

# Response 613

## 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: Zoe Mienie

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.

I view this to be an unnecessary and unwanted development that, quite frankly, is being conducted in an undemocratic way. Please listen to the residents of Warrington regarding the sacrifice of the greenbelt.

Please refer to NPPF paragraphs 79 to 92 that I have enclosed below and align that to your proposal, I'm afraid to say you can't. Reading paragraph 79, how can Warrington Council morally compromise such areas? I do not understand, reading paragraph 89, how Warrington Council are even able to propose such development.

\*\*

79. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:

- i. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- ii. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- iii. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- iv. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- v. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

81. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.

82. The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. If proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should:

- i. demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate
- ii. set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary
- iii. show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development
- iv. demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with Local Plans for adjoining areas
- v. show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the Framework

83. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

84. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

85. When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:

- i. ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development
- ii. not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open
- iii. where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period
- iv. make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development
- v. satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period
- vi. define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent

86. If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.

87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- i. buildings for agriculture and forestry
- ii. provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it
- iii. the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building
- iv. the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces
- v. limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan
- vi. limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development

90. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are:

- i. mineral extraction
- ii. engineering operations
- iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location
- iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction
- v. development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order
- vi. 91. When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.

92. Community Forests offer valuable opportunities for improving the environment around towns, by upgrading the landscape and providing for recreation and wildlife. An approved Community Forest plan may be a material consideration in preparing development plans and in deciding planning applications. Any development proposals within Community Forests in the Green Belt should be subject to the normal policies controlling development in Green Belts.

\*\*

You could not in good faith put forward your plans under the Community Right to Build Orders - a Community Right to Build Order is put together by local people who can decide on the type, quantity and design of buildings they want, and in the locations they want them. I know local people are objecting to the plans.

Writing candidly, I wish to protect the Green Belt and the character of the countryside to ensure the continued happiness of the residents. For myself, I cycle from my home [REDACTED] through the Daresbury Business Park and I get great pleasure – and sanity – in admiring the countryside of Walton and Moore. When my work was on its previous location [REDACTED] (Stretton) I had to cycle among the cars and vans on London Road, I appreciated a noticeable increase in my happiness when I diverted my cycle route to go along the old Roman road by the grass areas in Pewterspear and the cricket grounds.

There are numerous studies showing the benefit in mental health being in nature and for so much green belt to be at risk is incredibly worrying. I believe the option of sacrificing greenbelt for building new houses for people is short-sighted and does not acknowledge the severe consequences that will come. This is without mentioning the climate change impact.

[REDACTED], walk around the countryside offered by the surrounding areas. I walk along Delph Lane, along the canal side and then along Red Brow Lane taking in the greenery, fields and wildlife that Moore offers. Again this helps certainly with maintaining a healthy mental outlook, which is essential as the stresses and work threaten to overwhelm us. Mind and the Big Lottery Fund have supported many ecotherapy projects. So instead of burdening local health centres and paying for tablets and medication which a patient may become unhealthy reliant on, there is free, inclusive therapy, currently on our door step.

Ecotherapy is a cost-effective way to improve both physical and mental wellbeing, which is accessible and inclusive. Over the last five years Mind's Ecominds scheme has shown that ecotherapy has a real impact on people's mental wellbeing, provides access to education and training, increases social connectivity and the enjoyment of community green spaces. Mind's new report "Feel better outside, feel better inside" presents the latest evidence for benefits of ecotherapy and shows how it can help Health and Wellbeing Boards meet outcomes across health, social care and public health. <https://www.mind.org.uk/about-us/our-policy-work/ecotherapy/evidence-for-ecotherapy/>

And also Halton's very own Health and Wellbeing Board and their priorities: [https://www3.halton.gov.uk/Pages/health/PDF/health/Halton\\_Health\\_and\\_Wellbeing\\_Strategy.pdf](https://www3.halton.gov.uk/Pages/health/PDF/health/Halton_Health_and_Wellbeing_Strategy.pdf)

I implore you to please work with the residents as a team in a collaborative way and open the forum for discussion, face to face. Ask us for suggestions of other areas to develop or even to re-think the drivers being the proposed plan, i.e. do the Warrington residents really want Warrington to be a City at the sacrifice of its rural areas? I firmly believe if the residents wished to live in a City they would move, I think the residents move to and remain to live in Moore and Warrington due to the current offering, a mix of rural and urban, please do not alter that balance.

I beseech you to reject the development of Warrington rural areas. I beseech you to keep England's green and pleasant lands, so



Dear Sir/Madam,

I have lived in south Warrington since birth, [REDACTED]

When it came to finding a house of my own [REDACTED], I chose to find a home in Warrington because of the unique circumstances within:

- that it is a resolute town offering high street brands,
- the transport links of M56, M6 and M62
- the transport links of Warrington Bank Quay and Warrington Central
- easy availability of Liverpool and Manchester airport
- near to three major cities
- the countryside available in South Warrington i.e. a mix to the urban areas in Warrington centre in North Warrington and the rural area in the south
- the nature parks of Moore Nature reserve, trans pennine trail, Victoria Park, River Mersey walk, Paddington Meadows etc
- villages on offer including Latchford, a “Cheshire village” in the form of Stockton Heath, rural village of Moore and Daresbury.
- Essentially a mix of urban and rural areas.

I very much appreciate the current structure of Warrington and do not want to see its rural feel and setting lost. I am writing to make the following points of objection.

The Local Plan have disregarded the natural and historic assets within the villages of Warrington as well overlooking the Halton borough local plan which immediately adjoins the proposed South Western Urban extension, which would sacrifice the very nature of rural areas which provides a fantastic natural resource enjoyed by numerous residents from the wider Warrington community and beyond, who use the footpath network, towpaths and various cycling routes.

A main purpose of green belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another – clearly as this proposal would explode the population of the Warrington into the village of Moore beyond any recognition and severely put it at risk as merging into Runcorn and Warrington urban areas. The definition of village is “a group of houses and other buildings that is smaller than a town, usually in the countryside [where countryside is defined “as land not in towns, cities, or industrial areas, that is either used for farming or left in its natural condition”]. This obscene proposal of expansion of Stretton, Appleton Thorn, etc would annihilate the village and completely rip it of its unique characteristics. How can housing be taken from 390 dwellings to 1,950 for a village?

The Port Warrington proposal indicates a large distribution centre with huge warehousing to the north of the Manchester Ship Canal. This development would have a devastating impact on the lives of the residents of Promenade Park as their homes directly overlook this area. There are 80+ homes on this site and it accounts for nearly a quarter of the population of the village of Moore and Walton. The site is beautifully maintained by the residents and is regularly commended by the Cheshire Best Kept Village Judges. The majority of residents have chosen to retire here because of its pleasant, open setting and relatively peaceful environment. Residents need the reassurance that proper assessments will be made before any permissions are granted, together with enforceable control measures, especially in relation to noise and the visual impact of development.

To say I am also very concerned about the impact of Port Warrington on Moore Nature Reserve which is important for both wildlife and people in equal measure and must be protected for future generations is an understatement to the greater depths. How can a reasonable council suggest such a thing?

Finally, all of the above proposals would have a huge, adverse impact on existing services in the area. All of our local medical centres are full and the local roads are regularly clogged with traffic trying to find a route either from Warrington or Runcorn, when there is either a hold up on the M56, the Runcorn Bridge or the M6.

I view this to be an unnecessary and unwanted development that, quite frankly, is being conducted in an undemocratic way. Please listen to the residents of Warrington regarding the sacrifice of the greenbelt.

Please refer to NPPF paragraphs 79 to 92 that I have enclosed below and align that to your proposal, I'm afraid to say you can't. Reading paragraph 79, how can Warrington Council morally compromise such areas? I do not understand, reading paragraph 89, how Warrington Council are even able to propose such development.

\*\*

*79. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.*

*80. Green Belt serves five purposes:*

- i. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas*
- ii. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another*
- iii. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment*
- iv. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns*
- v. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land*

*81. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.*

*82. The general extent of Green Belts across the country is already established. New Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances, for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. If proposing a new Green Belt, local planning authorities should:*

- i. demonstrate why normal planning and development management policies would not be adequate*
- ii. set out whether any major changes in circumstances have made the adoption of this exceptional measure necessary*
- iii. show what the consequences of the proposal would be for sustainable development*
- iv. demonstrate the necessity for the Green Belt and its consistency with Local Plans for adjoining areas*
- v. show how the Green Belt would meet the other objectives of the Framework*

83. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

84. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

85. When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:

- i. ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development
- ii. not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open
- iii. where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period
- iv. make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development
- v. satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period
- vi. define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent

86. If it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.

87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

89. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- i. buildings for agriculture and forestry

*ii. provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it*

*iii. the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building*

*iv. the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces*

*v. limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan*

*vi. limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development*

*90. Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These are:*

*i. mineral extraction*

*ii. engineering operations*

*iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location*

*iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction*

*v. development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order*

*vi. 91. When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.*

*92. Community Forests offer valuable opportunities for improving the environment around towns, by upgrading the landscape and providing for recreation and wildlife. An approved Community Forest plan may be a material consideration in preparing development plans and in deciding planning applications. Any development proposals within Community Forests in the Green Belt should be subject to the normal policies controlling development in Green Belts.*

**\*\***

You could not in good faith put forward your plans under the Community Right to Build Orders - a Community Right to Build Order is put together by local people who can decide on the type, quantity and design of buildings they want, and in the locations they want them. I know local people are objecting to the plans.

Writing candidly, I wish to protect the Green Belt and the character of the countryside to ensure the continued happiness of the residents. For myself, I cycle from [REDACTED] Latchford through the Daresbury Business Park and I get great pleasure – and sanity – in admiring the countryside of Walton and Moore. When my work was on its previous location ([REDACTED] Stretton) I had to cycle among the cars and vans on London Road, I appreciated a noticeable increase my happiness when I diverted my cycle route to go along the old Roman road by the grass areas in Pewterspear and the cricket grounds.



There are numerous studies showing the benefit in mental health being in nature and for so much green belt to be at risk is incredibly worrying. I believe the option of sacrificing greenbelt for building new houses for people is short-sighted and does not acknowledge the severe consequences that will come. This is without mentioning the climate change impact.

[REDACTED] walk around the countryside offered by the surrounding areas. I walk along Delph Lane, along the canal side and then along Red Brow Lane taking in the greenery, fields and wildlife that Moore offers. Again this helps certainly with maintaining a healthy mental outlook, which is essential as the stresses and work threaten to overwhelm us. Mind and the Big Lottery Fund have supported many ecotherapy projects. So instead of burdening local health centres and paying for tablets and medication which a patient may become unhealthy reliant on, there is free, inclusive therapy, currently on our door step. Ecotherapy is a cost-effective way to improve both physical and mental wellbeing, which is accessible and inclusive. Over the last five years Mind's Ecominds scheme has shown that ecotherapy has a real impact on people's mental wellbeing, provides access to education and training, increases social connectivity and the enjoyment of community green spaces. Mind's new report "Feel better outside, feel better inside" presents the latest evidence for benefits of ecotherapy and shows how it can help Health and Wellbeing Boards meet outcomes across health, social care and public health. <https://www.mind.org.uk/about-us/our-policy-work/ecotherapy/evidence-for-ecotherapy/> And also Halton's very own Health and Wellbeing Board and their priorities: [https://www3.halton.gov.uk/Pages/health/PDF/health/Halton\\_Health\\_and\\_Wellbeing\\_Strategy.pdf](https://www3.halton.gov.uk/Pages/health/PDF/health/Halton_Health_and_Wellbeing_Strategy.pdf)

I implore you to please work with the residents as a team in a collaborative way and open the forum for discussion, face to face. Ask us for suggestions of other areas to develop or even to re-think the drivers being the proposed plan, i.e. do the Warrington residents really want Warrington to be a City at the sacrifice of its rural areas? I firmly believe if the residents wished to live in a City they would move, I think the residents move to and remain to live in Moore and Warrington due to the current offering, a mix of rural and urban, please do not alter that balance.

I beseech you to reject the development of Warrington rural areas. I beseech you to keep England's green and pleasant lands, so renowned it is poems and hymns. We must stand against such change in our habitat. We must **insist** and encourage innovation from our government to solve this housing requirement in a more sophisticated, appropriate and simply sensible approach, instead of building everywhere. May I remind you that Moore had already made sacrifices for the housing with the establishment of Sandymoor, and once again, the government is asking for more fields 20-odd years later. Does that not strike you? Strike fear in your very being as to how short-sighted this approach is? In our lifetime there will no longer be green areas to build on, the time to take a stand and object is NOW, and make the government re-consider. This development is at most a very poor band-aid over a problem that requires a different solution – the current one is surely inadequate. Look at Singapore and their innovative housing, shouldn't this be something Britain wants to replicate for their own purposes? Let's rebuild in our cities, on our wasteland, on our brownfield sites and keep such typical English /British villages like Stretton, Appleton Thorn, Grappenhall Heys and the countryside around it.

To throw it out there, build houses on the wasteland in Runcorn. It is a neighbouring town. Work jointly with them on the housing and utilizing each other's redundant land. Think collectively. Think of England, Britain, the UK, this planet.

I do look forward to hearing of change in approach for the overall of the proposed development.

Yours sincerely,

**Zoe Mienie**