

Response 852

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: Nicola Pratt

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	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED]
Postcod	[REDACTED]
Telephone numbe	[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 co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

The plan is based upon unsound economic growth projections, inconsistent population figures, inconsistent use of household density figures to calculate number of required houses, plans for more houses than government targets, does not explicitly prioritise urban/brownfield development as only course of action until the time it is used up. There are no proposals for funding of local infrastructure (doctors, schools, etc), no firm plan to ease crossing of ship canal, no detail of health and well-being facilities. The proposal does not tack traffic problems, will increase pollution and needlessly suggests release of green space for development when there is already sufficient space in urban/brownfield. The plan is simply inaccurate, overly vague and incomplete and totally unsound on all counts. The plan as it stands is not a plan, just vague wording to somehow justify allowing developers to make money building on greenspace.

The council has failed to provide any answers to request for details and therefore not fulfilled duty to co-operate in setting a realistic and sufficiently informed plan

5. If you answered 'Yes' to any of the options in question 3 then please give details in the box below the reasons why you support the legal compliance or soundness of the Draft Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

cannot actually comment on full details of whether legally compliant or not

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.

The plan should more accurately reflect the number of houses required for the projected population growth and use a factor of 2 (or more, as per 2.3 density from 2011 census) and decrease number of houses to less than 12,000. This is more than fulfilled by the council statements on available urban/brownfield development capacity. The plan should spell out specific plans for schools, medical facilities, etc and funding methods that will be used to fund them. Transportation "evidence" should be removed until such a time it is well defined and can be properly evaluated. Until detailed transportation plans are released, the overall plan must be considered incomplete and unsound based on no proof of a plan to handle the increased requirements of the population. For example, exactly what will allow easier crossings of ship canal and the Mersey? Exactly how will M6 and M56 junctions existing traffic problems be fixed and not simply compounded.

Until these changes and missing information are provided, the plan should be considered wholly unsound and not fit for release or guiding further policy

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)