

**From:** [Local plan web form](#) on behalf of [Main modifications consultation](#)  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Local plan main modifications consultation  
**Date:** 21 April 2023 14:44:51

---

Submitted on Fri, 21/04/2023 - 14:11

Submitted values are:

## Your information

### Your name

John Cooke

### Address

[REDACTED]

### Phone number

[REDACTED]

### Email address

[REDACTED]

## Modification response

### Which main modification or consultation are you responding on?

3.4.10 Green Belt

### Is the main modification legally compliant?

No

### Why do you consider it is not compliant (max 2000 words)

I am primarily objecting to proposals for the South East urban extension.

I believe the scale of development to be unacceptable and unnecessary. The suggestion seems to be that the land is low quality, this is patently untrue in the area around Lumb Brook Road / Wrights Green, which is highly productive arable land.

The scale of housing proposed seems based on inflated and outdated figures.

The infrastructure improvements are not spelled out, but seem unlikely to solve highway junction bottlenecks on all sides of the area. The Witherwin Ave extension seems to have disappeared from the plan, where this was the only significant highway improvement, which could have mitigated some of the traffic, which otherwise uses Lumb Brook Rd and New Lane, which are inadequate and unsafe in places. Further housing around this Witherwin Road extension would be more appropriate, and less disruptive to existing residents and rich environment than those areas proposed.

The evidence from recently approved housing estates is that policies on affordable housing, local centres, etc are not carried through in practice.

Appleton Thorn should be expanded as a local centre, with a local shop at least.

Specific older person provision should be included. A retirement village would be appropriate, as there is little existing supported provision.

In short, it seems the proposals are based on the easiest, cheapest wins for developers, (and WBC), rather than best provision for local residents.

### Is the main modification sound?

No

### Why do you consider it is not sound (max 2000 words)

As described above, the plan lacks detail and destroys valuable arable land and green belt with insufficient justification.

## Detailed response and document upload

### Detailed response to main modification (A maximum of 5000 words, which equates to roughly 10 sides of A4 paper)

Please refer to earlier comments.