

Internal Use Only	
Date Received:	
Acknowledged by:	
Recorded by:	

11.9.17 LO 11.22.



WARRINGTON
Borough Council

Warrington Borough Council

Local Plan

Preferred Development Option

Regulation 18 Consultation

Standard Response Form

July 2017



2: Questions

Question 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?

Response: Yes, I only found out about your Preferred Development option on Saturday 23rd September 2017, due to a leaflet, from an unknown source posted through my door, which outlined the proposed new dual carriageway that would be made by demolishing homes in Latchford and extending the rail way embankment, currently use to Fiddlers Ferry power station, which would increase noise levels substantially opposite my owned home, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Also, the additional pollution from the proposed scheme, I feel is badly ill thought through. As, not only myself would you be inconvenienced, having lived here since [REDACTED] as well as being born and loved in Warrington since [REDACTED] you are also, inconveniencing thousands of other owners and tenants in Latchford and Crappenhall, who, have also been life long residents of Warrington. Furthermore, the fact that you are also proposing to do the same by taking the popular leisure and recreation use of the Pennine Trail use by walkers, pet walkers, cyclists (Viper Bike Club regularly use this section of the Pennine Trail from their HQ in St. Tilda's church, Latchford) from Latchford to Lynton and beyond to Dunham Massey. Also the Pennine Trail is used by horse riders, as well, as Trans Pennine Trail from Liverpool to Hull, and, then to Liverpool. The fact you feel the need to change the use of this route for your purposes of Preferred Development option is badly thought through as is the Latchford Rail Supply route to Fiddlers Ferry which would be a noise major disturbance to thousands of Latchford residents. The fact that you need ~~the~~ a road structure in place first is further disturbing and that ~~if~~ any (being like myself) were not aware of the above proposal until 3/9/2017

contd

Question 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?

contd from Question 1

Response: The fact that you accept there is a need for a new canal crossing across the Manchester Ship Canal is required, and, has long been needed, the one you are proposing in your PDO is not acceptable, or, the right one.

Furthermore, the fact that it secretly, only appears on Figure 4 (without any detailed outline) is very poorly put across, as, are all your diagrams in the 60 page report, even though, there is nothing written on pages 4, 43, 49, 56 and 57 of your PDO.

Furthermore in the 55 page actual PDO, that you produced in July, 2017, there is much repetition repeatedly, which could have further reduced the Report to less than 50 pages.

Also, I am angered that such a substantial Development for Warrington, is virtually kept a secret from the Warrington residents, it affects & includes the most re noise, disturbances, quality of life and negative health effects. Already being 2nd polluted town in the North West due to pollution, it has the highest Bronchitis and Asthma rates Nationally as well.

Question 2

In answer to question 2, you repeat the figures for to many times in this PDO, although, the actual number of homes listed are outlined, no mention of prices and number of homes being 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 beds, and whether you would prioritise some homes for homes you would compulsory purchase. Your proposed PDO also as a devaluing aspect to a large number of homes in Latchford area, Grappenhall, Thelwall and Appleton Hall, for the proposed benefit of the new City Home project, not well thought through.

Question 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'?

Response:

For 25,000 homes in the next 20 years for WBC PDO I think yes. But, the network / transportation route is wrong for Letchford and Greppethall and Thelwell.

As I understand it, for 25,000 homes to be built in the 'Garden City' as you call it, it is also fully dependent on the western link also being built, which has many coloured routes as options for the eventual choice of 1 route being eventually decided. It makes more sense for ^{the} Great Sankey development ^{bordering} St Helen's BC to be used, adding to the new houses as part of the Newtown Development years, as facilities and roads are in place connecting to the M62 re the Omega Development and that should be phased in and built. It should be Government back WBC PDO scheme. Along with plans for the western link.

* On a positive note, the western link should be developed further taking traffic and transportation routes away from the Town Centre to ease the traffic congestion further and reduced air pollution from the Centre of Town, and over to west via Gr Sankey, to the M62 Omega new exit and M6 north motorway route. Thus, allowing residents of the new city to use Exit routes M56 at Lymington and M6 South for west and east and M6 North and M62 west and east traffic use.

Question 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Response: NO

Your diagram Figure 4, being the clearest of your diagrams to read (the other are all unclear and poorly shown) does not actually any of the "Existing Roads Upgraded" as stated in your Key with one long and one short dotted red line. Which is the same with the "Relocated Roads" in your Key with one long blue line & one short blue line. Both these ^{type of} roads you refer to in your Key, none of these roads appear anywhere on the Figure 4 map.

Furthermore, you only identify 1 brown field site, that being Fiddlers Ferry. And, in my opinion it is likely to be available for use within the next 20 years.

Although you list the number of houses to be built in all other areas of Warrington, there is no description as to where.

I am told that Warrington PDD is competing with 18 other Boroughs/Towns/Cities and only one will be successful. Reading your PDD, I feel your presentation is poor, and people who write and produce this should be sacked due to points raised/written on pages 3, 4 and 6 especially. As stated before, the PDD is written badly, repetitive in nature, the diagram very poor, hard to read, unclear to read, fuzzy in areas and most are put on sideways and in different directions to read. It is as though, WBC want the PDD plan to fail as I state 18.

Question 5

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

Response: Yes. The level of communication especially with Latchford Wards has been inadequate, especially in respect of Phase 1 PDD. There has been no communication either from both Latchford Councillors Maureen McLaughlin and Hans Munday to the local residents and both are on the WBC Economic Planning Committee which is a conflict of their interests, only sitting on this Committee by virtue of the fact they have been elected Councillors to serve their communities of Latchford. They should both resign immediately as Councillors of their respective Wards.

You have failed to produce adequate transportation that would suit the residents of Latchford, Wrappenhall, Thelwall and Appleton Thorn, and one that would preserve the villages of Latchford, Stockton Heath and Thelwall.

I Love Where I Live Warrington Campaign
"I live in Warrington and I Love Where I Live"

But the Preferred Proposals of WBC PDD are not acceptable by myself, and, I have only been made aware of WBC your local plan, PDD for 7 days, since 3rd September 2017, by the objection group, Wrappenhall and Thelwall re your Warrington Preferred development Option as both your 'Spatial Awareness Options' are badly flawed and grossly and drastically affect the quality of life of Latchford, Wrappenhall, Thelwall and Appleton Thorn.

Question 6

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

Response: Yes, you have failed to assess different options for the main developments, especially that there are no options re-Latchford, Grappenhall, Thelwell and Appleton Thorn in respect of the Garden City Plans and Warrington Park, as only one carte blanc choice chosen by WBC.

Your preferred Development Option is a failure, in that it provides additional pollution to Warrington and Warrington South especially, adding to potential pollution throughout all of Warrington. Already Warrington is one of the most polluted towns in England and second polluted town in the N.W.

Your priority should be to reduce the pollution especially in and near the Town Centre taking traffic away from the Centre and not your proposed route, on land, / railways / Penine

Trails you do not own. Your priority should be to make Warrington Town Centre and at least 1/2 a mile radius Pollution Free of Traffic. And

create Park and riders 1/2 and 1 mile at different points North, South, East and West of the Town Centre, especially 9:00am til 7:00pm. Monday to Saturday and 10:00am til 5:00pm

Sundays, which would be easy to arrange re Steven Broomhead's target stated in 2015 and videoed by [redacted] Interview.

Question 7

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

Response: No for reasons stated in answer to Question 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

The Traffic Light systems South of the Town Centre all around Bridge Foot / River Mersey Crossing should be altered to not only suit Pedestrians and cyclists who are the ones to have to wait. The Traffic Light system does NOT help Pedestrians and cyclists who prefer these methods of transport into TOWN. Travelling by foot there is inadequate crossing comforts, cars cover traffic light crossing areas. These areas should be pedestrian marked for crossings at the Traffic lights and yellow markings either side to protect pedestrians. As well as wider crossing areas as the areas for crossings are further badly designed in the location of the Traffic lights, in the way of the routed pedestrian areas limiting space to cross. As when pedestrians are crossing both ways, there isn't enough room. Also cyclists crossing areas should be provided for both sides next to pedestrian and pedestrian crossings point to make them user friendly. At peak Times, Priestley College Students have no respect for other pedestrians & cyclists

Question 8

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

Response: The PDO for the City Centre is insufficiently demonstrated and insufficiently reported in this Local Plan. Where actually is it. What is it. Why hasn't it been delivered to the Library where we are supposed to be able to examine it along with the non-existent WBC 'Standard Response Form' we were supposed to be able collect.

Why was the Open Days at The Pyramid, Royal Hotel etc not circulated to all Warrington Homes, so that we firstly were to be informed about this information dates, so that I and local Warrington Residents could attend. WBC have only been successful in making the Local Plan a failure in communication and in notifying residents of 'The Great Plan of The Local Plan' also an absolute failure to inform the residents of the Great 'City' Development, which your (WBC) Mr Farrell, doesn't even know Warrington wants to become a City, even though they have entered the next Competition currently in motion, to be the next Cultural City after Hull. The 'new City' is merely a housing estate, for Builders and Council to make a lot of money from land and the new houses to be built on prime country land.

Question 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Response: What does this mean!

Is it the destruction of the Warrington Countryside even further along with its Woodlands. The very areas that the vast majority of local residents enjoy.

Question 10

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

Response: Why are you proposing to destroy the established 'Moorre Nature Reserve' for the sake of Warrington Waterfront and a New Port and your Local Plan. Another area that is widely used by a high population of Warrington Residents.

Question 11

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

Response: more details are required to those given in your plan.

House types

House prices.

more diagrams to show school locations

A more detailed Time scale plan for car works, and buildings ie roads,

houses, shops, schools etc ...

The local plan as produced is too basic, in respect that it totals 50,000 new residents

within 20 years, ie 2037 ie 24,000 new homes in the 'New City' of Warrington.

New Town targets of Warrington have been reached the past 30 years and beyond.

The programme for a City Status is a hidden target within the next 20 years.

Warrington is already the biggest urban area in the N.W outside of Liverpool and Manchester, and also Warrington is the most successful

Town in the N.W. due to its New Town Status Economically in Performance. But, will not become a City ~~at~~ the residents expense

economically, healthwise and noise pollution of the local plan Roadways re use of Railways and Pennine Trail routes from Thelwell to The Town centre

Question 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Response: Build houses on Great Sankey at the border with St. Helens. Use the existing road networks recently completed and those of the Warrington New Town era developments.

Question 13

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

Response:

Question 14

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

Response:

Question 15

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

Response:

Question 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Response:

Question 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Response:

Be more transparent. Put your Local Plan fully in all Libraries for public viewing, and the next phase of your revised Local Plan and subsequent plans 6 months in advance of any future deadlines for (Standard Response Forms, from residents etc.

Mr Farrell should re-consider his opinion and office. WBC personnel should be sacked for how, and what, they have produced in the local Plan. This work is grossly inefficient.

The whole project has been badly mismanaged. The advertisement that was inserted in the Westmorland Gazette, being the only newspaper announcing Warrington Borough Council Plan is a major strike out, surely, worth a 1st warning to his position. As is his dealings with Welta Hall and his strong desire to take the property of the Residents of Warrington, be another WBC warning of his position, and, I request a 3rd & final warning be given to Mr Farrell for this local Plan, lack of information in advance to local residents of Letchford, Thelwell, Grappentall, Appleton Thom, Appleton, Stockton Heath and Walton.

to his plan for 'A new city' and the effects of diesel, petrol, pollution, air pollution and dispute the lives of the residents in the above parishes, let alone the health of the children in the town and school play grounds along the planned road links.