Warrington Local Plan Consultation response from █████████████████████████
██

1 Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

I have not seen anywhere which explains what the expected growth from the existing population is. From the vast scale of the proposals one must assume that the growth is coming from outside the town. Why are they coming? For jobs? For housing because Warrington has big plans? Is it because to achieve 'CITY' status Warrington needs to grow it's population (ie a vanity project)? Is the scale in proportion with what is proposed across the rest of the country?

2 Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

I am sure there is further opportunity for infill and development of brownfield sites without taking vast swathes of green belt. Perhaps you should look again. There is no mention for example of using the old derelict airfield at Stretton which would seem to be an ideal site – large area with existing access roads, which could be upgraded.

3 Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

I would think not, there must be more brownfield sites. Please see my previous answers, because there should be an objective to release only what green belt is absolutely necessary. I do not know what the term 'safeguarded' means, there is no definition.

4 Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

I don't know what is driving these objectives, see answer 1. The objectives are defined in long wordy sentences and should be more direct and measurable.

5 Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

I would like to have seen a succinct summary of what is being proposed, where. I think the provision of all the planning regulations, and highly technical background within the proposal documents is unhelpful for a member of the general public. I have spent 2 whole days looking at the supporting documents and have only scratched the surface of the material presented.

6 Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

The main development location is south of Grappenhall and the impact is going to be huge. There should be a more balanced approach spreading developments over the whole MBC so the impact on existing southern areas is reduced.

7 Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No. I understand development is needed, and don't take the approach of no change in my own district has to be maintained, but I can't see the justification for turning vast areas into concrete.

8 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

TOWN centre is a bottleneck now and more needs to be done to provide transport links which don't rely on the centre. There is gridlock regularly, particularly when the motorways are disrupted and traffic spills off onto the surrounding roads, which is at least 3 times a week. There are quite enough retail parks and food outlets to sustain a population twice the existing size, how about better leisure/sport facilities? The cycle-ways are currently poor and need investment to encourage people to take more exercise, and get out of their cars and use public transport.

9 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

The proposal would seem to be a very good location and use of pre-used or reclaimed land, and the opportunity should be taken to maximise this option to avoid taking green belt land to the south. Also should building become viable at Fidlers Ferry then the areas would naturally combine, so that should be considered now, not deferred as is currently suggested.

10 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

It is far too big, see my previous answers. There is no detail about schools, doctors, amenities, local services that will be needed. Indeed there is reference that all such services are currently at capacity. The development needs to be as self contained as possible because if everyone has to travel for anything they need, the impact is going to grind existing life to a halt. I can't see anywhere where park and ride is proposed.

11 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

They should remain outlying, we do not want to be in a vast urban sprawl where any identity is lost. Thelwall is classed as urban, but it is borderline. Around the Thelwall area there are proposals for A56 Stockport Rd, Camsley Lane, ADS, Halfacre Lane, Weaste Lane etc. The Thelwall conservation area has even been proposed for housing along Bell Lane and between Lymm Rd and Stockport Rd. With these proposals Thelwall will become urban, with virtually all the green space being lost. When has a conservation area become eligible for new housing development?

12 Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

I have yet to see what type of employment is proposed. Is there existing demand which is unfulfilled or is it expansion? Is it for existing population or new population being attracted to move in?

13 Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

As it seems that they have already moved into the places illegally you may as well make them legal and as long as they pay for their use keep these areas but make them more controlled.

14 Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste? No

If this means supporting fracking then no. How about powering the new developments from renewable sources?