

■

question1: Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

I think that 20 years is far too extended a plan. The minimum Government NPPF requirement is only 5 years (in 2.26) Much that is unpredictable could happen during this long time, especially in the light of recent uncertainty because of BREXIT. This timespan is of paramount importance to the Greenbelt release and safeguarding and the irreversible destruction of natural features such as Moore Nature Reserve and the Transpennine Trail, as once the plan to avail of them has been passed, they will remain permanently doomed, whatever actual circumstances/real needs ensue. With regards to such issues frequent and regular review should be the way forward, rather than giant leaps into the dark.

Just because Warrington is a geographically desirable place for businesses to set up and distribution companies to dump their warehouses that doesn't mean that we should allow all comers and budge up to find space for it and its supposed attendant influx of house-seeking employees. WBC are employed and commissioned by the current citizens of Warrington to act solely in our best interests and this doesn't necessarily mean selling out to developers on a growth gamble. The motivation for this appears to be to kick start "growth " to a greater extent and thus support WBC Executives despotic drive to obtain City status (admitted 4.6), which itself seems to be motivated by (besides the inevitable egomania) a potential increase in grant funding/tax revenue and an unhealthy prostitution with magnates such as Peel.(4.5 ... 'the level of private sector interest waiting to invest in Warrington') The housing numbers have been bumped up to reflect this aspiration. If a more conservative measure were to be used (perhaps in line with the recent new Government recommendations) and planning was done incrementally, rather than in this irresponsible, draconian fashion, there probably would be little need to touch the greenbelt. This may result less than maximal "economic growth" but ..so what?...we'd be stable and prosperous still and sparse factual indication is available that any of this would actually deliver the expected jobs/affordable housing/quality of life and security of amenities to current Warringtonians. (2.20) Devolution bids and LEP/SEP should not be dictating wholesale how Warrington is shaped as a town, as these priorities relate only to opportunities for multiplying capital and wealth does not readily and magically diffuse or percolate downwards!

The housing/land need projections are based on the initial consultation period (24oct to 5 dec 16) which is certainly news to me!, as would be the present one too, had I not encountered some "scaremongers". Not so the developers - they received a "call for sites" and so it's not at all surprising that they were the majority of responders and the public's views were hardly represented at all in the resetting of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and thus the calculation of how many houses should be built. Also not surprising (2.32) then, that the majority of respondents supported the 20 yr plan ,extended to 30 yrs by Greenbelt "safeguarding" - more business/money in it for them! This means that the average person in the streets of Warrington cannot trust these land/ housing numbers results to be in their best interests, no matter how appropriate a method was used, as the data gathered will be completely biased at the start.(2.19 - how much notice was taken of this ?)

(2.10) "The Governmental to produce a standard methodology to be followed for these calculations"... This has now been released and so these numbers should now be redetermined in the light of this directive.

question 2 Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

It seems you may have underestimated the number of new houses that could be gleaned from the town centre sites and the total 'recycled ' number in general, as there is a lower limit on area of site accepted in the tally(in 2.25)_ , thus a significant number of multiple smaller sites in town , which could lessen the actual necessity of greenbelt usage have probably been overlooked. How you have "adjusted" for this is not at all clear.

Many people are complaining that the Town Centre is becoming a ghost town- If commercial outlets are less keen to concentrate themselves here, innovative plans should be drawn up to

create pleasant affordable/social accommodation (as is the norm in many continental equivalents and could be multiplied vertically) whilst preserving the historic architectural character of the exterior instead of just bulldozing it all or leaving it to fester.

question 3 Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Greenbelt, including the amount to be safeguarded?

no because upcoming release of Brownfield Sites such as Fiddlers Ferry and Appleton Airfield and Hospital site(once relocated) have not been accounted for - again, this would be easily dovetailed with a shorter term plan.

WBC knows that the likelihood is that these areas will indeed become available within the timescale of the PDO (3.6), but the sacrificed Greenbelt lands will remain exposed and unprotected and probably get built on in addition anyway.

The NPPF requires “exceptional circumstances” to be demonstrated to excuse any reversal of greenbelt protection. It’s not enough to just declare it exceptional because it’s what the developers want to do! The very principle of “safeguarding”(may I say, a despicably misleading term) greenbelt land so many years in advance is a complete oxymoron in terms of this precept. Nowhere has there been any clear indication of what these exceptional circumstances are deemed to be. Also, I’m not happy with ARUP assessing the “strength” of the greenbelt for the purpose of releasing it for development. That company seems to go everywhere that Peel Holdings wishes to invest in development, declaring the greenbelt useless, so that plans can go ahead. It can't all be that useless, or why was it protected in the first place? There should be an independent assessment performed by a body with no previous associations with companies standing to financially gain from this plan, if necessary at the expense and direction of organisations seeking to protect the greenbelt, if WBC refuses to fund it.

Question 4 Do you agree with the Local Plan Objectives?

W1 -The objective of becoming a City is not relevant to the plan. We won't suddenly get better infrastructure/communities by building to the seams and calling ourselves by a posh name! genuine regeneration work and improvement of existing infrastructure might be harder to pull off but it is what is needed.

(4.6)-Why is this sequence of events being cited? (see recurring theme at 4.40 also) “massive housing developments...infrastructure...unlocking of brownfield...regeneration” makes me very suspicious of WBC’s as yet undeclared intentions. How about....read : massive estates in Grappenhall.... gives excuse and developer funds to open up Transpennine Trail Bypass... (Fiddlers Ferry site finally becomes available)...eureka!...carry on building the road, chaps, all the way along the disused railway to (Fiddler’s Ferry), where you will find your second pot of gold and build a mirror image “garden city suburb” on the other end of the track, with adjacent “employment land” - then bus Eddie Stobart up and down it to your hearts content, all the way from M6/M56 Junction, with a central connection to Peel Port Warrington at the flyover....

This could explain how come the TPTBP currently ends mysteriously on the maps at Latchford Lidl... the sheepish/clueless behaviour of planners asked about its significance at consultation....the contradiction between common sense expectation and the fact that it only appears on the plans at stage 3 (after 10 yrs.)

- The objectives of the Plan clearly hinge on such underhand methods and undeclared intentions in order to “make Warrington Great again” whilst prostituting with developers and pillaging our green assets.

W1-nowhere has it been demonstrated exactly how existing neighbourhoods will be strengthened... in the case of Grappenhall and Thelwall the reverse is true. We weren't aware we were suffering from any particular weakness, but surely we soon will be when you increase our population twofold and fill in all our green spaces!

W2 - I do not agree with any objective to take away Greenbelt land. It is supposed to be permanently protected. The idea of “safeguarding “ is an insult to peoples’ intelligence - just an excuse to taken even more and pretend you're not.

W3 to W6 sound very agreeable in principle but are rendered hollow pink and fluffy gestures in the light of the methods intended to achieve them in W1 and W2

question 5 Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different "Spatial Options" for Warrington's future development?

(4.52). If all 3 options can deliver the full number of houses, then surely more dispersed development with restoration as well as addition of infrastructure would be more equitable and less of an upheaval? (4.54) The advantage of multiple smaller sites for efficient/early delivery espoused here applies particularly well to option 3.

The detriments cited for option 3 apply to the other options equally well, except for its sad lack of city status opportunity and "infrastructure potential" (read: if we dump a massive development right top of your community, then you'll have to let us plough right through the middle of it with an "access road" which we really want for other purposes)

It is unfair to the people that the Council is deciding the distribution of housing depending solely on the cards dealt into its hand by the developers in the "call for sites". I'm sure if the initial response to them were to be a more conservative one, such as "very sorry but this uses up far too much greenbelt, and is unfairly distributed, - we'll accept only this selection for now, so go away and come back with some better suggestions..." they'd be back next week with more reasonable alternatives... of course they're going to try and grab as many prime development sites as possible in pricey South Warrington if it's allowed! but these aren't even the types of homes Warrington really needs. Looking at the Call for Sites Map, although it is very poorly produced from the point of view of clearly identifying underlying/background areas, it seems that there is in deed lots of "undeveloped" land on the other three sides of Warrington - it can't surely be that there are individual reasons covering the unavailability of all of this? isn't it rather that less submissions occurred here mainly because it's not as lucrative!

question 6 Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

93% of greenbelt housing is going into south warrington and more than 1/3 of the total new houses. (This doesn't include the huge additional burden snook in at Appleton HCA and not declared in the Plan) This is not well balanced.

(4.48) Lymm and Culcheth were not forwarded for major development because it would double their size and affect their individual character. Well, there must be some other reasoning going on here, as the same disqualifying facts apply equally to Grappenhall and Thelwall. The proposed developments will double the population size (compared to 2011 census) - or even worse if only Grappenhall, where most of it is centred, is considered. This particular location will also cause further detriment by creating a virtual conurbation of continuous housing from Lymm right across to Appleton Thorn and Stockton Heath, whereas it would not have this effect to the same degree if concentrated on Lymm or Culcheth.

As for spoiling the character of places - this just goes to show that you guys need to get out of Chester once in a while and pay some recreational visits to these places you're tinkering with! Sit outside the Parr Arms with a beer and look out on the cobbled street (presently being carefully and expensively restored by GnTPC), the Medieval Church with Lewis Carol's Cheshire Cat inspiration stone carving, whipping stocks and pirate's grave. Drive down past Latchford locks on the tall tree tunnelled very winding road to the lovely Thelwall Church, Little Manor and Pickering Arms and old Post Office. It's all very much worth preserving.

question 7 Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No. I don't trust it because you seem to have based your conclusions on solely economic/business considerations with no proper assessment/thought given to environmental/social concerns.

question 8 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the City Centre?

Warrington is not a City but a Town, therefore it has a Town centre not a City centre

(5.18) Totally incomprehensible map. Looks like a whole load of bundles of land for house builds, with no explanation of how refreshing bright ideas are going to effect a positive transformation to the advantage of the community or how the historic character is to be maintained/enhanced. There are no conservation areas in the town centre plan, neither does WBC have a top level conservation officer in post to ensure this.

Throughout no 5 - multiple annoying inappropriate references to Warrington as a City. If you're trying something subliminal here, don't assume people are that suggestible... or maybe you need to convince yourselves!

question 9 Do you have any comments to make about our preferred development option for developing Warrington Waterfront?

This bit seems like a nice idea but it's hard to tell from this what exactly you intend.

I am against the development of the Ship Canal and Moore Nature Reserve as Port Warrington. With that and all these distribution centres it seems we will become the freight post office sorting room of the NorthWest.

It seems from this presentation that WBC really want this in order to excuse/veil the mother of all distribution hubs...rail,water,new road converging... wont it be a challenge making it pleasant (bearable) to actually live there?!

question 10 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb

I live in Grappenhall and I'm not impressed that you want to dump a third of your excessive number of new houses here, filling in all the gaps of genuine green space between the communities south of the ship canal. As I said above, the numbers are unwarranted, and their concentration here, spoiling the character of a long established sustainable area, is an abomination. This here "Garden City Suburb" is just another soundbite (and I don't care if the present Government conceived it in a lovely lightbulb moment , promising you tempting funds to raise it) - Its not a real Garden City - they are built in toto from scratch, with adequate space, to improve wellbeing(you should know the historical roots) - if Fiddlers Ferry were to become available, that could be the place to do the deed properly- not superimposing it on top of a long established settlement!

In order to achieve this you are ruining beautiful countryside which should stay protected as greenbelt and attracting extra new people who can afford these houses (and deliver your council tax cheques) but commute out, having no allegiance to Warrington. The whole set up will (intentionally??) isolate us. What I call "North Grappenhall" has quite a strong affiliation with Latchford. The swing bridge and the ship canal and locks are part of our "back yard". It seems you intend to cut us off, hailing to our own new "local centre", so Peel can finally ditch the irksome swing bridges and freely bus its freight all the way up to "Port Warrington".

The Embankment and the Transpennine Trail are a very important wildlife havens and recreational amenities. Theyve survived several decades undisturbed since the last train ran and this road wouldn't be needed at all now except for City fixation.

question 11 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South West Urban Extension?

Again, why does it all have to be in the South, destroying greenbelt?

I am against it in as far as it seems to be inextricably linked/an excuse for the development of Peel Port Warrington on Moore Nature Reserve and the desecration of that idyllic hamlet and for the propagation of the Western Link (further access for Eddie Stobart), which incidentally, should have been properly aired as part of this plan, instead of trying to get it by separately under the radar of the rest of Warrington's citizens and despicably playing to peoples divisions over the many different potential routes. It didn't work very well, by the way. Now we know what's what, it's made us even more united.

question 12 Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the outlying settlements?

As I have said above, I believe a more dispersed distribution of necessary housing would be more appropriate.

Question 13 Do you agree with our approach for providing new employment land?

As said above ,I have no wish to see our greenbelt turned into an HGV depot/Cargo Dock.

Question 16 Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

This local Plan should not be forwarded until

1. it has been ascertained as to whether the people of Warrington actually strongly desire to become a City, or even approve of WBC's frankly stated/exposed motives for pursuing this. this seems unlikely on evidence gathered so far(A recent Warrington Guardian Poll showed 80+% against)
2. The people have been properly consulted with. Not the evasive approach we have so far experienced:a) total lack of notification b) consultation period over summer break c) advert via "Westmorland Gazette"d) lack of consultation in area where most of building work and dispossession likely to happen e)awful abandonment of the folk of Latchford by their "compromised " Ward Councillors f)reluctance to extend time span and number of consultations at all and outright refusal to allow further concessions deemed needed by our MP who has bothered to show up to nearly every meeting on the issue.g) lack of accessibility provision for ITchallenged and Senior folk. Paper copies of the response form were not freely available, copies of the PDO itself even harder to find.
3. A thorough Transport assessment of the status quo and predictions on the various options have been reliably performed.
4. A proper investigation into the Health care needs-current and likely under various options has been done, with a plan for the fate of Warrington General included.
5. Environmental aspects have been properly investigated and ensuing restrictions acknowledged and adhered to.- relating to a)preservation of wildlife b)prevention of air pollution c)prevention of worsening flooding risk.

This Plan shows Warrington Borough Council in it's worst light. It's process is an affront to Democracy. If it goes any further, that will be to the detriment of all parts of Warrington. We will be reduced to nothing but the Industrial Glue/Cable Ties of the Northern Powerhouse for the sole advantage of opportunistic economic parasites.