

# Response 691

## 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: Anthony Kinsella

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)

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 don't think it is legally compliant because the plan exceeds the requirement for growth determined by the government's formula set down in legislation.

It is not sound because many things in the plan cannot be justified in relation to the need for the level of development.

The duty to co-operate has not been met as the level of objections to the previous PDO have not been addressed. If the required level of growth cannot be accommodated in current brownfield sites then WBC should be consulting again with the local parishes to determine exactly what is feasible and providing evidence of exceptional circumstances for development in green-belt which it has failed to do.

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 capacity for areas of business development should take into account the closure of the Fiddler's Ferry power station. Developing whole swathes of Grappenhall puts too much burden on the south of the town and it's current infrastructure at the Lymm and Stretton motorway junctions. The requirement for Lymm to provide over 400 new homes on green belt without any additional infrastructure or amenities means the area will be shouldering more than its fair share of growth. Culcheth is a similar sized village but is only required to provide half the amount of housing. The plan also does not take into account the housing planned for the Lymm Hotel site in this figure.

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)