

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 June 2019 11:57  
**To:** Local Plan  
**Subject:** Representations on Proposed Submission Version Local Plan (also attached as word doc)  
**Attachments:** notes for representation on local plan by D Steele.doc

## **Planning Policy and Programmes, Warrington Borough Council**

### **Representations on Proposed Submission Version Local Plan**

**By David Steele resident** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**June 2019**

### **Land use**

The overall approach on land use is back to front, it is not applying the guidelines of “brown field first” as the fiddlers ferry site is discussed and then not included instead green field is included from the start. This is also true for the hospital site. These 2 areas should be in the land use plan first with contingents if they do not become available.

### **Viability**

The “Warrington Local Plan Viability Assessment” only assesses the financial viability and says nothing about whether it will work in terms of quality of life, infrastructure and jobs or whether people will want to come?

### **Infrastructure**

As Object W4 of the plan in the main only listed exiting plans of current problem areas on transport and very little on health, the evidence file:- Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been examined and I would make the following comments:-

The IDP does not acknowledge that the borough wide infrastructure is already over loaded as the town under went major expansion as a new town. This is noted in :-

Warrington in context 2.1.10

*“In 1968 Warrington was designated as a New Town, primarily to take economic advantage of its unique position at the hub of the region’s communication network, evidently aided by the arrival of the regions motorways. Warrington was also becoming a significant growth area and the New Town was designated in part to manage and direct this rapid growth and to tackle the congestion issues it was facing”*

But this is not developed as to the impact on the current state of the town/infrastructure.

In particular I would comment on the following sentence from (IDP) part of para 2.7

*“It is important to note that at a broad Borough-wide level Warrington can accommodate the levels of development proposed by the Proposed Submission Version Local Plan as long as a **comprehensive approach** is taken to the provision of infrastructure, particularly on the larger development sites.”*

I can see no evidence of a **comprehensive approach** in the IDP evidence document

e.g. in 2 areas:-

### **Transport:-**

There are 3 waterways that pass through the town (River Mersey the Manchester ship canal and the Bridgewater canal) and there is only one new crossing planned (not fully funded) and that is likely to be mainly used by commercial traffic for “Port Warrington” and private and commercial traffic avoiding the tolls on the Mersey gateway bridge. It will do little to help movement around the town which relies on infrastructure that dates back to the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. **The transport items in the schedule show no understanding of the problems currently caused by the town’s geography.** Most of the entries are items that are trying to fix the current problems in a piecemeal way. None of the new bits of road produce an overall improvement as they all link in to the existing arteries and crossings.

Where is the overall plan to cope with the “town wide” impact of the planned expansion?

I personal have spent ■ years commuting around/through Warrington and it has only got worse this plan tells me it is going to get even worse.

The following para 2.14 from the IDP indicates to me, there is no overall plan rather a “do bits as we go” approach.

*“In order to co-ordinate this approach the Council aims: • To encourage investment in and improvement of existing infrastructure. • To work in partnership with internal and external stakeholders to ensure the timely and coordinated provision of high quality infrastructure that supports future growth. • To assess the infrastructure needs and requirements which will support growth in the Borough through the IDP. • To monitor and review the IDP on a regular basis to ensure that future infrastructure needs are considered and updated”*

To conclude on transport:- the information in these documents does not indicate a **sound comprehensive approach** or a plan, going forward.

### **Health**

I could find nothing in the IDP on health except this in the IDP Schedule:-

*Social Community Facilities Garden Suburb Community Hub New community facility comprising leisure and health services South Warrington MD2*

*Funding estimate £20,000*

*Funding gap £20,000*

So there appears to be one new health facility in the plan with the building not funded and dependent on developers.

There appears to be no plan on how the area will attract the required health professionals to provide the services, as the existing G.P. and hospital services are already over loaded.

Again To conclude on Health:- the information in these documents does not indicate a **sound** *comprehensive approach* or a plan, going forward.

## **Final overall comment**

In summary there is very little “overall plan” in these documents just a lot about process. There is a plan for “Port Warrington” by a developer and the idea we need more land to build on, but very little about the current problems and the geography of the town. This is not a sound plan.

David Steele

13/6/19