

Warrington Local Plan 2021

Examination in Public

Respondent 0457 STRETTON NDP

Written Statement regarding Matter 2 - The Duty to Co-operate.

Issue 1

Subsection – Economic growth/employment land provision

Ref Q6 – 10.

1.1 We draw your attention to the duty to co-operation, or maybe lack of it, either accidental or by design, between WBC and the developers, Langtree and Panatoni of the 6/56 logistics development in Appleton Thorn and other logistic developments within the Warrington and ST Helens conurbations. This involves the very doubtful overall financial and logistical justification of an unsound and unjustified proposal. The utilization as part of the local plan of the 6/56 proposed land in Appleton Thorn, for which planning application was recently approved at the WBC DM meeting, but which is now subject to a potential government determination, is flawed as it fails to consider or possibly ignores the full relationship between the existing Gemini complex and the newly approved Parkside Regeneration logistics development in Newton-Le-Willows.

1.2 This matter would appear to be quite complicated, and worthy of investigation, which involves the proposed 6/56 development by Langtree and Panatoni, with Warrington BC being seen to have railroaded through the planning application. It should be questioned as to why the 6/56 logistics development should be located just 8 miles away from Parkside Regeneration, taking note that both developments are logistical developments and under the control of Langtree. A further note which adds some degree of incredibility and possible collusion is that Warrington Regeneration and Langtree each have a director on the WR company board, which offers up the possibility of unfair advantage and the impartiality being compromised.

1.3 Parkside Regeneration has all the advantages, brown field site, excellent rail connectivity and a low landscape profile. Whereas 6/56 is green field good agricultural land, no railway connectivity and located on the highest ground in the south Warrington area. A blot on the landscape.

1.4 The local plan fails to objectively take the whole picture into consideration from a planning, logistical and financial viewpoint which points to the fact that it is an unsound proposal.

Issue 2

Subsection – Other Strategic Matters

Ref Q13b.

2.1 An issue of concern which needs closer inspection, is the apparent failure in the duty to co-operate regarding the solution for the strategic infrastructure road in Stretton. This directs the NDP to conclude that the dialogue between WBC and the Highways England agency has not been open and honest, as required by government guidelines, in relation to the proposed strategic

infrastructure road starting at a point on the A49. (Reference NDP submission pages 37 - 42) as opposed to a proposed alternative solution and indeed an earlier 1973 solution.

2.2 We have even further evidence, by way of refusal by WBC to a request for correspondence through freedom of information between Wallace, Highways England and WBC. This is supported by a statement by Respondent 2336.

2.3 In discussion with representatives of WBC transport staff at the public consultation events they categorically stated that there had been no contact with Highways England with respect to discussions for an alternative starting location for the strategic infrastructure road, that being from Junction 10 traffic island on the M56. We have evidence (clauses 127 & 128 P42) and a copy of the Highways England Options Report that identifies the Junction 10 solution is an option.

2.4 It must be noted that the original 1973 and 1980 plans and reports for the Warrington New Town clearly identifies junction 10 as the starting point of a main north / south distributor road, so the precedence has been set. The reticence of WBC highways planning to accept a sensible engineering solution, previously established, is clearly being driven by private developers. This is also tied directly into the developer's request to WBC to include parcels of land (R18/088 East) to the south of the durable green belt boundary to be released from the green belt. (Reference NDP submission pages 9 - 14)

2.5 Our further concern is that the starting point on the A49 is co-incident with the requirements of the private developer, Miller Homes (Ex Wallace Land Investments) having a vested interest in access to their proposed development. This is all compounded by the unsound and amateurish plan by WBC to solve the Cat and Lion junction congestion problem.

2.6 It must also be noted that it has been previously stated that the 6/56 proposed logistics development by Langtree will rely upon a second access route to their facility by way of this infrastructure road. If it were to start from J10 then the local impact will be somewhat reduced but to have HGV access coming down the A49 and through a residential development is flawed and unsound on many fronts.

2.7 This whole interrelated set of issues has proposed an unsound and unjustifiable solution to the infrastructure road issue and needs complete re-evaluation.