

Internal Use Only

Date Received:

Acknowledged by:

Recorded by:



**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:

1. I FIND IT DIFFICULT TO ACCEPT THAT THE POPULATION OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO TODAY, ~~WERE~~ LIVE IN WARRINGTON, WILL INCREASE AT A RATE THAT REQUIRES. THE LEVEL OF HOME DEVELOPMENT SET OUT IN THIS REPORT. WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF POPULATION GROWTH, RELATING TO THE INDIGENOUS POPULATION OF WARRINGTON? THE MODELING SHOULD BE BASED ON THIS NUMBER.
2. THE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT MUST ASSUME. WARRINGTON CONTINUES TO ATTRACT PEOPLE TO LIVE IN WARRINGTON BUT WORK IN LIVERPOOL, MANCHESTER, CHESTER AND OTHER LOCATIONS. WHY IS SOUTH WARRINGTON BEING SACRIFICED TO PROVIDE HOMES FOR PEOPLE WHO DO NOT WORK IN THE WARRINGTON EMPLOYMENT AREA. SURELY LIVERPOOL, MANCHESTER, CHESTER AND OTHER TOWNS AND CITIES SHOULD THEMSELVES PROVIDE THE HOUSING FOR THEIR OWN EMPLOYMENT AND POPULATION GROWTH NOT WARRINGTON.
3. WARRINGTON SHOULD BE DEVELOPING NEW HOMES FOR ITS OWN POPULATION GROWTH, NOT CREATING A VAST DORMITORY SUBURB FOR THE BENEFIT OF LIVERPOOL, MANCHESTER AND CHESTER.
4. HOW DOES WARRINGTON'S PLANNED GROWTH FIT INTO THE LIVERPOOL CITY REGION'S SHELMA. WHY SHOULD HOMES BE BUILT IN WARRINGTON THAT WILL ONLY ADD TO THE COMMUTING ISSUES ON THE M6, M12 AND M56.
5. WARRINGTON'S GROWTH PLANS CONFLICT WITH ITS DUTY TO CO-OPERATE.

## 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:

- (1) THE NUMBER OF HOMES AND EMPLOYMENT LAND APPEARS TO BE GENERATED FROM A DESIRE FOR CITY STATUS. THIS DESIRE HAS NO MANDATE FROM THE PEOPLE OF WARRINGTON.
- (2) THE CREATION OF THE CITY, WILL DESTROY THE LOOSE FEEL AND AMENITY OF SOUTH WARRINGTON AND SUCH DESTRUCTION CANNOT BE WORTH A COUNCIL DRIVEN GOAL OF CITY STATUS.
- (3) I CANNOT AGREE THAT THE CURRENT ~~OFF~~ <sup>INDICATED</sup> FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE PLANS CAN ACCOMMODATE THE HOMES TO BE BUILT IN THE GARDEN CITY SUBURBS (SOUTH WARRINGTON) OR THE SOUTH WESTERN WARRINGTON URBAN EXTENSIONS. SUCH PLANS WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THE CHRONIC INFRASTRUCTURE OVERLOAD IN SOUTH WARRINGTON AND WARRINGTON CITY CENTRE.
- (4) THE POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF FIDDLER FORD MUST BE FACTORED INTO THE PLANS. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THAT SITE WITH LOWER MORE REALISTIC GROWTH TARGETS WOULD REMOVE THE NEED FOR ANY GREEN ~~FIELD~~ <sup>BELT</sup> LOSS.
- (5) BROWN FIELD DEVELOPMENT, HAVE THE NUMBER OF HOMES PER ACRE BEEN MAXIMISED? IF THEY ARE MAXIMISED DOES THIS REMOVE THE NEED FOR GREEN ~~FIELD~~ <sup>BELT</sup> LOSS?
- (6) IF NO GREEN BELT IS USED MAXIMISE THE USE OF BROWN FIELD FOR BOTH EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING HOW MUCH GROWTH WOULD THIS PROVIDE FOR WARRINGTON.
- (7) WARRINGTON TOWN CENTRE URGENTLY NEEDS REGENERATION. THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO BE IMAGINATIVELY MAXIMISED.
- (8) IF THE TOTAL HOMES DEVELOPMENT REQUIRED IS 15K THIS CAN BE ACCOMMODATED WITH BROWN FIELD PLANNING THIS ONLY.

### 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:

(i) No. I do not believe you have appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from Green Belt.

Because

(a) The population growth projection is too high.

(b) The population growth projection is provided with homes for people that will not work in Warrington

(c) The population projection appears tied to a political objective of City Status that has no mandate from the population of Warrington

(d) The available Brown Field sites with the further potential of Fiddlers Ferry, provides more than enough scope to meet the growth needs of Warrington and a fantastic opportunity for innovative regeneration of the Warrington town centre

(e) There is no requirement to re-designate Green Belt if the Brown Field sites are properly developed.

(ii) I believe that no Green Belt should be considered for redesignation until all the Brown Field sites have been redeveloped. This will provide adequate opportunity to test the growth forecast and the true population growth requirements in Warrington to meet the industrial and demographic changes.

(iii) I believe it is far too premature to start to plan to re-designate Green Belt until all Brown Field and the Fiddlers Ferry site have been fully redeveloped.

(iv) No case has been made for the exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt.

## Question 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

### Response:

1) No I do not.

(a) THE CASE FOR CITY STATUS HAS NO MANDATE FROM THE WARRINGTON ELECTORATE. AND THE PRICE THIS PLAN. PAY FOR THAT WITH THE DESTRUCTION OF SOUTH WARRINGTON IS WHOLLY DISPROPORTIONATE.

(b) THE GROW OF POPULATION IS FAR AND ABOVE THAT REQUIRED TO MEET THE NEEDS OF WARRINGTON.

(c) THERE IS NO NEED FOR WARRINGTON TO BE TRANSITIONED TO A "NEW CITY." NO CASE HAS BEEN MADE FOR THIS.

(d) THE LOSS OF WARRINGTON SOUTH IS TOO HIGH A PRICE TO PAY FOR THESE GROWTH PLANS, THE CASE HAS NOT BEEN MADE AS TO WHY. BROWN FIELD ONLY COULD NOT MEET THE REAL REQUIREMENTS OF WARRINGTON.

(e) THERE IS NO SENSITIVITY IN THE RELEASE OF GREEN BELT RATHER IT WILL DESTROY THE NATURE OF SOUTH WARRINGTON AND BLIGHT ITS RESIDENTS.

(f) NO ALLOWANCE HAS BE MADE FOR THE ACTUAL DETRIMENT THOSE NOW LIVING IN SOUTH WARRINGTON WILL BE SUBJECT TO.

(g) NO ACCOUNT HAS BEEN TAKEN OF THE AVOIDABLE CHRONIC TRAFFIC ISSUES IN SOUTH WARRINGTON.

(h) NO ACCOUNT HAS BEEN TAKEN OF THE EFFECT OF THIS DEVELOPMENT ON VISIBLE CORUSERS SUCH AS STOCKTON MOUTH.

(i) OBJECTIVES W4 AND W3 CAN BE ACHIEVED WITHOUT GREEN FIELD RELEASE AND THIS PLANS IMPLEMENTATION.

(j) W5 IS ~~CONTRARY~~ CONTRARY TO THIS PLAN THIS PLAN WILL DESTROY THE CHARACTER AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS OF WARRINGTON.

(k) W6 I SEE NO EVIDENCE THAT THIS PLAN WILL ACHIEVE THIS GOAL.

## Question 5

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

### Response:

(i) THE SPATIAL OPTION ONE IS FLAWED BY ITS GOAL OF "CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELIVERY OF WARRINGTON NEW CITY" AND THE "MANAGED GREEN BELT RELEASE" WITHOUT ANY DEMONSTRATION OF "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES" AND TAKES NO ACCOUNT OF ITS IMPACT ON SOUTH WARRINGTON AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY THAT CURRENTLY LIVES THERE

(ii) THE SPATIAL OPTION TWO IS FLAWED BY ITS GOAL OF "CONTRIBUTING TO THE DELIVERY OF WARRINGTON NEW CITY" AND THE "MANAGED GREEN BELT RELEASE" WITHOUT THE DEMONSTRATION OF "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES". THE BUILDING ENVISIONED IN THIS PLAN WOULD DESTROY SOUTH WARRINGTON AND CHANGE FOREVER SETTLEMENTS SUCH AS STODEN HEATH AND THE OTHER OUTLYING SETTLEMENTS.

(iii) AN OPTION TO CONCENTRATE DEVELOPMENT ON BROWNFIELD SITES HAS NOT BEEN PRESENTED THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT OMISSION TO THE DEBATE.

(iv) AN OPTION NO TO RELEASE ANY GREEN BELT HAS NOT BEEN PRESENTED THIS IS A SIGNIFICANT SHORTCOMING IN THE PLANNING REPORT.

## Question 6

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

### Response:

(i) South Warrington is generally unsuitable for further development presenting three water barriers between it and the town centre all of which have the issue that the crossings create bottle necks.

(ii) The infrastructure roads, ~~roads~~ <sup>transport link,</sup> etc of South Warrington are heavily <sup>h</sup>congested/overwhelmed. This has not been effectively considered.

(iii) South Warrington has significant transport issues for commuting to Liverpool and Central Manchester. These have not been considered.

(iv) The impact of the ~~foot~~ bridge on South Warrington has not been considered.

(v) North Warrington would appear to present a better alternative for development given its proximity to highway established industrial areas, shopping complexes and the ~~the~~ M62 linking Liverpool and Manchester.

(vi) A garden suburb to the north of the M6 linking, Winwick, Croft, Culcheth, and Burtonwood would appear to make the most sense given the already existing, motorway access and close proximity to the East Lancs Road. If a garden suburb anywhere is really required, why has such a northern extension not been seriously considered?

(vii) A river and canal corridor expansion to west and east has not been given due consideration. A mixture of brown field and poor quality green space could be used.

## Question 7

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

### Response:

No. I Do Not.

(i) IT IS UNNECESSARY, THERE IS NO NEED TO DESTROY THE GREEN BELT IF WARRINGTON'S GROWTH IS RESTRICTED TO THE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE BROWN FIELD CITY AND THE REGENERATION OF THE TOWN CENTRE.

(ii) CITY STATUS IF IT MEANS THE DESTRUCTION OF GREEN BELT AND SOUTH WARRINGTON IS NOT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE INHABITANTS OF WARRINGTON.

(iii) THE GROW PROJECTIONS USED DO NOT EQUATE TO THE GROWTH OF THE INDIGENOUS POPULATION.

(iv) DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTH WARRINGTON IS SHOULD COMPENSATED BY THE THREE WATER BARRIERS, OF MERSEY, MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL AND BRIDgewater CANAL AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT ISSUES THEY CREATE.

(v) IF ANY AREA HAS TO BE REDEVELOPED BEYOND THE BROWN FIELD THIS SHOULD BE NORTH WARRINGTON NORTH OF THE M62.

(vi) ANY DEVELOPMENT OF WARRINGTON SHOULD BE SUCCESSIVE AND START WITH BROWN FIELD, THEN FIDDLERS FORD AND ONLY ONCE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE IS EXHAUSTED SHOULD ANY RELEASE OF GREEN FIELD BE CONSIDERED. IF "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES" THEN EXIST

(vii) I SEE NO CASE FOR "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES" BEING MADE FOR THE RELEASE IN THE PLAN NOW OF GREEN <sup>BELT</sup> ~~EVALUATED~~ SITES



## Question 8

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

### Response:

(i) MAXIMIZE THE HOUSING WHILST LOOKING TO PROVIDE INOVATIVE TRANSPORT SOLUTIONS NOT JUST MORE ROADS.

CONSIDER,

(i) TRAM SYSTEM, LINKING CITY CENTRE WITH SUBURBS

(ii) LIGHT RAILWAY.

(iii) USE OF THE WATERWAYS

(iv) AN 'EAST - WEST AXIS OF <sup>INOVATIVE</sup> ~~ROAD~~ TRANSPORT ROUTES AS ABOVE.

(v) DEVELOP TO BREATHE LIFE INTO THE TOWN CENTRE SEE (i)(ii)(iii)(iv) ABOVE.

(vi) DEVELOP THE CITY CENTRE AND BROWN FIELD AND THEN ASSES IF ANY MORE DEVELOPMENT IS REALLY REQUIRED.

## Question 9

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

### Response:

- (i) ENSURE BROWN FIELD DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH DENSITY QUALITY LIVING.
- (ii) ENSURE INNOVATIVE TRANSPORT LINKS, NOT JUST MORE ROADS.
  - (i) TRAM SYSTEM
  - (ii) LIGHT RAILWAY.
  - (iii) USE OF WATERWAY.
- (iii) MAKE TRAVEL TO THE TOWN CENTRE EASY, NOT JUST BY CAR.
- (iv) COMPLETE ALL DEVELOPMENT BEFORE GREEN BELT IS CONSIDERED REQUIRED FOR ROADS.

## Question 10

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

### Response:

- (1) ENSURE HIGH DENSITY QUARTER, ACCOMODATION
- (11) BUILD INNOVATIVE TRANSPORT LINKS TO THE CITY CENTRE AND RAILWAY STATIONS
  - CONSIDER
    - (1) TRAMS
    - (2) LIGHT RAILWAYS
    - (3) WATER TRANSPORT
- (111) DO NOT REMOVE GREEN BELT UNTIL THIS DEVELOPMENT IS COMPLETE

## Question 11

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

### Response:

- (i) Do NOT Proceed.
- (ii) ENSURE ALL BROWN FIELD DEVELOPMENT IS COMPLETED ~~LAST~~ FIRST.
- (iii) DEVELOPMENT WILL DESTROY SOUTH WARRINGTON AS IT EXISTS TODAY.
- (iv) INFRASTRUCTURE WILL BE OVERWHELMED
- (v) STOCKTON HEATH, <sup>WILKINS</sup> AN EVEN GREATER BOTTLE NECK
- (vi) THREE WATER BARRIERS HAVE NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY CONSIDERED AND THE TRAVEL NORTH PINCH POINTS THESE CROSS.
- (vii) DO NOT BUILD A DORMITORY SUBURB OF LIVERPOOL, MANCHESTER AND CHESTER, THIS IS WHAT THIS PROPOSED GARDEN CITY SUBURB WILL BE.
- (viii) IF A GARDEN CITY SUBURB IS NEEDED BUILD NORTH OF THE M62 NOT IN SOUTH WARRINGTON
- (ix) THE SERIOUS TRAFFIC CONGESTION ON M6 AND M56 WILL BE SUBSTANTIALLY WORSE - NO REAL CONSIDERATION HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE IMPACT OF THESE VEHICLE MOVEMENTS

## Question 12

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

### Response:

(1) THIS IS NOT NECESSARY.

THE GROWTH PLANS ARE SPECULATIVE

ALL ~~GREEN~~ <sup>BROWN</sup> FIELD NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED FIRST

IT WILL CREATE MORE TRANSPORT ISSUES.

(2) ONLY WHEN ALL BROWN FIELD SITES HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED SHOULD AN ASSESSMENT BE MADE IF ANY MORE DEVELOPMENT IS NEEDED. AT THIS STAGE IT IS NOT REQUIRED TO CREATE THE SOUTH WEST EXTENSION

### Question 13

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

#### Response:

(1) NORTH WARRINGHAM DEVELOPMENT TO BE CONSIDERED IF ANY DEVELOPMENT IS REALLY NEEDED AFTER ALL BROWN FIELD HAS BEEN DEVELOPED.

(2) AT THIS STAGE NO DEVELOPMENT IS NEEDED REVIEW AFTER BROWN FIELD

(3) CONSIDER IF A GARDEN CITY SUBURB OF BURTON WOOD, WINWICK, CROFT AND CULCHETH WOULD BETTER MEET THE TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS IF ANY DEVELOPMENT IS REALLY NEEDED.

## Question 14

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

### Response:

(i) No. CONCENTRATE EMPLOYMENT LAND NEAR  
ONCEA, CONSIDER FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF BURTON  
WOOD. FURTHER EMPLOYMENT LAND IS NOT REQUIRED  
IN SOUTH WARRINGTON

(ii) SOUTH WARRINGTON'S CHRONIC TRANSPORT PROBLEMS  
WOULD ONLY BE EXACERBATED BY MORE EMPLOYMENT  
LAND IN SOUTH WARRINGTON

## Question 15

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

### Response:

No,

- (1) Do NOT Reward those who break the law with illegal sites by making them legal
- (2) Move the Gypsy sites away from urban areas and near to - adjacent to the motorways.
- (3) Do not designate green belt for Gypsy or Traveller sites



## Question 16

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

**Response:** NO COMMENT

## Question 17

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

### Response:

- (i) Yes a plan that Doublers Warrington with use of brown field sites only.
- (ii) Innovative transport solutions not just more roads
- (iii) Rail, Bus, Tram, Light Railway connections
- (iv) The location of the jobs of those who may in the future live in Warrington ensure a territory for Liverpool, Manchester and Chester is not being built at the expense of those who already live in Warrington