taken as proof of absence</i>'. The lack of current evidence is routinely taken as proof (or a strong indication) of absence, and national planning policy does not indicate otherwise. Instead, development proposals should be determined in accordance with paragraph 200 of the NPPF, which sets out that the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact. Contrary to basic condition a), the level of protection and enhancement specified within Draft Policy W9 exceeds the requirements set out within Section 16 (including Paragraph 200) of the NPPF. Redrow therefore requests that the policy wording is revised to align with national planning policy.</p> <p>Policy W10: Support policy, however it is a duplication of strategic and national planning policy.</p> <p>Policy [W11]: It is important for vehicular and active travel routes to consider movement across the parish and into New Carrington and beyond. Redrow reject any request for contributions for infrastructure that are not directly related to development of Redrow's land interests, are not necessary to make the development proposals acceptable in planning terms or are not fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. For example, Policy W11 seeks to encourage the (through developer contributions) improvement to existing pavements and ongoing maintenance (the extent of which is unclear), new welcoming roadside signage, a signposted heritage trail and a celebratory village centre sign and improved access to parking facilities at existing village assets. These items all relate to existing issues which exist within the parish or desires of the parish council currently; it is not clear how these matters relate to proposed development at all and therefore how they would comply with the tests above.</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p>We do note the Parish's requirements for new speed limits and road markings at key junctions. Any development at Warburton Lane will need to provide suitable access to the development as well as mitigate any off site impacts it might have however those must be limited to changes required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>Policy W12: Redrow do not consider that W12/2 or W12/6 meet NPPF criteria.</p> <p>LGS W12/2 serves the residents of Partington and the residents along Oak Road, which are not part of Warburton or the WNDP boundary. It is therefore unclear how the 'local significance' of this space has been assessed in relation to said residents. Notwithstanding this, Redrow do not consider that the parcel of land is demonstrably special to the local community or holds a particular local significance.</p> <p>The area is not accessible to the public and Redrow find it difficult to understand how the land is enjoyed as a place of tranquillity. It is not ancient woodland nor is it considered to provide important views in relation to heritage assets.</p> <p>Redrow reference the previous planning appeal, stating the inspector concluded that notwithstanding the value which local people placed on the entire landscape surrounding Warburton, its characteristics were insufficient to be considered as a 'valued landscape'.</p> <p>Redrow consider that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the features (i.e. that parts of the LGS are of value visually, arboriculturally, ecologically) are 'demonstrably special to the local community' or that they hold a 'particular local significance' due to any of those attributes; both of those tests must be passed for such a designation to be made and for designation as LGS to be justified.</p> <p>Redrow consider that W12/2 is an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>Planning practice guidance (reference 37-005-20140306) set out that the purpose of a LGS designation is a way to provide special protection against development for green areas of particular importance to local communities. Notwithstanding the above, Redrow consider that the proposed designation W12/2 would be objectional because such a designation would be in conflict with other areas of the Development Plan, including JPA30.</p> <p>The requirement of paragraph 107 of the NPPF that LGS designations are to be treated as Green Belt for the purposes of policy making (and de facto for decision making) would clash with JPA30. This land cannot be kept open and will necessarily be bound by development. Indeed, Planning Guidance (paragraph 37-007-20140306) specifies that '<i>designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.</i>'</p> <p>Whilst Redrow do not support the designation of W12/2, it also does not consider it is necessary in any case due to development control criteria within PfE JPA30, which safeguard and mitigate any harm to any attributes</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p>of conservation value at the Site, whether that is landscape, arboriculture, heritage or ecological value.</p> <p>Redrow disagrees that LGS W12/6 area is capable of satisfying part b) of NPPF paragraph 106. The area may be capable of forming part of the setting of a heritage asset, but as such, its value to the significance of the heritage asset would be protected by policy and statute. It is not necessary for it to be otherwise protected.</p> <p>Save for that, that value attributed to W12/6 appears to be on the basis of it providing for views across the Moss and towards Warburton when existing Partington or travelling along Moss Lane. The LGS designation is intended to protect land which itself is of special value or significance, which this land is not. The land highlighted is, essentially a highway verge and contains none of the listed attributes listed in paragraph 106 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that designation of the land would also conflict with the policies of the PfE. The land proposed for inclusion in W12/6 is within the boundary of JPA30, which is excluded from the Green Belt. It would be perverse in logic for a planning policy which allocates a Site outside of the Green Belt to sit side by side with a policy which re-introduces the effect of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Warburton Design Guidance and Codes (Appendix 4):</p> <p>Redrow do not object to the general design principles and the supporting analysis presented within Section 3 of the design guide.</p> <p>However, whilst the context from design decisions may be helpfully set by the document, planning policy and guidance requires that design guides 'guide' development without being overly restrictive as this could stifle creativity and constrain better, more contextually responsive, well designed development proposals coming forward.</p> <p>Redrow has no objection to the inclusion of guidance presented within Section 4, provided it remains advisory and indicative in nature, intended to inform development rather than to impose rigid requirements.</p> <p>A homogenous approach to design cannot be applied across the whole Warburton Parish, as the policy context and setting of the Parish varies significantly. Notably, the rural setting of the Green Belt, the sub-urban setting of strategic allocation of JPA30, and the urban setting of Warburton and Partington edge that adjoins, and is significantly influenced by, the main urban area.</p> <p>Summary: Redrow welcome the progress made in the Regulation 16 version of the WNDP and are pleased that many of their earlier recommendations have been acknowledged. However, they remain concerned that certain aspects of the Design Guidance and Codes could still give rise to potential conflicts. The WNDP as drafted still fundamentally risks undermining the delivery of development at Warburton Lane and, therefore, the wider New Carrington Allocation. The WNDP therefore, fails to meet the basic conditions for an WNDP, particularly condition a) having regard for national policies, d) delivery of sustainable development and e) conflict with strategic policies.</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
The Coal Authority	WP9	The area to which this consultation relates is not located within the defined coalfield. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.
Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)	WP10	<p>TfGM supports the active travel aspirations for the area, specifically linking into the existing and proposed network of the New Carrington development. TfGM welcomes any future discussions on public transport provision, specifically bus services.</p> <p>The Policy should integrate its priorities with Trafford Council’s Walking, Wheeling, and Cycling Strategy.</p> <p>TfGM supports alignments of the Plan with the New Carrington development.</p>
United Utilities Water Ltd	WP11	<p>Provides guidance on U UW assets and requests additional text to policy W3 (detailed below), commented on the deleted masterplan, requests amendments to Design Principles within Part 3.5 Water and Flood Risk and additional text to Part 4.3.3 Sustainability and Climate Change (detailed below), as well as seeking a new policy in relation to water efficiency.</p> <p>Policy W3: U UW request the following amended to Policy W3 - <i>‘Surface water must be discharged in accordance with the surface water hierarchy in national planning practice guidance. <u>Applications will be required to incorporate sustainable drainage, which is multi-functional, in accordance with the four pillars of sustainable drainage, in preference to underground piped and tanked storage systems, unless there is clear evidence why such techniques are not possible. The sustainable drainage must be integrated with the whole of the landscaped environment and the strategy for biodiversity net gain. In accordance with the principles in the Ciria SuDS Manual, any surface water discharge must include a treatment train that demonstrates no unacceptable impact on the habitat of the receiving body.’</u></i></p> <p>Policy W10 refers to the following parts of the Masterplan and Design Guide:</p> <p>Part 3.5 Water and Flood Risk; and Part 4.3.3 Sustainability and Climate Change.</p> <p>Part 3.5 Water and Flood Risk</p> <p>For consistency with national policy, U UW request that the Design Principles in this part are amended to state: <i>‘No Avoid siting homes in high risk flood areas (having regard to all sources of flood risk) and mitigate increased risk of storms/flooding with high quality multi-functional sustainable drainage systems (see part 5.3.3 for more detail on SuDS requirements). These reduce the amount and rate at which surface water reaches sewers/watercourses.’</i></p> <p>Part 4.3.3 Sustainability and Climate Change</p> <p>Sustainable Drainage</p> <p>The 3rd paragraph of Part 4.3.3 states: <i>‘All proposals must demonstrate sustainable surface drainage systems that will not unduly increase pressure on existing wastewater and natural drainage systems.’</i></p> <p>To more effectively outline the policy and design requirements for sustainable drainage within the Warburton Lane element of the Carrington allocation, U UW request that this paragraph is supplemented with the following text:</p>

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		<p><i>‘Proposals for development at the Warburton Lane element of the Carrington allocation must be consistent with the allocation wide strategy for foul and surface water management required by Places for Everyone, informed by a hydrological assessment and an assessment of flood risk from all sources. Surface water must be discharged in accordance with the surface water hierarchy in national planning practice guidance. The design of proposals must assess and respond to the existing hydrological characteristics of a site to ensure a flood resilient design is achieved and water / flooding is not deflected or constricted. The whole development must make space for sustainable drainage that is multi-functional and designed in accordance with the four pillars of sustainable drainage (water quantity, water quality, amenity and biodiversity). The sustainable drainage must be integrated with the whole of the landscaped environment and the strategy for biodiversity net gain. SuDS features shall include permeable surfacing, soakaways, filter drainage, swales, bioretention tree pits, rain gardens, basins, ponds, reedbeds, wetlands, etc. Any drainage should be designed in accordance with ‘Ciria C753 The SuDS Manual’, sewerage sector guidance, or any subsequent replacement guidance.’</i></p> <p>We also note the following paragraph relating to water efficiency: <i>‘The installation of water butts within new residential developments is encouraged to collect rainwater from roofs and reduce the overall rainwater run off impact of any development.’</i></p> <p>UJW recommend the inclusion of the following additional wording as a new policy in the emerging NP and cross referenced in the associated design guidance regarding water efficiency. <i>‘All new residential developments must achieve, as a minimum, the optional requirement set through Building Regulations Requirement G2: Water Efficiency or any future updates.’</i></p> <p>UJW also suggest that any non-residential development should also be the subject of water efficiency requirements as per the below recommended wording: <i>‘All major non-residential development shall incorporate water efficiency measures so that predicted per capita consumption does not exceed the levels set out in the applicable BREEAM ‘Excellent’ standard.’</i></p>
Adrian Smith	WP14	Having witnessed how the development of adjoining former farmstead land adversely affected the nearby heritage property, I fully recognise the need for the NDP.
Clare Grace	WP25	Fully support the Warburton Neighbourhood Plan
Cliff Dunbabin	WP26	Our village needs to be protected from inappropriate development and ensure it retains its character.
Elsa Beckmann	WP29	Strongly support and agree
Jyoti Raja	WP41	Registers formal objection to any development in the Warburton area. Whilst recognising the general need for housing, this particular proposal raises serious concerns across a range of planning and environmental factors. It is evident that unchecked development of this nature can have lasting negative consequences. There are plenty of brownfield sites to build on including Partington.

Person or Organisation	Ref	Summary of representations
		Concerns are then discussed regarding excessive housing density, disruption during construction, access for heavy machinery, access for future residential traffic, substantial rise in local traffic volumes, pressure on school places, limited access to medical and dental services, negative visual impact, lack of adequate screening, proximity to listed buildings, increased flood risk to Red Brook, inadequate affordable housing provision, inadequate noise assessment, and harm to local wildlife. The Council should reject further building in a large scale on green belt.
Kieran Walshe	WP45	Fully supportive of the NDP and particularly support the content in relation to the proposed developments off Warburton Lane and Moss Lane and their potential impact on Warburton.
Luke Waldock	WP49	Fully in support of the proposed NDP. It fully reflects the special qualities of the area and sets out a community-led approach. It promotes sustainable development and considers the long-term needs of both current and future residents. It's clear that the plan has been shaped through local consultation, which is really important. Also support the emphasis on protecting green spaces, improving infrastructure, and ensuring development is in keeping with the area's rural character.
Mark Priestner	WP52	Support the idea that local residents have a say in the future of the village.
Pablo Inglesias	WP56	Support all
Richard Nicholls	WP62	I fully endorse this very comprehensive plan. It looks to protect and preserve the very distinctive character of this part of rural Trafford and is not prejudicial against any suitable and sympathetic development.