

[REDACTED]

Dear All

I refer to my e mail of the 30 August 2017 and would ask you to accept this e mail as part but additional to me earlier e mail and should be read in conjunction. My e mail of 30th August is as follows:-

Dear All

My husband and I are extremely concerned at the proposed development news. It is very unclear from all the articles that we have read as to how the plans have been arrived at and what if any consideration has been given to the local residents. One of the things that amazes us is that Warrington Borough Council are Proposing to release green belt land to build 9345 homes 650 to be built north Warrington 40 to the East of Warrington and 8655 to be built in south Warrington a total of 9345 homes in what is currently designated green belt land.

4032 homes on the waterfront and 3526 in the city centre. Giving a total of 16903 homes. Who do Warrington Council think are going to buy these homes. Where are all these people coming from.

Why are Warrington Borough Council not considering releasing more urban area or brown belt areas which there seems to be an abundance of in North Warrington. Where there is current access to the M62 and would be very easy to build new access roads to the M62 if necessary.

The plans for the new road which will devastate Grappenhall and Thelwall and will cause absolute mayhem which is already being suffered by the local residents because of the congestion on the M6.

Are Warrington Borough Council going to reimburse current home owners in South Warrington for the loss of value that will be attributed if these plans proceed. We believe the plans will reduce the value of properties by about 30%.

The development of all these houses or the building of this proposed new road on this scale will not benefit the residents of Grappenhall or Thelwall, and will make the whole area a much less attractive place to live. It is unclear who will benefit from them certainly not local residents who have been given no consideration at all.

We would urge Warrington Borough Council re reconsider these plans and review the existing brown field sites that are available for building new homes that would not devastate the lives of so many people of South Warrington.

Please accept this e mail as 2 votes against the proposed plans from both my husband and myself.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Our additional comments are as follows:-

We believe that this project is being driven by Developers whose ulterior motive is financial and who do not have the interest of the residents of the Grappenhall and Thelwall community in their plans.

We went to a meeting at the Park Royal Hotel and must say how disappointed we were at the lack of specific information or answers to questions. Representatives of Warrington Borough Council "WBC" told us to look at their website for specific details. We found this to be totally inadequate and difficult to understand. The plans on show were extremely difficult to follow or make any sense of. We asked how they had arrived at the plan i.e. number of houses, location etc and were told that a feasibility study had been done but we could not establish the basis of information used for this feasibility study. We asked why we needed to make Warrington a city and again were told this was as a consequence of the feasibility study. We do not want to live in a city, we would have bought property in a city if we wanted to live in one. We paid a premium to live in South Warrington in a green belt area which currently as a consequence of WBC actions we believe to be blighted.

Could WBC explain why the original additional houses in Appleton are no longer part of the plans. The plans for these additional houses were passed almost 30 years ago but developments stopped. Please explain why.

Why has WBC not looked to regenerate brownfield sites which would be more beneficial to everyone. We understand the Fiddlers Ferry power station is being demolished and as far as we understand it there are no plans for any housing developments on that site. Additionally there appears to be a large amount of land in the Burtonwood area that I said in my earlier e mail could have direct access to the M62.

When asked where all the people were coming from to live in all these houses we were told that WBC had included major development of warehousing, factories, offices etc which would generate the need for the additional housing. We would suggest that there has been a miscalculation on all fronts and would ask that WBC to revisit the whole matter both for additional business's and housing needs required. We believe WBC vision is seriously flawed. We did ask where are all these business's were coming from and again were told that this was all part of this feasibility study which we stress we believe to be flawed.

We have been unable to find any justification for reclassifying the Green Belt. We understand that there should be exceptional circumstances for reclassification and we cannot find any exceptional circumstances anywhere.

With regard to the consultation process this seems to us to be seriously flawed. I would refer WBC to the Supreme Court case against Haringey Borough Council in 2014 which set the standard for local authority consultation. I have attached a copy of some notes that we have received which sets out the reasons that WBC has failed in its duty and obligations.

What should happen is for WBC to build the minimum level of houses that the Government will allow as we cannot see how the current plans enhance Warrington and certainly not South Warrington at all, either for the benefit of the town or the people who live in it without completely changing the lifestyles for the worse.

Please accept these notes on behalf of both my husband and myself.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Notes regarding Warrington Borough Council's flawed consultation process

A Supreme Court case against Haringey Borough Council in 2014 set the benchmark for the standards of local authority consultation. The case made it clear that while there is no general legal duty to consult people affected by a decision, a duty to consult may arise out of the Council's **common law duty of fairness** (R(BAPIO Action Limited) v Secretary of State for the Home department [2007] EWCA Civ 1139).

The key message from the Haringey case is that consultations must be carried out fairly. Looking at issues of who, when, how and evidence based analysis.

1. Who should they consult- the demands of fairness are higher where the authority contemplates depriving someone of something;
2. How should they consult – if someone is likely to be worse off they should be specifically identified and consulted;
3. When to consult- it should be done with sufficient time to allow people to know what you are thinking of doing, telling them the options and giving time for them to reflect on it:
 - a. Consultation should be at a time when the proposals are still at a formative stage to allow for "intelligent consideration and response";
 - b. Adequate time must be given;
 - c. It must allow the public meaningful participation in the process;
4. Analysis- The data collected from the consultation must be handled and objectively managed – there must be sound data collection, processing and analysis.

Warrington Borough Council has failed in several respects.

The highest court in the land requires that if a person is to be worse off as a result of the proposals they should be contacted directly by hand delivered letters and by telephone if necessary. This should have been reinforced by street notices and press releases. None of which have been done by the council. The courts have determined that use of the Council's website alone is not sufficient. People affected should have been identified and targeted with communications. Most of Grappenhall will consider themselves to be worse off as a result of these proposals but a number will definitely lose businesses and property. Communication has therefore been ineffective and compromised the consultation process.

There appears to be no evidence of a scoping exercise around the consultation and no steering group. The greater the involvement with the community the better. No links have been forged with local groups, community representatives, bodies and forums to ensure understanding of the proposals and also the process.

It is not clear how the council has determined the necessary period of consultation. It has given the minimum time possible for people to be consulted. Consultations of this size and nature could last for 3 months. It has consulted over the holiday period meaning a large proportion of those affected will not have been made aware of the consultation being carried out or have been unable to access the information.

There is no evidence of a communications strategy. The communication has been very inadequate. The information is poor and the plans are illegible. Information from the planning officers at the public meetings has been conflicting and unclear. In addition, the data and documents provided in the consultation are not digestible during the period allowed for the consultation.

There has been no proper access given to the consultation documentation. The information has been placed online and at libraries only as far as we are aware. Only a limited amount of paper forms have been made available and then only on request and by collection from the council offices. The Council have relied too heavily on online forms and information. The council should not assume that people have access to technology.

There has been no proper data collection at the consultation meetings. A note of the number and name and address of attendees was not taken. Feedback forms were not provided to the attendees to allow the council or any other relevant body to determine the usefulness and appropriateness of these meetings. Attendees at the meetings did not see the council's planners taken any notes of comments made to them.

The consultation timetable does not even seem to include the requirement for a report to be produced summarising the results of the consultation that is currently being carried out.

The council have failed to provide a proper consultation plan including a communications plan. This should have been drafted, tested and then implemented. People have not been enabled to take part in this extensive plan consultation. The council must give active consideration of the data collected.

Even in times of local government austerity this is not just best practice it is a requirement.