

Response 674

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: Patrick Moore

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		
Sound		X
Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate		

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.

The amount of proposed extra housing put forward by the Council (945pa) is close to double that actually required (545pa) according to official population growth figures for the area

The proposed additional infrastructure - Highways, Canal Crossings, Public Transport Systems - do not appear to have taken into consideration the impossibility of widening the main routes into Warrington centre from the south (Chester Road, A49 and A50) or the fact that Peel Ports intend increasing ship traffic on the Manchester Ship Canal. Nobody in authority at the various public consultations was able to say what plans were in place on when these extra roads, cycle paths, tram-ways would be installed (before, during or after the housing was built). The three swing bridges currently in use are simply not capable of taking the addition traffic this massive housing project will produce.

Given the current congestion to be found at any time of the day on the Chester Road and A49 from Walton and Stockton Heath, I cannot see how the extra traffic that this project will bring to the area will not aggravate an already unpleasant situation. The effect that this will have on air pollution levels can only be to increase them, to the detriment of fellow road users, pedestrians and residents living next to these highways.

Obviously, the number of additional residents envisaged in this plan will incur the need for more medical facilities, schools and shopping centres, not mention petrol stations located south of the Manchester Ship Canal. Whilst the Council has confirmed that these are requirements, they cannot promise any of them will be built or managed. This will have a devastating impact on the area.

Choosing to use Green Belt land (which once used can never be retrieved) when there are so many alternatives which also happen to be far more centrally located seems to be questionable at best and both environmentally and morally repugnant. People are drawn to this area for its natural beauty and to lose so much of it when there are other options is an appalling decision. I am also highly concerned that with both the planned housing and the commercial areas being by the canals of this area that public access will become restricted or even removed in some places - we need to see an unequivocal statement from the council guaranteeing that access will not be changed at all.

Most importantly, if these proposals do go ahead despite the protestations of so many, can the Council please ensure that whichever building contractors come in to build these thousands of homes are forced to make them fit-for-purpose. The housing should all be energy-efficient with sufficient suitable insulation throughout from the very beginning; garages (if built) need to have doors large enough for today's vehicles to use them or there needs to be enough off-street parking spaces for a minimum of two cars per household; garden space needs to be compulsory; windows should have a decent minimum size and number designated to each building. The current system of simply throwing up boxes to fulfill building quotas is simply not acceptable.

Finally, I seriously question if the Council - who have spent the last decade or so cutting back on services, facilities, etc as they have had their budget slashed by successive governments - will be able to carry out this plan as they do not have the money for it. Charging employers for their staff to park will not generate anywhere near the amount required and is basically another tax on people who have managed to gain employment.

If you can still declare the proposals to be Sound, I will need to request a redefinition in dictionaries of the word

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.

The number of houses proposed needs to be seriously reduced.

The choice of using Green Belt before other re-usable sites needs to be reconsidered.

Definitive plans on changes to be made to the local infrastructure (additional roads, widening current roads, new canal crossings) have to be clearly shown and guaranteed before we can give an answer to the question of whether or not we approve of them. The same goes for the new transport systems - none of the proposed tram, bus train, cycle lanes, etc shown at public consultations are anything more than ideas. Nobody has committed anything to actually building these things.

Definitive guarantees need to be given by the Council showing how exactly they are going to fund all these developments and that this will not change, even if the make-up of the council chamber does.

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)

Warrington Draft Transport Plan 4

From: Patrick Moore. [REDACTED]

The first thing I need to inform you about is the official online form you would prefer to be receiving. You cannot access it! I was unable to get past Page 1 as it insisted I supply an Agent name, despite it clearly being marked as "If Applicable" (which in my case it is not. Therefore, you will have to read through this email instead.

The following are my comments on and objections to the plan in its current form and they will loosely follow the two FAQ sheets I received when I visited the Warrington Wolves event in May.

Highway Infrastructure to Link New Urban Development with Warrington

How will it be physically possible to widen roads like the A49 and A56 to take the extra traffic (with the planned Public Transport links and Cycle Lanes) when they will all pinch at the three swing-bridges across the Manchester Ship Canal?

In what order are you planning to build houses and introduce the new transport? No-one had the answer at the public meeting and we were repeatedly told no actual plans have been confirmed; these were just plans and ideas....

It is claimed that there has been only been a "marginal" increase in traffic using the above-mentioned roads since the opening of the new Toll Bridge over the Mersey at Runcorn. I beg to strongly differ. There is much more HGV traffic using the A56, A49 and Walton Road (Eddie Stobarts even have their learner drivers in articulated-lorries regularly using them as training routes) and the A5060 from The Stag to Centre Parks is now solid with traffic until at least 1030 every weekday morning. When the swing-bridge is closed, the southbound traffic backs-up all the way to Bridgefoot.

The idea of charging companies for employee car-parking seems to be pretty ridiculous. Unless people live near their workplace, they have no option but to drive there. I have worked in Woolston, Preston Brook, Deeside and Trafford Park and none of them have a useable public transport system which would have allowed me to get to work and home again without a couple of hours journey. Why not build affordable housing closer to the work areas and therefore reduce the need to travel?

One of the main reasons driving this government led increase in housing is that it is required for and will help instigate increased employment and retail requirements. How is this possible when we continue to our High Streets stripped of businesses? Whether it has been big names like Debenhams, Marks & Spencer and Woolworths or the smaller shops in our local areas, the picture seems to contradict the whole idea behind the plan.

The plan states that there will be a "guaranteed increased supply of affordable homes". What exactly does that mean? What are the numbers? What is "affordable housing" in the minds of the planners? With the average wage of most lowest paid workers still below £15k per annum, how exactly are measures going to be put into place to ensure that they will be the ones getting this housing?

I also strongly believe that no building contracts should be given to any company not guaranteeing that all new housing will be fit-for-purpose. They need to be properly insulated, have enough windows to allow light in, have energy-efficient system in place, large enough garages to fit today's vehicles in them, space between neighbouring buildings. Up to now, house-building seems to have been a blank

cheque to developers and builders to put up as many homes as possible into whatever space they have been given, with no thought on anything but profit.

As well as affordable housing, the proposal states that 20% of the new housing will be built for elderly residents. What are the plans for this exactly and which areas are being designated for the older residents of the town?

The argument that all searches for suitable Brown Field sites for re-development have proved to failed, simply does not stand up. As mentioned previously, if you do not want people travelling to work by car, what better way than to have their homes close enough to make that truly possible? Covering swathes of irreplaceable Green Belt is just too easy a “solution” and one which will cause irreparable damage to the environment.

Peel Ports and Eddie Stobarts continue to push for new developments, regardless of the vehement opposition to them and I just hope that Council will not bow to corporate pressure and continue to refuse planning permission for the Port and Transport Hub that they continue to propose.

The plan talks about funding coming from the business car-parking scheme, but that will obviously not be enough to pay for the entire scheme. How exactly does the council (and the government) expect this to be paid? Increased Council Tax when facilities and services continue to be slashed on an annual basis? I do not think so! We need to see a detailed budget, showing exactly how – and who – will be footing the bill for this plan.

In closing, as I am not knowledgeable in what exactly constitutes a legal argument against the proposal, I can only air my objections as I believe that allowing them to go ahead as currently planned they will prove to be a financial and environmental disaster for the town.