

Response 734

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: David Pennington

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) based on closure developments at fiddlers ferry the plan is now flawed. As there are now firm plans to close the site in 2020 the local plan will need to be revised to account for the building provision this brown field site can now accommodate. Whilst I believe it only has limited potential for residential development it would provide more than enough land for all the required employment development. this in turn would then allow the land currently allocated to employment to be considered for residential development instead. This would then reduce the need for release of greenbelt.
- (2) The plan is not sound as the transport strategy is too vague. The council wants to reduce the reliance on car journey's but has now firm plan on how to deliver this and they only have vague ideas which may include trams/light rail etc. This does nothing to address the air quality issues the town has at present particularly in Stockton Heath. in addition despite the claimed aspiration to reduce car reliance the proposed garden suburb will undoubtedly create a significant amount of additional car journey's and there is no provision for increasing the capacity of already heavily congested roads.
- (3) If the development is predominantly on greenbelt land then the council should be ensuring that this development is kept to a minimum and therefore the calculations used should ensure the lowest yearly build total and for the shortest legally proposed period. This would then allow the council to be more flexible in its future planning if the need for housing reduces in the coming years but also will preserve greenbelt for future release should there be a greater need.
- (4) The stated aim of the plan is to ensure that each area's unique character is protected yet it actually allows the urban sprawl to extend from the town centre right up to the boundary of the motorways with only narrow bands of separation. this is contrary to the stated aim and therefore the soundness of the plan can be called in to question.
- (5) The council wants to reduce the reliance on cars but proposes quite a low housing density for the garden suburb. There should therefore be consideration for a greater housing density as the requirement for car parking spaces/garages should be reduced in line with this policy.
- (6) insufficient consideration has been given to housing density which again would make the plan unsound. The council has failed to properly consider the benefit of a greater housing density. This would allow the required housing to be built on a smaller amount of land thus reducing the need for land. This would not only protect a larger amount of the greenbelt but would also ensure that the housing units would generally be more affordable.

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.

- (1) The plan should be revised to take account of the land soon to be released at Fiddlers Ferry power station.
- (2) Greater detail is required regarding transport improvements involving public transport and the road network.
- (3) As the stated aim of the plan is to protect as much greenbelt as possible all build calculations should be reviewed and the lowest possible build figure used.
- (4) The stated aim of the plan is to reduce the reliance on cars so this needs to be addressed within the plan. examples would be a reduction in carparks around the town which would provide further brownfield development land. A consideration to greater housing density as parking and garage spaces are reduced within the new development.
- (5) The plan needs to clearly justify the choice of housing density for each proposed area and provide details of what alternative densities have been considered.

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)