

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



WARRINGTON

Borough Council

Planning & Policy

WBC

New Town Hall

Warrington Borough Council

tdk@warrington.gov.uk

by 29/9/17

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: you have exceeded economic forecasts for housing + employment needs.
No. You discounted historic need for housing + employment land at one stage in your report as continued growth can't be guaranteed + historic levels included such things as New Town + EEC migrants. After Brexit things have changed + employment + housing growth may well reduce.
Also since Government published new guidelines for Local Authority planners, the calculations will change altogether - downwards for Warrington 24,000 new homes would mean population explosion of up to 50,000. This would increase Warrington's size by 25% over 20 yrs. This is excessive, based on "ambitions" not need.

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?

Response:

You could include far more brownfield sites including Fiddlers Ferry which will go off stream during planning period

We should utilise as much of these areas as possible, even if it means smaller parcels of building land in order to safeguard our greenfield sites.

Town Centre Infrastructure needs sorting out before further expansion of outside existing areas. The traffic congestion is already at excessive levels leading to too much pollution

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:

No. As before we should utilise brownfield + infill sites within existing urban areas. Please don't destroy our greenbelt. The numbers are excessive + include the councils "ambitious plans" + not what existing residents need. More people need more roads! more pollution!

We need our greenbelt areas to act as buffer against urban sprawl. Any greenbelt land south of the Canal will not go to "affordable housing" which is a real need of ~~by~~ our residents. Developers + landowners want greenbelt obviously because of their profitability, not residents needs. These areas would attract people from outside Warrington + become a dormitory suburb for neighbouring cities.

Question 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Response:

No we don't want to be a city
we need to put more effort into
attracting higher paid employment
opportunities not more warehouses which
need space but few employees.

The need for a port is not proven.
It may be an ambition of Peel Holdings

not residents

1. Where are plans for extra hospital provision - already overstretched.
2. Where are real improvements to Town Centre traffic & empty shops.
3. Where is the emphasis on affordable employment housing

Question 5

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

Response:

Question 6

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

Response:

The housing developments south of Canal are excessive - biggest single area in borough - & also using more Greenbelt land. We could rationalise the forecast for housing downwards & accommodate it closer to town or on brownfield ~~sites~~ sites.

Please preserve our Greenbelt. This is such an amenity for all residents. There's a need to increase outdoor activities such as walking, running, dogwalking etc. Greenbelt perfect for this. We need better plans to reduce air pollution already worse in Warrington. The Greenbelt locations would encourage more road traffic making things worse. Why discount more development in central & Northern areas of Warrington?

Question 7

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

Response:

1. No, the preferred development option includes an indication of a road along railway line from Greppenhall to Latchford.
2. This would mean the demolition of scores of houses including mine. The traffic would thunder over all the areas mentioned + destroy completely the nature of settled communities including many elderly people + many who live in affordable housing. We couldn't afford to move south of the canal! The largest portion of housing would ~~other~~ be in greenbelt areas! In the interests of developers + landowners not existing residents.
3. All options discarded don't give reasons which stand up - + based on outdated assumptions.
4. Paragraphs 4.9 + 4.10 of plan confirms the need for 15,429 houses + 129 hectares of employment land. This already exists within Warrington's existing urban areas. No need for new, greenbelt land.

Question 8

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

Response:

We don't want a city, just
a rationalised town centre to try
to reduce congestion + find tenants
for all empty shops

Question 9

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

Response:

Question 10

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

Response:

Where is the need for a waterfront
or is it 'Peel Holdings' vested interests

Question 11

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

Response:

We don't want a garden city suburb. Warrington residents want affordable homes & jobs in & around Town Centre.

We don't want to lose our greenbelt. It would lead to massive traffic explosion more pollution, & would ~~attract~~ draw people in to Warrington from elsewhere increasing needs on overstretched hospital -

Question 12

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

Response:

Please see previous comments
re greenbelt, pollution, congestion, projected
housing/employment needs

Question 13

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

Response:

Stop Urban sprawl. Our outlying areas provide the "lungs" for all residents. Villages such as Moore, Grappentall, Latchford are either picturesque or really good community areas or both. We need affordable housing and jobs preferably located near town centre + public transport.

Question 14

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

Response:

far in excess of what is likely after
BREXIT, also exceeds economic forecasts

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:

1. The plan is based on the council's ambitions, not residents' needs.
2. Should focus on affordable housing and attracting well-paid jobs
3. Should have radical approach to cleaner ~~air~~ air, less, not more traffic
4. Focus on existing residents, not attracting ever more.
5. Focus on preserving greenbelt, encouraging wildlife - which Nantington is blessed with (We have birds, bats, badgers etc on railway line)
6. Need more use of existing brownfield sites & less on sprawling ever more into our ~~rural~~ ^{rural} surroundings - Once it is gone, it goes forever.
7. We need extra hospital capacity