

Warrington Local Plan 2021

Examination in Public

Respondent 0457 STRETTON NDP

Written Statement regarding Matter 6b – South East Warrington Urban Extension

Our NDP submitted objections firstly address the list of questions under this ID02 issue and full supporting details can be found in our NDP document. To eliminate repartition, we refer to specific clauses to highlight our objections.

Note that all our comments specifically refer to the unjustified and unsound ramifications to the Stretton Neighbourhood area.

Q1 - Land parcel R18/088, latterly split between R18/088 East and West, was originally included in response to the WBC 'call for sites' by Wallace Land Investments on behalf of three landowners. This was done knowingly that it was green belt and south of the durable GB boundary of Stretton Road. The east part of this land was originally excluded from the plan (PDO) whereas the West part was included. Neither parts should be included as the only circumstance for inclusion is financial to the benefit of the developer and the landowners. Financial incentive alone does not qualify for exceptional circumstance for removal of this land from the green belt. Full detail is on P9 – 14 of the Stretton NDP submission. Also see Figure 17 on P18 for the durable boundary limit.

Q2 - The scale of the Wallace / Miller proposal (circa 700 homes) will over double the housing stock in Stretton. This is unsound and unsustainable in terms of scale and growth. Refer to clause 7 on P2 of the NDP submission.

Q3 – Full details of the inconsistent and unsound assessment of the various land parcels in Stretton, especially R18/088 East and West, apparently in the favour of the developer, is fully detailed in the section on Green Belt Assessment and reclassification starting on P14 of the NDP submission.

Q4 – The effect of developing the green belt south of the durable boundary, parcels R18/088 east and west will be purely for financial gain for by WBC, the developer and the landowners. The development would destroy the character of the village. It is wholly against the principles of the NPPF in protecting the green belt from urban sprawl. Refer to the full details of the contravention of the many clauses of the NPPF 2021 which start on P21 of the NDP submission.

Q5 – There are no exceptional circumstances to release this green belt. Refer to Q4 response.

Q6 – Compensatory improvements have not been divulged to members of the NDP and therefore it is unclear how this will make recompense for the destruction of the village.

Q7 - no answer.

Q8 – The Transport and Accessibility section of MD2.3, as applied to Stretton, is farcical in the amateurish manner in which the alleviation of the Cat and Lion junction congestion and the location of the start of the new infrastructure link road have been represented. For full details refer to the Strategic Road Infrastructure section, starting on P37 of the NDP submission.

Q9 –Additional adverse effects from this potential development, which are stated throughout the NDP submission are:

- Loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural lands required for crop production to make the UK more self-sufficient in these times of climate change.
- Increased air pollution
- Increased traffic congestion
- Increased HGV traffic movements
- Increased noise pollution
- Increase in Co2 emissions
- Loss of habitats
- Destruction of rural character of our village.
- Does not attempt to aid the government Net Zero initiative.

Q10 – The proposal is probably deliverable but it is highly likely that it is not viable as it is deemed that suitable non-green belt is still available within other areas of the borough which would absorb the circa 700 houses proposed within the Wallace / Miller plan.

Q11 – No answer.

Q12 – The main modification for soundness would be to abandon the plan for Stretton and retain the green belt status for Stretton. The proposals are unsound, unjustified and unsustainable in terms of scale and growth.