

Response 625

Respondent Details

Information	
[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: Keith Small

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	-

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)

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

1. The LDP is substantially the same as the previous version which received thousands of objections.
2. The number of new houses required is derived from a generic Whitehall guideline spreadsheet. WBC should justify the number of new houses in the context of the needs of Warrington, not Whitehall.
3. Significant areas of green belt are targeted in advance of exhausting brownfields.
4. The LDP has been developed in isolation. Warrington is constrained by its physical boundaries. WBC should consult with neighbouring councils to develop a series of coordinated LDPs which better suit the wants and needs of the region.
5. The plan for the town centre is vague. Retail is now heavily on-line. Further retail sites have been developed out of town i.e. Westbrook in the 1980s and more recently A49 north. Employment in the centre is limited. Many will continue to access Manchester, Liverpool and other locations outside of Warrington which are more attractive for retail, leisure and employment. What is the vision for Warrington town centre recognising that it will always be a small northern town?
6. The number of new houses required per year is unrealistic. Such a number cannot be delivered.
7. There is no plan for the residents of south Warrington to access the town centre. Banking and retail are now heavily on-line. Employment in the centre is limited to retail, legal and the shiny new WBC offices. A positive is the forthcoming cinema complex. However, the danger is that fewer and fewer residents of south Warrington neither need nor want to visit the town centre and Warrington will in effect become two towns.
8. Employment. Warrington South does not need employment. The large majority of workers for the proposed employment sites in south Warrington will commute in from outside the borough. Inevitably private car transport will be used,
9. Traffic. If congestion is to be improved then access to and from proposed new employment sites in south Warrington should be banned during peak hours.
10. Traffic. If congestion is to be improved then a potential solution for access to and from proposed new employment sites in south Warrington is to ban access by car for those resident outside the borough; use park and ride schemes located to the east of M6 jn20 and south of M56 jn10.
11. Traffic. The proposed new dual carriageway running parallel to the M56 (described in the IDP as Warrington South Strategic Infrastructure (Garden Suburb Strategic Link)) has no defined purpose. It would not address the pinch points of Stockton Heath, M6 jn20 and M56 jn10. Further there is a funding gap of £93 million and £130 million for phase 1 and phase 2 respectively.
12. Traffic in South Warrington. Rail transport is unrealistic. It is unrealistic to expect that a significant percentage of employees for the proposed new employment sites will live in south Warrington. Therefore a significant percentage of employees will commute from outside south Warrington. This will exasperate the known transport pinch points of Stockton Heath, M56 jn10 and M6 jn20 [detail : Lumb Brook Road/ Grappenhall Road junction is a bottleneck; Consider opening up Stockton Lane again. Its closure was a knee jerk reaction. A few well-placed crash barriers would mitigate the residual risks].
13. Traffic. IDP 'Junction 20 M6 – improvements' have a budget of £50 million but the timescale is long term (2028-2038). This is after many of the proposed houses and employment areas will have been built.
14. Traffic. A fully independent transport assessment should be conducted. It is not acceptable to salami slice.

15. Traffic. The proposed two new roundabouts onto Grappenhall Lane will only slow traffic down. If Six56 is not built then they are not 'required'.
16. Traffic. The proposed relocation and signalisation of Cliff Lane roundabout. There are no details of how traffic will be managed during the construction works. It is difficult to imagine how traffic access to/from the vital M6 junction 20 will not be severely disrupted for a protracted period of time. So is the proposal deliverable in practice ?
17. Traffic. 'The widening of part of the carriageways to the two M6 J20 dumbbell roundabouts, including partial signalisation'. There are no details of how traffic will be managed during the construction works. It is difficult to imagine how traffic access to/from this vital junction will not be severely disrupted for a number of months. The proposal is to still have single carriageways in either direction immediately outside Howshoots farm. This will exasperate the situation especially given the proposal huge increased in lorry movements.
18. Traffic. If the three Victorian bridges over the ship canal are not supplemented then the danger is that fewer and fewer residents of south Warrington ever visit the town centre and Warrington will in effect become two towns. The proposed new crossing site is little more than a crayon drawing on the map. There is no assessment of whether or not it can realistically be built. The indicative cost is optimistic. There is no assessment of the how it would interact with the local roads and therefore no assessment of its benefit or detriment.
19. Howshoots link road is not a panacea. It would
 - a. remove a bottleneck at the Grappenhall Lane/ Barleycastle Lane junction.
 - b. Worsen the bottleneck at the Grappenhall Lane/ Knutsford Road roundabout.
 - c. Significantly increase traffic on Witherwin Avenue. It will turn into a main artery through a large housing estate. How will primary school children from the existing and proposed new houses safely cross Witherwin Avenue to access the Primary School, play area and friends on the other side ? Traffic calming, new footbridge, pedestrian crossings, speed cameras ?
20. Traffic. The proposed development of Port Warrington will lead to increased traffic disruption to the users of the swing bridges over the ship canal. The danger is that fewer and fewer residents of south Warrington ever visit the town centre and Warrington will in effect become two towns.
21. Traffic. What if one of the three Victorian bridges over the ship canal is declared unsafe and has to be taken out of service ?
22. The environment. The 'very special circumstances' to develop the green belt appear to be based upon the need created by the generic Whitehall guideline spreadsheet rather than the wants and needs of the residents of Warrington.
23. The environment. If the council is serious about protecting the environment then it should lead by example and require all new build houses to go well beyond current legal minimums for energy efficiency. Indeed the Government's direction of travel is for zero emissions houses and a ban on fossil fuels being used for heating. Or is the plan for Warrington to build as many energy inefficient houses before the ban officially comes into place.
24. The environment. If the council is serious about protecting the environment then a firm commitment should be made to provide electric charging point to 100% of car parking spaces. Indeed throughout the borough.
25. The environment. The plan evidently still assumes that residents will use private cars for decades to come. There is vague talk of public transport solutions. Footpaths and cycleways will presumably continue to be expanded in the period of the LDP.

This is to be welcomed for leisure purposes. However, many people commute outside of Warrington to places too far for bicycles.

26. The environment. A fundamental flaw with the LDP is that the proposed new houses are not sited adjacent to employment sites or adjacent to public transport link directly to more distant employment sites. You need to be realistic that public transport will in practice never be able to meet the needs of current and future residents who commute to and from the area
27. Infrastructure. IDP section 2.11 'For the Garden Suburb, the Council is proposing to facilitate the forward funding of key infrastructure requirements. For the purposes of the Local Plan Viability Assessment, the Strategic infrastructure cost for residential development has been set at £18,500 per dwelling in the first year of the development. This figure has been assessed using current estimates for the delivery of infrastructure in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, assumed S106 contributions and the cost of advanced funding. Against this the Council has set an external public sector funding requirement. It should be noted that the funding to meet this requirement has not been confirmed at this stage. The financing to support this enabling infrastructure is the subject of ongoing discussions'. The LPD cannot be approved until the funding is in place.
28. Infrastructure. IDP 'Garden Suburb Community Hub New community facility comprising leisure and health services £20,000'. This is a ludicrously small budget for a community centre to serve the 1000's of proposed new houses in south Warrington.
29. Infrastructure. WBC have history of building houses in south Warrington without the accompanying infrastructure [schools, doctors, dentists, schools etc]. The existing infrastructure is over-stretched. As an example in the IDP there is a funding gap of £22.5 million for the 'Garden Suburb New primary school provision within Garden Suburb providing a minimum of 7 forms of entry.' As a further example the 'New Primary Health Facility at Appleton Cross' is scheduled to be built sometime between 2017 and 2028. When will it be built ? As another example the 'Garden Suburb New secondary school within the Garden Suburb providing a minimum of 6 forms of entry.' is estimated at £30 million but there is no funding. Will it be built ? The IDP assigns no cost to the proposed healthcare facility for the garden suburb. If there is not even a budget cost will it ever be built ?
30. Infrastructure. In the IDP there is no detail (cost, timescale, location) of the proposed new hospital. Tellingly it is the very last sentence in the IDP. It is as alluded a 'long term aspiration' which in practice will not be delivered ? Surely the health of the residents is the most important piece of infrastructure.
31. I am just one resident and am surprised by the vagueness of the LDP. 5 marks out of 10. Please resubmit. In summary when will WBC listen to what we are saying ?
32. Comments on PDO, ref my letter dated 27^h September 2017
 - a. Public consultation. You have failed to contact every household directly. The initial aims and aspirations received very little public comment because we were not aware of it. The time period was only 6 weeks. We do not want a city. There is a general feeling that a clique of Councillors is on an ego trip decided that Warrington *needs* ~ 22,000 homes. This must be addressed if the public is to be won over.
 - b. You purport to have followed due process. However, the initial exam question (see above) was phrased in such a way that Option 2 (Garden City Suburb) is part of the preferred development option.

- c. Recent investment in Warrington South. I struggle to name any spends on significant infrastructure and amenities in Warrington South over the last 20 years. Grappenhall Primary in the late 1990s. Priestly College in the last 10 years. A replacement roof on Bridgewater High in 2016. Flowers on Stockton Heath high street. Increased car park charges in 2016. Who will pay for all the promised infrastructure and amenities ? You cannot fail to notice the severe condition of public finances. When will it be delivered ? There is a severe credibility gap on delivery of infrastructure and amenities.
- d. Further to the above there is a strong suspicion that the first few 100's or 1000's of houses will be built without the accompanying infrastructure and amenities.
- e. Ultra-high speed broadband. WBC have the opportunity to provide hugely valuable infrastructure at minimal cost. All contracts could specify that appropriate trunking be provided for which ownership defaults to the Council thereby generating future revenues.