

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

Contents

1: Contact details	Page 2
2: Local Plan questions	Page 3
3. About You questions	Page 20

1: Contact Details (Compulsory)

Title:

First Name:

Last Name:

Organisation (if applicable):

Phone Number:

E-

Which best describes you? (tick ✓ one option only)

Resident in Warrington



Resident from outside of Warrington

Business

Other, please specify

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:

See attached document.

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:

No.

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...see attached document.

Question 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Response:

Broadly, yes. But in scale, these feel far too ambitious.

Question 5

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

Response:

No.

Question 6

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

Response:

No.

Question 7

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

Response:

No; see attached document.

Question 8

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

Response:

No....I never go there so cannot comment. I also feel that we should drop this 'City' aspiration.

Question 9

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

Response:

No.

Question 10

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

Response:

No.

Question 11

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

Response:

Yes. See attached document.

Question 12

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

Response:

No.

Question 13

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

Response:

I agree with the Council's approach on this matter.

Question 14

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

Response:

No comment.

Question 15

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

Response:

No comment.

Question 16

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

Response:

No. See attached document.

Question 17

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

Response:

COMMENTS ON “PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION” DATED JULY 2017

1. THERE IS NO BUSINESS JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS

I understand that the NPPF requires the Council to provide and update the OAN. However, at the very least, any proposed number greater than the OAN should be justified. After all, there is a cost in implementing the proposed Plan....how do you know that it will be a good investment?

If only the OAN is used, the number of new dwellings destined for the Green Belt could be reduced by 3318 (Table 1 of Preferred Development Option), which if these are all in the South West Urban Extension would **reduce the call on Green Belt land by approximately 47%** (based on the numbers given in Section 3.3 of the SWUE Framework Plan).

2. THE OLD RNAS STRETTON HAS NOT BEEN CONSIDERED FOR HOUSING.

I understand that the old airbase makes a STRONG contribution to the Green Belt. However, it is derelict land with no other use.

It is morally wrong to cover arable land in houses just because the land may only make MODERATE contribution to the Green Belt....it is still farmed and can still provide food for our children and for the generations that will follow them. Today's Council should not be trying to make a quick buck at the expense of tomorrow's generations.

If the old airbase is used for housing (roughly 500 dwellings at 20dph over an area of approximately 25ha), **the loss of productive arable land in the south west of the borough is reduced by a further 10%** (again based on the numbers given in Section 3.3 of the SWUE Framework Plan).

3. INFRASTRUCTURE

I note and agree with the Council's assessment that the road infrastructure in the south of the borough is inadequate now.

I also agree that a pre-condition on any start being made on the South West Urban Extension is that:

- J10 and J9/20 are significantly upgraded (SWUE Framework Plan, Section 3.3)
- The proposed new strategic link roads are completed.

I also note that there are currently no Highways Agency plans to upgrade these junctions.

There is insufficient prominence given in the Preferred Development Option to the need for safe, segregated cycle routes throughout the South West Urban Extension.

4. **MINERALS SPATIAL STRATEGY**

In the absence of a separate strategy, I note that the Local Plan will need to include and justify a Minerals Spatial Strategy. I further understand that, where feasible, the borough is expected to be self-sufficient and to safeguard mineral deposits for future use. Sand and gravel resources are limited in the borough and are insufficient to meet our needs (Section 6.2 of the Minerals Resource Study).

Sand and gravel resources lie within the proposed South West Urban Extension (Minerals Resource Study, Fig 2). How is the Council proposing to safeguard these resources (including a 250m buffer zone) if the land is used for housing?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]