

# Response 664

## 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: Stephen Carr

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)	-
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.

- 1) I do not see the fundamental justification for the proposed scale of development and the adverse impacts it will have on residents. I do not understand what WBC's strategic goal is, other than development for development's sake. The growth predictions appear to be driven by parties with vested interest in development. There is no sign of serious scrutiny or challenge to the projections put forward. There is no serious planning for the start-up and development of economic activity in Warrington to justify the commercial sites. These sites are essentially for the financial benefit of developers and the large-scale logistics operators. What real benefit accrues to the people of Warrington from this? This plan is fundamentally unsound.
- 2) The application requires the removal of land from the Green Belt, and this needs 'exceptional circumstances' to justify it. If this development does proceed then this will have a significant negative effect on the rural and open character of the general south Warrington area, in terms of visual impact, traffic and air quality, access to existing rights of way for quiet enjoyment, and the public's psychological well-being. Importantly, it will degrade the Green Belt in this area and open the door to yet more justifications of further removal of Green Belt. I also understand that the Green Belt boundary was confirmed only five years ago, so I do not accept that these development now override this. The primary driver for release of Green Belt is commercial gain for developers and business - this is not sound.
- 3) The road and motorway network in this area is already overloaded and congested at peak times.
  - 3.1) Port Warrington will add several hundred or more HGV movements every day (with 24 hour operations) to a local traffic infrastructure that has not been designed for it and cannot take it. This will cause noise, disruption and pollution, and more load on the motorway system.
  - 3.2) Increased housing will lead to much more traffic (commuting to other centres, schools, etc), especially at peak times. Key junctions will be grid-locked. Air quality will be adversely affected.
  - 3.3) There is little planning for significant improvements to public transport, at times and by routes when people need it.
  - 3.4) Hence this plan is unsound.
- 4) Warrington is already known to have poor air quality by national standards. Adding more congestion, more traffic and HGV movement will worsen this. I have seen commentary from qualified professionals in their objections to other local plans (Stobarts) that the air quality measurements being relied on are inadequate and not sound.
- 5) Social infrastructure is not meaningfully considered.
  - 5.1) The existing schools, hospitals, and primary care facilities are full or over-loaded. There is no concrete plan to deliver any additional facilities to defined timeline or scale.
  - 5.2) Education is barely addressed. A proper plan to deliver provision from under 5s to 18 years need to be provided, ideally with content for adult learners as well.
  - 5.3) I note the BUPA hospital at Stretton is carefully shown in the Garden Suburb Development Framework document as a health care facility on the south side of Warrington, but with absolutely no recognition that this is a private hospital specialising in elective treatments. It is not a primary health care facility, it does not have A&E, and it is not NHS. Most of its patients travel from outside the area. I regard its representation in this document as disingenuous, to say the least.
  - 5.4) There is no consideration of the other essential 'soft' aspects of the social fabric that build social cohesion and give people things to do: sports centres, community centres, village halls, youth clubs, religious centres, even pubs. There appears to be a presumption that these will appear by magic, or from the goodwill of commercial developers.
  - 5.5) The local centre of Stockton Heath is already both too busy and struggling. There are bars and restaurants on the one hand, and charity shops on the other. There needs to be a funded plan to develop a proper balanced mix of facilities for local residents at various income levels, not rely on an evening/recreational destination model for those with disposable incomes.
  - 5.6) Emergency services. What is the plan for policing, fire & rescue, and ambulance provision? If the idea is to rely on an ambulance station, a fire station, and a police station which are all on the north side of the river, the ship canal, and the Bridgewater canal, while increasing the residential and business population on the south - meaning on the other side of the well known traffic choke-points - then sooner or later something will go very wrong.
  - 5.7) For all these reasons, this plan is not sound.
- 6) The plan will destroy the character of the area by swamping the Green Belt and building generic warehouses, depots, and commuter houses.
  - 6.1) We will end up in a situation like Watford in Hertfordshire, where what was a distinct town and satellite villages, all with history and local character, have been forced together into a mess of urban developments and congested traffic links around the M25.
  - 6.2) The developments termed 'villages' in the Garden Suburb are not true villages, they are housing estates aimed at particular price points to suit the developers.
  - 6.3) The 'country park' is a more of a marketing term than a valid description - it will be a relatively small area with some trees.
  - 6.4) This is not sound.
- 7) Larger economic and environmental factors.
  - 7.1) This is not a forward-looking plan on national environmental grounds, specifically CO2 emissions. We should be making more use of rail haulage, not diesel HGVs.
  - 7.2) The likelihood of the UK leaving the EU on disadvantageous terms now seems to be increasing, making a recession likely, which will negatively impact all businesses, especially haulage and distribution. This means that any internal business case made for Port Warrington, which is part of the overall scheme, should now be re-visited before major projects are undertaken.
  - 7.3) There appears to be a presumption by some interested parties that the Atlantic Gateway and the Northern Powerhouse will deliver economic growth, but the evidence for this is not apparent to me. For example, what is the plan to radically improve the trans-Pennine rail links?
  - 7.4) There is a reasonable possibility of an undeliverable plan, failed projects and unfinished works, potentially obliging WBC or government to 'pick up the pieces' and cover costs.
  - 7.5) The plan is not deliverable and is unsound.

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.

Complete review and rework to address local people's concerns and needs. Comprehensive challenge and scrutiny of developer-driven initiatives.

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)