

Response 797

Respondent Details

Information	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

PART A - About You

1. Please complete the following: Please note the email address (if provided below) will be sent a full copy of the submitted response and a unique ID number for future reference (pdf attachment).

Name of person completing the form: PETER CHORLEY

Email address: [REDACTED]

2. What type of respondent are you? Please select all that apply.

A local resident who lives in Warrington

3. Please complete the following:

Contact details	
Organisation name (if applicable)	-
Agent name (if applicable)	-
Address 1	[REDACTED]
Address 2	[REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Telephone number	-

PART B - Representation Form 1

1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? From the drop down list please select one option.

Draft Local Plan (as a whole)

2. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph (s) or policy sub-number (s)? Please select one option.

None of the above

3. Do you consider the Draft Local Plan is: Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No
Legally Compliant		X
Sound		X
Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate		X

4. If you have answered 'No' to any of the options in the above question then please give details in the box below of why you consider the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

I object to the Warrington Plan development of current greenbelt land because:

- The recent announcement (13th June 2019) of the closure of the Warrington Fiddlers Ferry Coal Fired Power station on 31st March 2020 will release acres of empty 'Brownfield' development land that has existing road infrastructure, rail and close proximity to the M62, and will reduce / negate to proposed need for business (logistics) expansion land capacity into current food producing agricultural land within at least the next 6 years. This huge 'brownfield' site has not been included in the business growth land availability calculations in the current Warrington Plan (under consultation/ review), which means it is not an accurate, or sound assessment of land availability for future growth and the need for further use of greenbelt sites for business and or housing need.

-The assessments for Housing growth are based on out of date, earlier assessments in 2014 of future population growth by the ONS. These were further revised down by the ONS prior to the Brexit Result. Although the government said councils should use these inflated figures (that have been superceded and are therefore out of date) Warrington Council have gone much further in their plans by further increasing the planned growth by several thousand dwellings based on unjustified housing need. These inflated household numbers are not sustainable in both the lack of provision of infrastructure already in place in the town and in particular, south Warrington and also the lack of provision being proposed in this plan. There have been recent Warrington Guardian articles stating that the councils own research states that further Manchester Ship Canal crossings are required to sustain the growth of the proposed Garden Suburb (3/4 new 'villages' and associated shop/school). However these have not been included in sufficient detail in the plan, but have been vaguely noted in the LTP4 Plan. However, there is not enough detail of the funding, their routes, or sizes of these roads to carry Traffic/ cycle/ busses for the Public to effectively comment on within the plan. However, by the fact they are being vaguely 'noted' within the plan, and that plan being accepted, then they are more likely to be progressed, without the further scrutiny by the planning departments and Public, because the argument over the need for them to be built will have already been accepted should this current Warrington Plan and LTP4 plan be accepted in their current forms. The plan period should therefore be reduced in both time scale and scale of development, to allow growth to occur in response to real time need.

-The health authority have an intention to change the provision of Hospital care in Warrington, as the current General Hospital site in the town is considered not fit for purpose. The current plan that we are being asked to comment on should include details of proposed site of any relocated hospitals, as this will affect the need to further housing/ religious provision, road networks etc to access this facility. This plan is therefore not sound, as it makes only a general provisional site for a new healthcare facility (not general hospital) in the proposed garden suburb. This would presumably cater for the thousands of new residents, not cater for the existing population, so therefore the draft plan should include this new general hospital site, whether it be a redeveloped on the current site, as has occurred in whiston, but with little access for the new residents located miles to the south of the Ship Canal, or on a new site not yet marked on the plans.

-This ill prepared plan is contrary to the majority of wishes of current Warrington Residents, by proposing housing figures far in excess of these projected targets. This plan therefore doesn't cater for Warrington, (on whose behalf it is supposed to be a plan for) but instead caters for the needs of regional/ national corporate house builders and land owners.

-The stages of the plan leave the amenity (schools / suburb centre/ Health Provision / community centre etc being built in the last phase of building, once the Warehouses (size of existing Trafford Park) and 3 main new 'villages' have been built. This time delay will put unnecessary strain on existing Healthcare / Civic / Schools in South Warrington, as the homes will be occupied before the facilities are in place. This will set up patterns of even more car / vehicle commutes to Lymm, Northwich, Manchester/ Liverpool/ Chester, as all are equal in time duration for commuters than currently heading into Warrington. Therefore, these new homes will not be for existing Warrington families to expand into, but rather serve to provide executive housing for people wishing to leave the surrounding cities.

- The Plan, based on initial work by ARUP suggests that the majority of current Greenbelt land to the south of the Manchester Ship Canal in South Warrington is of 'poor' greenbelt quality, and therefore should be built upon. Is there not the counter argument that this greenbelt should therefore be enhanced, to the benefit of current Warrington residents, to improve the health of the town as a whole, not sold off, (with inflated prices due to planning consent), as housing to cater for the housing needs of commuters from neighbouring cities, who currently view south Warrington as an ideal place to live, which is reflected in the higher house prices in the south of Warrington than the north.

The initial assessment made by ARUP in the original draft Warrington Plan, (that was objected to by over 4500 residents and was paid for by Warrington Council), is only one opinion. This should be opened to a wider audience/ range of opinions. This is the same established planning partner of Peel Holdings (ARUP) that is involved in the proposals to develop current greenbelt land as part of its 'Atlantic Gateway' growth proposals. Could this not pose a potential conflict of interests?

The loss of major areas of current agricultural land/ open space in one area, rather than the growth being spread across all areas of the borough, to help settlements develop naturally over time, is the wrong approach to town planning for Warrington. This approach is

usually used in areas where vast industrial brownfield sites need to be reused and repurposed, not for land that currently has a purpose as high value as farming and amenity value through it acting as a barrier to existing settlements against Motorway traffic noise and poor air quality.

-The involvement of Warrington Council in the procurement and ground rent revenue of these proposed new warehouse sites SIX56 and the Stobart Expansion on currently designated greenbelt land,(through its shareholdings in the company controlling Redwood Bank), and the council leaders involvement with Langtree, who are proposing the SIX56 development prior to the consultations on this draft plan and the proposed release of hundreds of acres of current greenbelt land, should mean that another body 'independent' body should be reviewing these decisions. The Stobart proposers, currently in appeal, and a second application have not shown a special circumstance or special need to build these planned warehouses on this site at this time. The Six56 application is a 'speculative' new build'. The rents on these units would need to be artificially low to tempt existing businesses away from existing locations with capacity that are well served by existing Public Transport, road and rail links.

- Consideration to the use of existing brownfield sites within the town, such as converting/ enlarging the many existing empty units /plots in Birchwood/ Woolston Grange/ Gemini / Omega business parks into larger units (if these are called for). These sites already benefit from existing Motorway access/ trunk roads and local residential areas for staff recruitment.

- Consideration of large areas of empty brownfield sites in neighbouring areas (empty business Land around Barton / Ship Canal in Salford, empty units next to the M56 in Runcorn/ Daresbury, empty units/ land in adjacent St. Helens, bordering the existing Omega site and even the huge empty 'airfields' brownfield development site in Deeside all show that there is not currently a need to build new warehousing in the near future. The granting of this planning application will only serve to further increase the value of the land by this land-banking property speculator on this site, without recourse to actually develop the site in the current economic uncertainty. The failure of Peel Holdings to further develop nearby Port Salford with a rail link, and further warehousing due to the current economic uncertainties of the past decade, all show there is not a current or near future need for this development.

- The existing road infrastructure cannot cope with existing traffic levels, particularly at peak rush hours, or during daily accidents, or speed restrictions during periods of high winds, when traffic is slowed on the high level M6 Thelwall Viaduct crossing. The plans for Six56 to be accessed from the a50 motorway roundabout, or use of traffic lights, will further slow traffic.

-Higher volumes of diesel lorry container traffic will add to the existing poor air quality in Warrington (, and around this junction, and for staff arrivals and departures on shift changes will add to further traffic borne air pollution. This location is not currently served by public transport. There are no plans for a rail link to this site, and it is located many miles from existing conurbations/ accommodation for its workforce. Therefore most of the commuter traffic of employees and business, will be road based. Proposed relief roads connecting this site to other junctions on the M56 are not in existence, or even the planning stages and have yet to secure any funding. Therefore this application is premature and not sustainable and should be refused, at the very least until any major road networks are built to accommodate this proposed development.

-The existing road traffic already passes through the town, resulting in gridlock, during poor weather conditions, when motorway, particularly on the M6, is slowed, or there are lane closures due to daily accidents. An increase in large container lorry traffic in this location will add to this congestion, increasing to further reductions in air quality and traffic noise pollution. This is because traffic comes through the town using the poorly maintained Peel swing bridges as an alternative, which brings the air and noise pollution even closer to existing communities.

-Existing Public transport and cycle routes to this site are poor/ non existent. It is not currently a residential area, and the existing housing in Appleton Thorn/ Grappenhall Heys is too expensive for rentals/ buyers by the limited number of contract/ self employed logistics staff that will be employed on minimum wage. The new Local Transport Plans for Warrington (LTP4) are currently in the consultation phase, and have no certainty of being introduced in their current vague. Even the roads that they are proposed to run on in the south of the borough, near to the site, have not been planned/ built. So this will increase likelihood of further road journeys by private vehicles to this site, clogging the existing A50.

-The scale of these proposed buildings in the 'employment area' are far in excess of the neighbouring agricultural / former airfield buildings, in both height and width. Therefore they will not be screened from the greenbelt by any mature / immature trees. They will dominate the surrounding farming landscape, particularly as the sight is on a ridge overlooking both Warrington and Lymm. This will overshadow and prove detrimental to the future and outlook of existing listed sites such as historic Bradley Hall moated site (within the proposed site), Howshoots farm, and completely change for the worse, the setting of South Warrington as seen from residents and passing traffic using the existing road network. This will harm and devalue the neighbouring remaining greenbelt land around this site.

-Removal of established hedgerows within the pastureland within the current greenbelt sites under review in this plan will lead to loss of wildlife habitat. Any wildlife impact assessments are flawed if they believe that wildlife such as badgers/ foxes/ owls / hedgehogs/ newts can simply move, or be accommodated by current adjacent sites north of the M56, during the construction phases of each of the sites. The current greenbelt acts as a lung for south Warrington and the north west region (being between conurbations of both Manchester and Liverpool, Halton). It is also a noise barrier / visual relief from the M56 and M6 motorways for the existing residents of Appleton Thorn/ Grappenhall/ Stretton.

-There is also the loss of food growing land, that post brexit, the country may rely upon for increasing home grown produce, and with the Government's intention to reduce the UK's carbon emissions. These plans are contrary to this, as they remove carbon absorbing vegetation, involve the use of many tonnes of concrete in their construction (high carbon footprint) and generate large amounts of CO2 in their running, through diesel/ petrol vehicle movements.

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Draft Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified above where this relates to soundness. (NB please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

To make it sound, it needs to be reduced from 20 to 15 years and be based on the ONS levels of population growth for Warrington, rather than a higher aspirational growth target set by Warrington Council.

The residents have already said they do not wish the town to become a city, and the growth envisaged by these plans is far in excess of that, and is only fuelled by council leaders aspirations for the town to become a city. This was evident in the original draft plan being referred to as city and for 'garden city to be created on greenbelt. This new plan has acknowledged the residents wishes for their town to remain a town, leading to references to city being removed, but the scale of development has not been sufficiently reduced.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? Please select one option.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

You have just completed a Representation Form for Draft Local Plan (as a whole). What would you like to do now? Please select one option.

Complete the rest of the survey (Part C)