

Warburton Parish Council.

Minutes of meeting held via Zoom (teleconferencing) on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> August 2020 at 7.30pm

**Present:** Mr Richard Nicholls, Mrs Clare Grace, Mr Richard Clegg, Mr Mark Priestner, Mrs Lucy Houghton, Mr Paul Beckmann, Mr Bob Jones, Mrs Gaye Fletcher, Cllr Dr Karen Barclay

**Apologies:** Cllr Claire Churchill

**Minutes.**

Minutes of meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> July were duly approved by the Council.

**Matters arising.**

Mr Ian Brayzier has agreed to be our internal auditor.

**Finance**

We still have £11,414.58 in the bank as there have been no payments. The RFO apologised for the delay in claiming the overdue VAT return payment.

**Redrow Developments**

This item was deferred until Cllr Barclay left the meeting.

**Neighbourhood Plan**

The Council expressed concern at the Government's new policy of the relaxation of planning applications.

**Correspondence.**

E-mails had been sent to residents updating on the two planning issues in the village, Redrow and Barns Lane.

Letters had been delivered to those residents not on e-mail.

We had received an e-mail in reply from one resident who mirrors our views but would like to see even fewer houses on the site. We had advised Dunham Massey PC of our objections to the Barns Lane application.

There had been another e-mail from a resident about broadband speed and they were advised to contact Voneus.

We had written to Trafford's Planning Dept objecting to the two footpath/cycleways from the Redrow proposed developments but they have now been withdrawn.

There had been an e-mail, copied to us from Cllr Karen Barclay, sent to Trafford Traffic requesting a meeting to discuss safety on the roads in Warburton. Cllr Barclay will write again regarding this.

**Tipping**

Garden refuse had been flytipped on the bend in Moss Lane and two domestic litter bags had been dumped in Sinderland Lane. Mark Dale was advised and all were quickly cleared. Mark is willing to come to Warburton to see first hand the problems we have and Mark Priestner will give the clerk suitable dates for his visit. Lucy Houghton would also like to be present.

**Cross Base**

Copies of the four quotations had been forwarded to councilors and all agreed that perhaps the company recommending partial removal of the structure and construction of a support base at the front and side areas before reconstructing would be best. The back and other side had not been subject to subsidence. Further, the fewer stones that were moved would mean less likelihood that more stones would be damaged or broken. We will contact Elisabeth Lewis (Trafford Heritage Officer) to find out her views before creating a Schedule of Works needed before we can apply for funding.

**Pavements in Warburton**

There had been no work done on the pavements in Warburton. The clerk had contacted one of the farmers suggesting that because hedgerows now are overlapping the footways there could be an excuse by Trafford not to undertake the work. Cllr Barclay will take up the matter with Leader of the Council. There was further report of a road sweeper being deployed in Warburton but it transpires this was a contractor removing mud from the roads. The lack of a pavement in Dunham Road was

also discussed. It had not been on the maintenance schedule but it is an adopted footway belonging to Trafford. This would, we understand, need huge investment by Trafford Council.

**Refuse Bins**

The residents have returned the bins to their gardens.

**Memorial near Heathlands Farm**

The Chairman has heard nothing more from the resident. Trafford are working at formulating a policy regarding roadside memorials. The Chairman had forwarded his thoughts on the subject to Sue Whitehead who is the Road Safety Officer working on the policy. The police do have Family Liason Officers who can be called upon.

**Bus Stops on Dunham Road/Moss Brow & General Maintenance**

It was reported that the hedgerow by the bus stop on Dunham Road at Moss Brow was so overgrown that passengers had to queue in the road. The clerk is to write to the homeowner advising the safety issues and asking the hedge to be cut back. Other bus stops in Dunham Road are also overgrown. One in particular seems to have been abandoned. Photos would be sent to Cllr Barclay and she would take this matter up with the bus company. Also contact would be made with Amey.

**Planning Applications.** This item was deferred until after Cllr Barclay had left the meeting.

**Vehicle Accident Log**

An accident had occurred on 12<sup>th</sup> August when there was a collision between a small van and a car by the junction of Bent Lane and Paddock Lane. The Council want to look further into the safety on all the roads in the Parish. The thoughts of the councilors regarding the danger hotspots have been collated and this exercise will soon be expanded to include the residents. The resulting road safety analysis will be put on the next agenda.

Councillor Barclay left the meeting at 8.45pm

**Redrow Proposed Development**

A full up to date statement sits alongside these minutes.

**Planning Applications.** No. 101153/HHA/20 Primrose Cottage. This was discussed but we found this application was not in keeping with the VDS. The single storey extension proposed a flat roof and the double storey extension was too close to neighbouring property. Permission had already been given in 2014 for a large extension and this further development would extend the property to over the 30% allowed in the green belt.

**Any Points of Interest**

The question of rural speed management was raised, as was the position of recreational footpaths and linking them up. There seems to be no policy by Trafford as communities seem to have slipped down the list. We need to improve things and a good start is the road safety analysis mentioned above. It was suggested we have a Zoom meeting with residents regarding the Neighbourhood Watch at which these points can be raised.

**Parish Magazine.** Father Michael will decide when the next publication is.

**Dates of next meetings:**

Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> September 2020

Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2020



Chairman's signature dated 29/9/2020

Report to Warburton Parish Council for the meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**APPEAL REF: APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720**

**LAND AT WARBURTON LANE, WARBURTON**

A 2<sup>nd</sup> Case Conference was held on 10<sup>th</sup> June. This required several actions from the PC;

1. To respond with an Addendum Statement of Case by 1<sup>st</sup> July re. the Wheatcroft principles. (This was raised by Killian at the Case Conference).
2. Statements of Common Ground and Proofs of Evidence to be submitted by 14<sup>th</sup> September.
3. Rebuttal Proofs to be submitted by 28<sup>th</sup> September.

The Inquiry will sit 19-23 October: 2-6 November. 9 and 10 November to be held in reserve. The Inquiry will use Microsoft Teams, but who will be allowed to access etc is still to be determined.

The Addendum Statement of Case was submitted on 30<sup>th</sup> June citing deficiencies in Local Infrastructure and Wheatcroft issues\*.

We asked what was the original application and what has changed in the application.

On 5<sup>th</sup> August WSP (for Redrow) (WSP was WSP/Indigo now just WSP) replied to me (copy to Tim Salter at PINS) refuting our comments on the Wheatcroft issues at length. The Inspector requested WPC to indicate whether this has answered the points on which the PC seeks clarification and, if not, to explain what else it needs to know. The Council is also requested to confirm its position with regards to the changes to the scheme and whether it considers them to be compliant with the Wheatcroft principles.

On 11<sup>th</sup> August, following a telephone conversation with me the previous day, Bethany Brown emailed Tim Salter to state that the LA has no issues in respect of the Wheatcroft principles.

On 12<sup>th</sup> August, I replied to WSP's letter of the 5<sup>th</sup> (following a brief consultation with Killian) copy to Tim Salter reiterating our concerns over Wheatcroft and slightly re-orientating our objections on the basis that 'Given the extent and especially the timing of the changes to the scheme, WPC consider that *'the development is so changed that to grant it would be to deprive those who should have been consulted on the changed development of the opportunity of such consultation.'* (The High Court quoted in Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/W/15/3131263 18th March 2016).'

This prompted a further response on 12<sup>th</sup> August from WSP, but it tends to reiterate what was previously stated. The upshot is that it is for the Inspector to consider whether or not the Wheatcroft issues have been echoed in the application.

On 3<sup>rd</sup> August I received a letter and Draft Statements of Common Ground. These have been required by the Inspector (to reduce Inquiry time) and I have been anxious for some time that despite the Inspector's request for WPC to be involved no draft had been presented to us.

The Statements of Common Ground related to Built Heritage, Archaeology and Landscape. I have liaised extensively with Mike Nevell and he has produced the WPC SoCG for Built Heritage and for Archaeology. For Built Heritage we are of almost exactly the same opinion as Trafford (Elisabeth Lewis prepared this) and we have stated that there are more unregistered heritage assets at risk from the proposals. For Archaeology, we are of similar opinion to Trafford (Norman Redhead prepared this) and we have expressed considerable

concern at the poor results and responses from Redrow, agreeing that an Archaeological survey condition(s) should be included in the Planning Conditions if the scheme is approved. Norman emailed (at Mike Nevell's suggestion), a copy of 'A survey of Historic Parks and Gardens in Greater Manchester Vol.9 Trafford' of May 1994 a useful document recording the existence of the park as surveyed at that time.

For Landscape, I have liaised with Nic Folland, the consultant LA employed by Trafford and the WPC SoCG is similar in many respects to Trafford's. He thinks the TEP (for Redrow) LVIA is very deficient is not recognising the 'designed landscape' of the park area and not recognising the high quality of the landscape of the valley to the east. However, I differ with Nick (Trafford) over the value of the landscape. I have stated that *'WPC believe strongly that despite having no designation of landscape quality, the land does comprise a 'valued' landscape to which NPPF paragraph 170 applies.'* This, I hope will throw us into a pitched battle over GLVIA Table 5.1 (used for the basis of TEP Table 6.4 in the EA) and show the Inspector how valued this landscape is.

Gaye has spent time going through the PC records to see if we objected at the time to the removal of the current Redrow site from Green Belt and into 'Protected Land status, but without any success.

Finally, WSP 'volunteered' to draw up the Statements of Common Ground before 14<sup>th</sup> September (when they have to go to the Inspector) so I will have to scrutinise these again and probably enter into discussion with the opposition. WSP also 'volunteered' to draw up a list of 'Core Documents' – those documents which will be referred to by the witnesses at the Inquiry. I have placed three more documents on the list, but WSP have refused to enter Mike Nevell's books on the list, stating that nobody else was going to cite them.

I am now re-drafting my own Proof of Evidence (and would like Mark to check again through his and have it typed up for Killian's benefit); Mike Nevell has completed his Proof of Evidence and I intend forwarding this to Killian for him to check it.

Applications 100074 and 100093 (the bridges) were withdrawn on August 4<sup>th</sup> (?) following our strong letters of objection (at the end of July) and Trafford Planners decision that they could not support the applications.

E. Paul Beckmann

***“The main but not the only criterion on which that judgment should be exercised is whether the development is so changed that to grant it would be to deprive those who should have been consulted on the changed development of the opportunity of such consultation.”*** Where a proposed development had already been through full consultation, and opposition had been total, it was not necessary to consult again on the smaller proposal.  
*The court considered the additional difficulties in commons application cases of allowing amendments on appeal because of the need to allow for the public interest.’*