

# Response 565

## 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: Stuart Neale

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)	N/A
Agent name (if applicable)	N/A
Address 1	N/A
Address 2	N/A
Postcode	N/A
Telephone number	N/A

## 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.

1. The plan uses a 20 year model which is too far in the future and commits Warrington to targets which are likely to be unsustainable, and thereby unsound within the time frame of the plan.
2. The proposed housing numbers are too high for the area to sustain.
  - a. The inherent unsound aim seems to be to achieve City status ahead of other considerations.
  - b. The high numbers will generate much of the housing into commuter suburbs for Manchester and Liverpool but without the transport links or infrastructure support to sustain them.
  - c. I refer above to insufficient transport links or infrastructure to support the housing, this will generate unacceptable congestion and pollution (see below)
3. There is no justification for releasing Green Belt Land. The test for release is "exceptional circumstances". These do not exist within the plan. The purported justification within the Plan is a circular argument and fallacious. It is fundamentally unsound. The proposal to release Green Belt Land runs contrary to the Clean Air policy which is vital to the area. The Green Belt acts as the lungs of the developed area. By releasing the land in the context of the consequential increase in traffic and pollution, the Council is abrogating its responsibility for the safety and well being of its citizens. I regard this part of the plan as potentially dangerous for the citizens and thus feel that the Council are being reckless as to the future health of all inhabitants of the Borough. The release will also lead to inevitable costs in the future to provide green offsets to scrub the pollution from the air. Why commit to a policy which will entail higher costs later to rectify the damage of destroying Green belt now?
4. The plan's unsoundness can be gauged by the failure to address the transport infrastructure problems of the area. Warrington's Victorian street size and street layout, particularly in the South of the Borough is a self limiting factor to any proposed growth. Proposed growth has to be made hand in hand with radically improved transport links. The Manchester Ship Canal provides serious problems for which radical solutions will be required to cope with any growth. Any plan which fails to address these is fundamentally unsound.
5. The plan fails to address transport pinch points particularly in and around Stockton Heath. The overall effect of the plan will be to gridlock Stockton Heath and alternative roads in and around the area. Users of Google Maps know that even with today's housing density, Google maps frequently comes up with preferred routes which avoid Stockton Heath and lead to higher density traffic in areas that have hitherto been jam free.
6. Education and Health:-On reading the draft plan , one might be forgiven for thinking that the families in the proposed new houses will be all be teaching their children by home learning and not at school, and that all the inhabitants, young and old, are never going to be ill and need medical or dental care. The plan needs to have a sound policy to address education (from nursery provision onwards) and health. A sound policy on this is spectacularly absent. It is as simple as that.
7. Shopping:-The plan fails to address shopping needs not just covering grocery etc but all aspects of normal requirements:- hairdressers; cafes; clothing etc.
8. Social Cohesion and Interaction:-the plan fails to address constructive community needs by failing to make provision for any youth centred activities (Scouts, Guides etc); any religious needs or Parish Hall type facilities (Appleton, Grappenhall, Stockton Heath and Appleton Thorn all have well used and highly valued community centres and a sound plan has to incorporate a similar provision for new housing to keep the character of the area). There is insufficient provision for sports for all ages. The existing sports facilities in the area are at maximum use and cannot support the huge population growth proposed.
9. Air Pollution. The plan will inevitably deliver appalling air quality as a result of the failure to make sound provision for transport links. This runs contrary to the Council's duty to address air quality and ensure a reduction , not an increase , in pollution. The whole policy is fundamentally unsound.
10. The Plan will destroy the character of the area. The area has grown organically as small villages have increased in size and expanded over the years. Organic growth maintains the character of the area. Grappenhall is the prime example. The unsoundness of the plan is exemplified by the failure to take, as a starting point, recreating villages with their own character. It is unsound to think you can just plonk houses down and it will all sort itself out.
11. The proposals are undeliverable.

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.

Modifications required:-

1. Reduce proposed housing numbers;
2. Plan for village areas to make sure that the new areas complement their neighbouring villages;
3. Retain Green Belt;
4. Provide for radically improved transport links;
5. Address traffic congestion caused by the existing road and canal layouts;
6. Make provision for youth activities and sport;

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)