

Response 546

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: Shaun Kevill

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 co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

I wish to object to Local Development Plan in the strongest possible terms.

Although I accept that development is required as Warrington as a whole continues to grow, the plan to destroy the vast majority of South Warrington's Green Belt is unnecessary and at the least extremely heavy handed.

"Special circumstances" have been given as the reason, however, it has not been made clear what these are and why South Warrington has to carry the vast majority of this burden?

I believe the air quality in Warrington has been graded as poor which I can only assume is due to being surrounded by 3 major motorways and the volume of vehicles in the area. I attended one of your consultations at Warrington Rugby Stadium and was told by a member of the planning team/staff member that 'it is bad but we are not 'quiet at the stage for special measures'. This wasn't the reassuring message/justification for additional building that he thought it was.

South Warrington has both the M56 and the M6 and where they meet at Junc 20 always has heavy to standing traffic (I drive past this every day while going and returning from work). This must have a major impact on the air quality especially when vehicles are queuing in South Warrington just to get on. I note the highways agency have concerns about the proposed developments which is unsurprising given problems already exist at the junction. No amount of road improvements will help if the cars don't have anywhere to go.

I note from a SIX56 brochure that they studied the air quality in the area and they deemed it was so bad that the addition of a massive distribution centre would not have a real impact. Why would you want to build homes in those conditions. I appreciate the short term financial gains, however, the current impact and of course long term impact on the population's health will far outweigh this. It is my understanding that Greenbelt helps to reduce air pollution. It seems we should be planting trees, not selling the land to a property developer to build expensive properties.

I read a small article in the Warrington Guardian regarding the proposed closure of the Sandy Lane Recycling Centre where Cllr Russ Bowden cited congestion and air pollution from the traffic as one of the reasons for its closure. Will 9000 (approx.) new homes not have a far worse impact. It appears the council is talking out of both sides of their mouth. Congestion is a problem when they want to sell the land to a property developer to build expensive properties and it is not a problem when they want to sell land to a property developer to build expensive properties.

In summary, air pollution/quality and congestion is currently a big problem in South Warrington and the LDP can only make this worse.

Are expensive homes in one of the most expensive areas in Warrington going to be affordable and help with the housing crisis? Although I understand that some houses will be made available for the council and lower earning families, surely the majority will be bought by the more affluent?

It is my understanding that the council is aware of the challenges facing our retailers, with online shopping and gaining more and more market share. If the trend continues, which there is no evidence to suggest it won't, won't more brownfield sites become available over the next 15-20 years where properties could be built? Of course this is only one example as I'm sure there are many others that could be investigated. What research has been done into the projected and current availability of Brownfield sites?

I am not a property developer but it appears to me that if I was in the business of building houses I would want to build on South Warrington's Green Belt due to the reduced costs of building and most importantly the fact that I could sell them for more money (than the majority of the other areas in Warrington). As a council I can also understand that the additional council tax from these more expensive properties (as council tax depends on bandings) will also be a very attractive proposition. The decision to allow the majority of what must be very valuable land to be developed on seems sort of sighted at best.

There are a number of plans under review/consultation (forgive me if this is not the correct terminology) including the LDP, Eddie Stobbart and of course the SIX56 that are all going to have a major impact on South Warrington. I understand these are being reviewed separately but given the potential impact they will have all must be considered together or at least make up part of the decision making process. It is my fear that big business has seen an opportunity to overwhelm the Council and local residents by putting all these proposals through at the same time, I can only hope that the council has the same concerns and will act appropriately.

South Warrington is a beautiful place that can and should be enjoyed by all. I appreciate the monetary value of this land to property developers and the council alike, however, once it is gone it is gone. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal in its current form and also prioritise the air pollution and congestion issues we are currently facing.

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.

I wish to object to Local Development Plan in the strongest possible terms.

Although I accept that development is required as Warrington as a whole continues to grow, the plan to destroy the vast majority of South Warrington's Green Belt is unnecessary and at the least extremely heavy handed.

"Special circumstances" have been given as the reason, however, it has not been made clear what these are and why South Warrington has to carry the vast majority of this burden?

I believe the air quality in Warrington has been graded as poor which I can only assume is due to being surrounded by 3 major motorways and the volume of vehicles in the area. I attended one of your consultations at Warrington Rugby Stadium and was told by a member of the planning team/staff member that 'it is bad but we are not 'quiet at the stage for special measures'. This wasn't the reassuring message/justification for additional building that he thought it was.

South Warrington has both the M56 and the M6 and where they meet at Junc 20 always has heavy to standing traffic (I drive past this every day while going and returning from work). This must have a major impact on the air quality especially when vehicles are queuing in South Warrington just to get on. I note the highways agency have concerns about the proposed developments which is unsurprising given problems already exist at the junction. No amount of road improvements will help if the cars don't have anywhere to go.

I note from a SIX56 brochure that they studied the air quality in the area and they deemed it was so bad that the addition of a massive distribution centre would not have a real impact. Why would you want to build homes in those conditions. I appreciate the short term financial gains, however, the current impact and of course long term impact on the population's health will far outweigh this. It is my understanding that Greenbelt helps to reduce air pollution. It seems we should be planting trees, not selling the land to a property developer to build expensive properties.

I read a small article in the Warrington Guardian regarding the proposed closure of the Sandy Lane Recycling Centre where Cllr Russ Bowden sited congestion and air pollution from the traffic as one of the reasons for its closure. Will 9000 (approx.) new homes not have a far worse impact. It appears the council is talking out of both sides of their mouth. Congestion is a problem when they want to sell the land to a property developer to build expensive properties and it is not a problem when they want to sell land to a property developer to build expensive properties.

In summary, air pollution/quality and congestion is currently a big problem in South Warrington and the LDP can only make this worse.

Are expensive homes in one of the most expensive areas in Warrington going to be affordable and help with the housing crisis? Although I understand that some houses will be made available for the council and lower earning families, surely the majority will be bought by the more affluent?

It is my understanding that the council is aware of the challenges facing our retailers, with online shopping and gaining more of a market share. If the trend continues, which there is no evidence to suggest it won't, won't more brownfield sites become available over the next 15-20 years where properties could be built? Of course this is only one example as I'm sure there are many others that could be investigated. What research has been done into the projected and current availability of Brownfield sites?

I am not a property developer but it appears to me that if I was in the business of building houses I would want to build on South Warrington's Green Belt due to the reduced costs of building and most importantly the fact that I could sell them for more money (than the majority of the other areas in Warrington). As a council I can also understand that the additional council tax from these more expensive properties (as council tax depends on bandings) will also be a very attractive proposition. The decision to allow the majority of what must be very valuable land to be developed on seems sort of sighted at best.

There are a number of plans under review/consultation (forgive me if this is not the correct terminology) including the LDP, Eddie Stobbart and of course the SIX56 that are all going to have a major impact on South Warrington. I understand these are being reviewed separately but given the potential impact they will have all must be considered together or at least make up part of the decision making process. It is my fear that big business has seen an opportunity to overwhelm the Council and local residents by putting all these proposals through at the same time, I can only hope that the council has the same concerns and will act appropriately.

South Warrington is a beautiful place that can and should be enjoyed by all. I appreciate the monetary value of this land to property developers and the council alike, however, once it is gone it is gone. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal in its current form and also prioritise the air pollution and congestion issues we are currently facing.

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.

I wish to object to Local Development Plan in the strongest possible terms.

Although I accept that development is required as Warrington as a whole continues to grow, the plan to destroy the vast majority of South Warrington's Green Belt is unnecessary and at the least extremely heavy handed.

"Special circumstances" have been given as the reason, however, it has not been made clear what these are and why South Warrington has to carry the vast majority of this burden?

I believe the air quality in Warrington has been graded as poor which I can only assume is due to being surrounded by 3 major motorways and the volume of vehicles in the area. I attended one of your consultations at Warrington Rugby Stadium and was told by a member of the planning team/staff member that 'it is bad but we are not 'quiet at the stage for special measures'. This wasn't the reassuring message/justification for additional building that he thought it was.

South Warrington has both the M56 and the M6 and where they meet at Junc 20 always has heavy to standing traffic (I drive past this every day while going and returning from work). This must have a major impact on the air quality especially when vehicles are queuing in South Warrington just to get on. I note the highways agency have concerns about the proposed developments which is unsurprising given problems already exist at the junction. No amount of road improvements will help if the cars don't have anywhere to go.

I note from a SIX56 brochure that they studied the air quality in the area and they deemed it was so bad that the addition of a massive distribution centre would not have a real impact. Why would you want to build homes in those conditions. I appreciate the short term financial gains, however, the current impact and of course long term impact on the population's health will far outweigh this. It is my understanding that Greenbelt helps to reduce air pollution. It seems we should be planting trees, not selling the land to a property developer to build expensive properties.

I read a small article in the Warrington Guardian regarding the proposed closure of the Sandy Lane Recycling Centre where Cllr Russ Bowden cited congestion and air pollution from the traffic as one of the reasons for its closure. Will 9000 (approx.) new homes not have a far worse impact. It appears the council is talking out of both sides of their mouth. Congestion is a problem when they want to sell the land to a property developer to build expensive properties and it is not a problem when they want to sell land to a property developer to build expensive properties.

In summary, air pollution/quality and congestion is currently a big problem in South Warrington and the LDP can only make this worse.

Are expensive homes in one of the most expensive areas in Warrington going to be affordable and help with the housing crisis? Although I understand that some houses will be made available for the council and lower earning families, surely the majority will be bought by the more affluent?

It is my understanding that the council is aware of the challenges facing our retailers, with online shopping and gaining more of a market share. If the trend continues, which there is no evidence to suggest it won't, won't more brownfield sites become available over the next 15-20 years where properties could be built? Of course this is only one example as I'm sure there are many others that could be investigated. What research has been done into the projected and current availability of Brownfield sites?

I am not a property developer but it appears to me that if I was in the business of building houses I would want to build on South Warrington's Green Belt due to the reduced costs of building and most importantly the fact that I could sell them for more money (than the majority of the other areas in Warrington). As a council I can also understand that the additional council tax from these more expensive properties (as council tax depends on bandings) will also be a very attractive proposition. The decision to allow the majority of what must be very valuable land to be developed on seems sort of sighted at best.

There are a number of plans under review/consultation (forgive me if this is not the correct terminology) including the LDP, Eddie Stobart and of course the SIX56 that are all going to have a major impact on South Warrington. I understand these are being reviewed separately but given the potential impact they will have all must be considered together or at least make up part of the decision making process. It is my fear that big business has seen an opportunity to overwhelm the Council and local residents by putting all these proposals through at the same time, I can only hope that the council has the same concerns and will act appropriately.

South Warrington is a beautiful place that can and should be enjoyed by all. I appreciate the monetary value of this land to property developers and the council alike, however, once it is gone it is gone. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal in its current form and also prioritise the air pollution and congestion issues we are currently facing.

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)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: SIX56 Objection
Date: 20 June 2019 21:36:59

Hello

I wish to object to SIX56 Plan in the strongest possible terms.

I have seen SIX56 proposed road developments to help but these are minimal and vastly insufficient given the size of the proposed development and the traffic it will attract. They say it will generate approx 4100 jobs. That is 4100 people travelling to the site every day most of which you would assume most would have to drive (almost certainly if shift workers). Even if only 50% drive (an unrealistic estimate) that is over 2000 cars a day. In addition, if we estimate that half these logistics jobs go to drivers that is over 2000 extra lorries on our roads.

South Warrington has both the M56 and the M6 and where they meet at Junc 20 always has heavy to standing traffic (I drive past this every day while going and returning from work). This must have a major impact on the air quality especially when vehicles are queuing in South Warrington just to get on. I note the highways agency have concerns about the proposed developments which is unsurprising given problems that already exist at the junction. No amount of road improvements will help if the cars don't have anywhere to go.

I believe the air quality in Warrington has been graded as poor which I can only assume is due to being surrounded by 3 major motorways and the volume of vehicles in the area. I attended one of your consultations at Warrington Rugby Stadium and was told by a member of the planning team/staff member that 'it is bad but we are not 'quiet at the stage for special measures'. This wasn't the reassuring message/justification for additional building that he thought it was. SIX56 state

I note from a SIX56 brochure that they studied the air quality in the area and they deemed it was so bad that the addition of a massive distribution centre would not have a real impact. Why would you want to new logistics site in those conditions. I appreciate the financial gains, however, the current impact and of course long term impact on the populations health will far outweigh this. It is my understanding that Greenbelt helps to reduce air pollution. I seem we should be planting trees, not selling the land to business that are only going to make the issue worse. .

In summary, air pollution/quality and congestion is currently a big problem in South Warrington and the SIX56 plan can only make this worse.

It is my understanding that SIX56 accepts that there are suitable brownfield sites available, however, they would prefer to build on this site. I can only assume because the land will be cheaper to develop and the obvious proximity to the M6 and M56. Is this a reason to grant them planning permission? The green belt should be protected and only built on as a last resort, not because it will be more profitable for a company.

There are a number of plans under review/consultation (forgive me if this is not the correct terminology) including the LDP, Eddie Stobart and of course the SIX56 that are all going to have a major impact on South Warrington. I understand these are being reviewed separately but given the potential impact they will have all must be considered together or at least make up part of the decision making process. It is my fear that big business has seen an opportunity to overwhelm the Council and local residents by putting all these proposals through at the same time, I can only hope that the council has the same concerns and will act appropriately. If all plans are approved South Warrington will lose almost all its green belt. Once this happens it will just become another part of Warrington Sprawl which could have a serious impact on the area. As a person originally from Salford I understand what happens to these areas and good people (pay taxes, work, don't commit crimes or are a financial and/or social burden) move further and further away (hence my move to Stockton Heath/Latchford/Appleton.)

South Warrington is a beautiful place that can and should be enjoyed by all. I appreciate the monetary value of this land to property developers and the council alike, however, once it is gone it is gone. I would strongly urge you to reconsider this proposal in its current form and also prioritise the air pollution and congestion issues we are currently facing.

Shaun Kevill