

Response 820

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: John Whitlow

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)	[REDACTED]
Address 1	[REDACTED]
Address 2	[REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Telephone number	[REDACTED]

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 cooperate. Please be as precise as possible.

I do not believe that the proposals contained in the Draft Local Plan are sound. I do not accept the scale and nature of the plan due to the massive negative impact it will have on the residents of South Warrington in the future.

Reasons that the plan is unsound:

- Growth predictions are based on unrealistic economic forecasts and population projections. For example: If the 2016 population projections were used, there would be an increase in the local population to 2041 of 18,874. This equates to the need for only 343 homes per year rather than the 945 proposed.
- The plan period is 2 years longer than it needs to be to meet government requirements. This necessitates the unnecessary building of an additional 1,890 houses and the consequent loss of around 120 hectares of Green Belt.
- Because of the above, the level of Housing Numbers are far too high and compounded by the addition of a 10% flexibility increase for which there is no need, as the Local Plan will be reviewed every 5 years. I believe the lowest number of new houses possible should be used in the development of the local plan.
- The overestimation in housing numbers has a significant impact in increasing the need to build on Green Belt. Warrington will lose 11% of its Green Belt, virtually all of it in South Warrington – this is unnecessary and disproportionately spread across the Borough. I believe the loss of Green Belt, if any is really required, should be spread more evenly and be a last resort after all other reasonable options have been examined.
- The location of new homes should be where the new jobs are being created to minimise commuting, and also be affordable in relation to the types of jobs created. This is not the case in relation to South Warrington:
 - o The 1,600 houses at Walton will all be for commuters as there is no new employment in that area.
 - o The new jobs created near the 'Garden Suburb' will be mainly distribution and logistics related and there is likely to be a serious mismatch between the remuneration levels of the new jobs and the costs of the new housing being developed – staff will have to commute from other areas. 5,000 houses are being developed which will mainly be for commuters as there is little existing commercial activity in South Warrington that will provide new employment opportunities.
- The villages of Walton, Grappenhall, Appleton Thorn and Stretton will be completely changed in relation to their character and distinctiveness which is contrary to the 'Vision for Warrington's future' outlined in the Local Plan.
- The traffic infrastructure proposals are totally inadequate to alleviate the current problems of congestion, noise and pollution in South Warrington and also support the new housing and commercial developments.
 - o The 'Garden Suburb' will have 5,000 new houses with consequent daily car journeys of at least 10,000:
 - There is nothing planned to improve the A49 as it goes north from the M56 through Stockton Heath towards the Town Centre – it is already extremely congested and very polluted
 - There is no new crossing of the Manchester Ship Canal in South East Warrington. WBC are relying on the existing Victorian swing bridges despite the projected major increase in shipping traffic necessitating the bridges being closed much more often in future.
 - The Transport Plan does not provide any details of how the new public transport systems would cross the Manchester Ship Canal or the Bridgewater Canal.
 - o The already congested and polluted A56 will need to support and contend with:
 - around 7,000 daily car journeys emanating from the Walton Development and the new houses Halton Borough will be building near the A56.
 - around 5,000 daily car and HGV journeys associated with the Waterfront development via the Western Link.
 - many people will use the Western Link rather than pay the tolls on the other two Mersey crossings.
 - traffic to and from South East Warrington using the Western Link via A56.
 - the new Western Link junction plus the 2/3 other new junctions needed to access the Walton housing development, will cause the traffic to stop and start continuously between Walton Village lights and the Western Link junction.
 - the steep incline on the northbound Western Link, will mean that traffic will be in low gears (especially HGV's) and as the Western Link is single carriageway, the achieved speed will be that of the slowest.
- The National Planning Policy Framework requires the Plan to be aspirational but deliverable. I do not believe this Plan is deliverable and is therefore unsound:
 - o The annual average delivery of 945 new houses is more than double the current build rates (359 in 2018/19). There is a peak build requirement of 1,656 houses in 2025/26 which I do not believe is achievable. Developers will only build houses if they believe they can be sold, so the control on the rate of building does not lie with WBC but with the developers.
 - o While some money is available from Government for infrastructure, the bulk of the funding will need to come from the developers. The size of that funding requirement is unclear in the Plan as is the commitment of developers to deliver the necessary funding for infrastructure. Development is only acceptable with the effective mitigation of its key impacts (traffic congestion, noise, air quality, education & health facilities, local amenities & the environment, as well as maintaining / improving our quality of life), are properly planned and implemented before and during the building process but before completion.

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)