

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



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:

We have no specific comments but support the need to identify additional land to address homes and employment needs over the next twenty years.

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 specific comments

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:

It is agreed that it is necessary to release Green Belt land to enable essential growth within the Warrington borough.

However, it is considered that there are some significant constraints to the sites chosen within the Preferred Options Plan such as flooding, made apparent during recent periods of extreme rainfall, which should be investigated further and may ultimately result in some of these sites not being taken forward or being brought forward at a smaller scale due to flood mitigation requirements. Due to this, we believe more consideration should be given to the provision of additional housing land within Warrington East which is largely outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3, and land around the settlements of Glazebury and Croft.

Additional housing development within Birchwood for example, would largely fall outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3 and could be utilised to provide an opportunity to upgrade the current infrastructure associated with Birchwood Train Station, improving accessibility, through the creation of a sustainable urban extension, as shown indicatively on the attached preliminary master plan. Improvements could improve accessibility to the station, provide much needed parking and supporting infrastructure.

We agree with the outcome of the Preferred Development Options that appropriate Green Belt release should also take place on the edge of existing villages, although, due to the proposed route of HS2, it is concerning that such a large proportion of this housing land is proposed at Culcheth. We would suggest that it would be more appropriate for additional housing land to be allocated to the nearby villages of Croft and Glazebury, which lie outside of the HS2 route. These are sustainable locations, with good access to local services and facilities which could accommodate an increase in population.

For all of these areas there are developers willing and able to take the sites forward.

Question 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Response:

We would agree with Local Plan Objective W2, which seeks to facilitate the sensitive release of Green Belt land, but would suggest, as per our response to Question 3, that the location of this release should be reconsidered to include additional land around Glazebury and Croft, together with land at Birchwood / Warrington East.

Question 5

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

Response:

The option which was considered to work best was Option 2 – which provided a Garden City Suburb of approximately 6000 homes and an urban extension to the south west of up to 2000 homes.

However, we are not convinced that this is the best location and suggest that further consideration needs to be given to sites to the East of Warrington / Birchwood. Large proportions of land to the south-west of Warrington falls under Flood Zones 2 and 3 and may negatively impact upon the potential for development in these areas. They also do not have the accessibility benefits of Warrington East where Birchwood railway station has the potential for upgrading.

Question 6

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

Response:

We consider insufficient consideration has been given to alternative locations and the basis for sustainable urban extensions linked to upgrading of existing railway stations.

Question 7

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

Response:

We believe that further consideration needs to be given to other areas of Green Belt release as identified in our response to Question 3.

Question 8

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

Response:

No specific comments

Question 9

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

Response:

We believe that consideration should be given to how to facilitating the improvement of facilities at Birchwood Train Station through allocating housing land in the area, which would improve transport connections throughout the Borough.

Question 10

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

Response:

Further consideration should be given to sites outside of Flood Zone 2 and 3, to the east of the borough.

Question 11

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

Response:

We would consider that further consideration needs to be made to sites to the East of Warrington. Large proportions of land to the south-west of Warrington falls under Flood Zones 2 and 3 and may negatively impact upon the potential for development in these areas.

Question 12

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

Response:

We would consider that further consideration needs to be made to sites to the East of Warrington. Large proportions of land to the south-west of Warrington falls under Flood Zones 2 and 3 and may negatively impact upon the potential for development in these areas.

Question 13

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

Response:

We agree that housing development should be considered for outlying settlements through appropriate Green Belt release.

However, we consider that the villages of Croft and Glazebury have the capacity for further housing allocation due to their sustainable nature. They are each sustainable locations with good access to local services and facilities. They are also located outside of the proposed HS2 route which will impact upon the availability of housing land at settlements such as Culcheth.

Question 14

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

Response:

No specific comments

Question 15

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

Response:

No specific comments

Question 16

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

Response:


No specific comments

Question 17

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

Response:

We attach details of a selection of sites available for Green Belt release / development, particularly in the vicinity of Croft and Glazebury.



SCALE 1:5000

Reproduced from an Ordnance Survey map by permission of Ordnance Survey @ on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.

Licence number ES 100004384

For identification purposes only.



390000

389500

389000

366500

37000

367500

36800

SJ6790
SJ6789

8979
5.25ha

3174
6.14ha

8160
12.68ha

4443
15.43ha
A/c + M

5371
1.09ha

8489
0.3ha

1833
7.56ha

5336
9.6ha

9629
3.4ha

8319
7.6ha


6318
1.72ha

SJ6889 SJ6789
SJ6878 SJ6788

SJ6739 SJ
SJ6730 SJ

367500





368000



Rural Land Register (RLR) Map
SBI - 106452912

Map 10/12

Legends

-  Your RLR Parcel(s)
-  SPS Permanent Ineligible Features
-  Adjacent Parcel Boundary
-  Unconfirmed Boundary

RLR Information

Sheet ID	Parcel ID	Total Area (ha)	SPS Recorded Eligible Area (ha)	English Region
SJ6696	9170	5.5	5.5	N
SJ6696	9547	9.8	9.8	N
SJ6796	1768	11.0	11.0	N

Scale 1:5000

50m 0m 50m 100m 150m 200m




Reproduced by permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO.
© Crown copyright and database right 2008. All rights reserved.
Ordnance Survey Licence number: 100022861

Date: 24/03/2010


Please return this sheet to us if you want to make any changes to the parcels shown on it.

MG
NORTH



-  EXISTING / PROPOSED BUFFER PLANTING
-  RECREATIONAL AREAS
-  LOCAL CENTRE
-  SITE BOUNDARY
-  MAIN TRANSPORT ROUTE

MG
SOUTH



We support the allocation of further houses in Lymm and would ask that our clients site be considered for an allocation of 5 new dwellings, as it will allow the reinstatement of previously residential properties and make more efficient use of an existing brownfield / residential site. The development of the site would have minimal impact upon to the green belt, as it is an existing residential site, the site is well screened by mature trees and has existing development at the rear and sides.

