



Examination Ref: 01/AF/WNP

Dear Mr Freeman,

Thank you for your email of the 7th July laying out the timelines for the examination of the Warburton NDP.

We are happy to accept your procedural intentions. Thank you for extending the timeline for our response, and we will hopefully be able to respond more quickly to any further queries you may have.

We hope that we have correctly responded to or interpreted correctly your intentions regarding your questions.

Where you have requested drawings or plans of the area, we have also sent those in the covering email.

The answers to your questions are below.

### Questions for Warburton Parish Council

1. Policy W1 – Landscape views: My copies of the Plan (Figure 2) and Design Guidance and Codes (Figure 12) are not of a quality adequate for reviewing the policy on the ground. Please supply a clear, map-based plan that, in particular, shows the points from where the views should be observed.

### Warburton Parish Council (WPC) Response

WPC has prepared a higher quality map showing the landscape views. This can be added to the final referendum plan as a replacement map to Figure 2 of WNP and published on the Parish Council's NP page of the website if recommended by the Examiner on his report. A pdf of the photograph locations is attached using the base map supplied by Trafford Council.

2. Policy W1 – “intrinsic local landscape character”: Is this the character as described in Section 3.3.1 of the Design Guidance and Codes or something else?

### WPC Response

This refers to the local landscape character identified and described for each Landscape Character Type as identified in the Landscape Character Assessment for Warburton and referred to in section 3.3.1 pp 24 to 26 inclusive of the Warburton Design Guidance and Codes. The wording could be amended to improve clarification to something like:

'Development proposals should recognise and respond positively to the intrinsic local landscape character of the Warburton neighbourhood plan area 'as identified and described in the Landscape Character assessment for Warburton'. Landscaping schemes should be sympathetic and appropriate to the relevant Landscape Character Type as identified in the Landscape Character assessment for Warburton (see Map 2).'

3. Policy W1: In the light of the comments of Trafford Council and Redrow Homes, is the reference to a 30m belt of woodland appropriate?

#### WPC Response

The justification for the 30m buffer zone is set out in para 5.1.13 of WNP. The determination that a 30m wide landscape buffer would be appropriate for the proposed Redrow housing to the west of Warburton Lane is based on a number of factors as follows:-

1. The former Green Belt boundary for very many years to Warburton (until 2004?) was the valley of the Red Brook, a wooded valley some 20 – 30m wide. This, and the immediately adjacent and visually prominent (especially from Warburton Lane in Partington) low rise to the south, in the field known as Hob Heath gives some, although incomplete, screening to the housing in Partington when viewed from Warburton to the south. Since removing the Redrow site from the Green Belt, making it 'safeguarded land' – effectively pushing the Green Belt boundary back into the former deer park – there has been no effort to establish a new Green Belt boundary. We consider that purpose d) 'to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns' etc in NPP para. 143 is appropriate here.

2. The Parish Council holds the view that even though the proposed development site has been judged to be grey belt, Trafford Council is surely still required to consider if development would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, in accordance with paragraph 155 of the NPPF. The PC considers the existing Green Belt boundary to be very weak and suggests that it is unlikely to check the unrestricted sprawl from Partington, now a large built-up area and importantly does not preserve the setting and special character of an otherwise largely unspoilt medieval landscape. The PC considers that the former deer park and various features in and around it constitute significant heritage assets and this should be recognised in the development to be placed in it – not least by generous screening.

3. At the Public Enquiry, Landscape Architect Nic Folland (acting for Trafford Council) agreed with Landscape Architect Paul Beckmann (acting for Warburton Parish Council (WPC)) that a 30m wide screen to the south of the proposed housing would be appropriate. The concerns from WPC were not merely to screen the proposed housing from views from footpaths, roads and properties to the south, but to minimise the visual impacts on what WPC clearly saw as a designed landscape – the former deer park.

4. WPC are concerned that the proposed housing will occupy the low rise referred to in 1. above and will be extremely prominent within the former deer park. It is notable that the park is effectively a shallow basin, the centre of which is occupied by the former manor house, now Park Farm. The Redrow site will occupy the northern rim of this basin and unless adequately screened will both severely visually impact the present setting of the footpath running through the former park and form a new and unpleasing northern horizon to Warburton.

5. The southern screening of Redrow's current application depends to a lesser degree on a copse of trees standing immediately around the extant medieval fish ponds just outside the boundary. This has not been surveyed, but we suggest it is unlikely to be very stable as the tree root spread will be constrained by the water in the ponds. It would make sense not to depend on this copse for any screening in the long term. Redrow did state in their comments that it was '...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.' Despite this, they have admitted that they have now reduced the density on their current scheme which has been submitted as a Planning Application. In the 'Report on the Examination of Places for Everyone' of Feb. 2024 under Issue 39 (regarding policy JPA33 New Carrington) para. 669 states that 'part 38 should be modified to ensure proposals properly reflect and respond to landscape character, set out which characteristics are considered important and provide a cross-reference to policy JP-G1 for completeness. To properly reflect its local importance, Warburton Village should also be added to the list of specific locations'.

4. Policy W2: Is the boundary of the Deer Park (Map 3) identified by the green line?

**WPC Response**

Yes. No. 31 in the key identifies it as the 'approximate boundary only – see 1757 map'. The key could be made clearer by adding a green line to No. 31. The green line is approximate only in that it shows the deer park at its maximum extent. We are unaware as to when the retrenchment took place or when the 'slangs' were taken out. To the west, adjacent to the Manchester Ship Canal, land-fill on the original river meadows has brought the levels up to those within the deer park, concealing the original deer park pale.

5. Policy W2 – assets “not limited to” those listed: How is an applicant expected to identify “historic landscape assets” that are not listed in the policy?

**WPC Response**

WPC recognises that the area is likely to be subject to further archaeological surveys and investigations over time, both as part of the planning process to inform decisions on development proposals, and through any future local heritage / archaeological projects (parts of the area have already been the focus of research and digs undertaken by South Trafford Archaeological Society (STAG) under the supervision of Dr Michael Nevell of Salford University and the television programme 'Time Team' in recent years). The PC would like the policy to reflect this and to provide suitable protection to heritage assets that have not yet been identified. The wording could be amended to improve clarity, for instance to something like:

'These include (but may not be limited to) the following (as well as any other built heritage and historic landscape character assets that may be identified in the area in the future):'

For information, the presence of the former deer park and the many heritage assets both within and around it were not generally recognised by the authorities until very recently, when the PfE focussed more attention on the area. In the preparation of the NDP the PC have recognised a number of historic features whose origin and function was previously unknown. Dr Nevell, who has written extensively on the archaeology of Warburton continues to discover more historic features as he investigates and visits Warburton properties.

6. Policy W2: For the historic landscape assets as listed in the policy, please supply me with the corresponding number of the assets as listed in the key to Map 3. It is not possible to identify and locate the assets solely from their description. There needs to be clarity over the assets covered by the policy.

**WPC Response**

Policy W2 Warburton Deer Park	Reference(s) on Map 2 and Key
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The park pale boundary including perimeter bank, ditches (including their hydrology), associated hedgerows and salters (deer leaps);</li> </ul>	2. Engineered ('scarped') embankment to the Red Brook valley 4. Perimeter hedge in good condition  8. Culverted Park ditch 9. Perimeter hedge (in poor condition) 11. Possible Park entrance after major retrenchement 13. Retrenchment line (possibly post c1600)

	<p>14. Warburton Lane (built after the Park)</p> <p>15. Culverted Park ditch</p> <p>18. Vestigial ditch line</p> <p>21. Extant section of original park pale</p> <p>23. Saracen's Head 'slang'</p> <p>24. Park Gate Farm – secondary entrance to the park following retrenchment</p> <p>25. Vestigial earthworks</p> <p>31. Approximate boundary only – see 1757 map</p> <p>Area of landfill C – Possible salters</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodland including the Coroner's Wood area of ancient woodland;</li> </ul>	1. Coroners Wood Ancient Woodland of which the western end is an SSSI.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrances at Jack Hey Gate Farm and at Onion Farm;</li> </ul>	12. Jack Hey Gate Farm 'Slang'
	16. Onion Farm 'slang'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probable site of the original Park Lodge at Onion Farm (including medieval building remains);</li> </ul>	19. Onion Farm, Listed. Medieval Chapel of Ease, possible site of Park Steward's House (c 1570) and original entrance to deer park from SE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fishponds (both extant and filled in);</li> </ul>	5. Extant fishponds
	7. Area of infilled fishponds (see 1757 map)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The moated pillow mound (rabbit warren);</li> </ul>	6. Pillow mound / moated rabbit warren
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The watermill site and leat system;</li> </ul>	22. Feeder pond to park ditch
	28. Possible site of water powered flour mill
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Warburton Park Farm moated site (including 2 remaining ponds from the former moat) and the Farm, Barn and Timber Framed building (all Listed);</li> </ul>	29. Moated site of Warburton Park Farm (Manor House Site)
	30. Listed half-timbered barn
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deer entry point at Coroner's Wood;</li> </ul>	1. Coroners Wood Ancient Woodland and possible site of 'salters' entry points for deer into the deer park
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medieval ferry crossing point on River Mersey; and</li> </ul>	32. Medieval ferry crossing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible deer pen, rear of The Beeches</li> </ul>	20. Extant pinfold (to hold deer?)
	<b>Other Heritage Assets on Map 2</b>
	3. Ancient bridge over Red Book carrying the old Warburton Lane
	10. Course of Warburton Park Brook (main culverted)
	17. Receptor pond for water from the Moss (east) to feed the deer park ditch
	26. Historic paved pathway (to ferry?)

	27. 1880 cottages

7. Policy W3: On Map 5, are the Indicative Wildlife Corridors to be taken as “areas of high distinctiveness habitats”?

**WPC Response**

No. They are different, and this is explained in the penultimate paragraph of Policy W3.

8. Policy W3 – second paragraph: Are “identified wildlife areas” those that are shown on Maps 4 and 5 or something else?

**WPC Response**

Yes. They are the areas shown on Maps 4 and 5.

9. Policy W4: Are the “areas of deep peat” identified somewhere?

**WPC Response**

Since WNP was submitted, Natural England has published up to date and more detailed maps identifying areas of deep peat – see <https://england-peat-map-portal-ncea.hub.arcgis.com/> . This includes a small, isolated pocket of deep peat in the WNP Area eg to the east of Bent Lane (64 – 83cm). Deep peat is classified as over 40cm in depth. ‘The Wetlands of Greater Manchester’ (1995) p.110 gives a description of Warburton Moss with a map on p.110 (the key is attached to the back cover of the book. We include a scanned image of the map and the key.

10. Policy W5: I will need to be clear as to the areas to which the policy relates. Figure 5 in my copy of the NDP does not have that clarity. Please provide me with a map-based plan that shows both the extent of the PFE JPA 30 New Carrington allocation and the areas regarded as being in close proximity to the relevant farming developments.

**WPC Response**

WPC has prepared a higher quality map showing these areas. This can be added to the final referendum plan as a replacement map to Figure 5 of WNP and published on the Parish Council’s NP page of the website if recommended by the Examiner on his report. We include a copy of the Trafford Carrington All Allocations map and an enlargement of the SW part of the map (within Warburton) indicating extant operational farms

11. Policy W6: In the light of the comments of Trafford Council, should the first paragraph of the policy be deleted?

**WPC Response**

WPC would prefer to retain the first paragraph of the Policy so that the relevant principles set out Warburton Design Guidance and Codes are applied where relevant to the development concerned.

12. Policy W8: Please provide me with a copy of Map 2 from the Conservation Area Management Plan.

#### WPC Response

WPC requests that a high-quality version of the map is provided to the examiner by Trafford Borough Council. Map provided courtesy of TBC and attached.

13. Policy W12: Please respond to the comments of Trafford Council and Redrow Homes with regard to site LGS W12/2, Coroner's Wood.

#### WPC Response

Please refer to the Consultation Statement, Appendix 6 Table 1: Trafford Borough Council Comments and Table 3: Stantec on behalf of Redrow Homes.

Whilst WBC supports the need to provide new links to help integrate existing communities in the Partington area with the proposed new development in the PfE site allocation, it considers that a new footbridge could and should be provided in a more favourable location which would not have such an adverse impact on local built and natural heritage.

It should be noted that the current footpath running along the valley floor is primarily an east-west route (there is a very steep flight of steps to the north, to Oak Road). There is no access to the western end of the site (the SSSI) but this area is regularly subject to trespass and has suffered fairly severely as a result. The footpath to the east ends at Warburton Lane and it is considered that there is scope to extend this within the proposed eastern housing development.

The proposed bridge over Red Brook which is referred to in TBC's comments could be extremely destructive of both archaeology and particularly wildlife, especially if it connects the site to the valley floor.

The proposed LGS 12/2 forms part of the northern boundary of Warburton Deer Park (see WNP Policy W2 and Map 3: Heritage and Landscape Assets Related to Warburton Medieval Deer Park) and therefore it has built and historic landscape heritage interest. It is an area of Medium Value of Habitat Distinctiveness (see WNP Map 4) and an Indicative Wildlife Corridor (see WNP Map 5) as identified by CWT in the report *Protecting and Enhancing Warburton's Natural Environment*, Cheshire Wildlife Trust, February 2021, which forms part of the evidence base for WNP. The area includes colonies of indicator species for Ancient Woodland. It should be noted that there is very commonly an association between deer parks and ancient woodlands, which are frequently found around and outside deer park boundaries.

A characteristic of ancient woodland is that the ground flora is extremely vulnerable to human traffic. Although only the western end of the Red Brook valley is an Ancient Woodland SSSI, there are many colonies of plants to the east of the SSSI which are characteristic of ancient woodland. While encouraging people to visit this area, its principal value is as a place of tranquillity, so it requires a level of protection. It should ideally be restored as ancient woodland and public access appropriately limited rather than encouraged. The Government 'Keepers of Time' policy for ancient and native woodland was published in 2005 and it is hoped that in compliance with this policy this area of woodland could be restored. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have 'standing advice' for planning decisions which affect ancient woodland, ancient trees or veteran trees and it is hoped that this advice should be sought by TBC and the developers.

Stantec argues that the proposed LGS12/2 does not serve the local community of Warburton Parish, but 'the residents of Partington and the residents along Oak Road'. The LGS may not be as close to most of Warburton's residents as those in Partington, but this does not preclude Warburton residents from being

'served by' the LGS. Moreover, Partington residents form part of the 'local community' alongside the Warburton Parish residents. WNP notes that the Parish provides a range of opportunities for enjoyment of the countryside to visitors from nearby urban areas (see for example Part 5.4 Active Travel, Recreation and Leisure and Appendix 1) and the various LGS all contribute to the attractive rural character of the area.

Stantec also argues that the LGS is not accessible to the public. WPC accepts this but notes that public accessibility is not one of the criteria for LGS in the NPPF and indeed the lack of public access contributes to and considerably supports the area's importance for wildlife and biodiversity.

WNP and its supporting evidence base provide clear and indisputable evidence of the particular local significance of the LGS, in terms of wildlife and historic landscape value. The Appeal referred to in Stantec's representation took place before much of this evidence was collated, and it is quite possible that a different view could be formed at the current time, taking into account the various technical documents published as part of WNP's evidence base.

Both parties argued that the area proposed in the Regulation 14 Draft Plan was too large and the LGS therefore could be considered to be 'an extensive tract of land.' WPC accepted that this was possible and therefore agreed that a smaller area should be identified.

The Parish Council considers that the LGS should be retained in the NDP and protected. The PC accepted that the boundary could be amended to reduce the area of the proposed LGS and the boundary was subsequently amended in the Submission Plan. Unfortunately, however a drafting error occurred in relation to the map and the incorrect area for the reduced LGS was identified: the area of ancient woodland (Coroner's Wood) to the west was identified but this area should have been excluded on the grounds that it is already offered some protection as it is Ancient Woodland. The correct area is to the east, and this shown on the Parish Council's website – see <https://www.warburtonparishcouncil.gov.uk/ndpfinalsubmission> and [Local Green Space \( This image is a correction to the one contained in the submission document \)](#) .

The correct area formed part of the larger area which was consulted upon as part of the Regulation 14 consultation and was also included in previous informal public consultations.

WPC considers that the revised area (as shown in the above links) should be retained as a LGS in WNP.

#### 14. Policy W14 – Energy Proposals: What is the justification for avoiding (presumably all) productive agricultural land?

##### WPC Response

The Parish Council would prefer to see existing productive agricultural land retained for food production. Warburton Parish includes a number of productive farms which contribute to local food production and provide local employment opportunities.

NPPF para 187. Sets out that 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: ... b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;' Footnote 65 goes on to say, 'Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality.'

The Policy wording could be amended too something like, '**Schemes should avoid the use of the most productive and most versatile agricultural land.**'

15. Policy W15 – “loss of one of these community facilities”. Does the policy mean that the loss of not more than one of the facilities would be acceptable or is the policy presuming against the loss of any one of the facilities?

#### WPC Response

The latter is correct. The Policy is presuming against the loss of any one of the facilities.

It should be ‘**Proposals involving the loss of any one of these community facilities will not be supported unless ....**’