

**From:** [Local plan web form](#) on behalf of [Main modifications consultation](#)  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Local plan main modifications consultation  
**Date:** 26 April 2023 11:18:54

---

Submitted on Wed, 26/04/2023 - 10:37

Submitted values are:

## Your information

### Your name

Philip Goodlad

### Address

[REDACTED]

### Email address

[REDACTED]

## Modification response

### Which main modification or consultation are you responding to?

MM001

### Is the main modification legally compliant?

Yes

### Is the main modification sound?

No

### Why do you consider it is not sound (max 2000 words)

I write in comment of the Warrington Local Plan main modifications, in which I believe, continue to fall short in the tests of soundness <Paragraph 35 of the NPPF>. It is my view, the plan remains unsuitable for adoption.

Having represented at the local plan hearing in September, I feel many of the key points remain unanswered or somewhat ignored. I welcome the final report as to how these have been considered, as generally, these have been overlooked in revision, yet the most pressing.

Like many, I continue to have significant concerns around flawed housing needs, unclear national policy, inadequate infrastructure, insufficient services, protection of significant green space and simply loss of heritage/character.

## Detailed response and document upload

### Detailed response to main modification (A maximum of 5000 words, which equates to roughly 10 sides of A4 paper)

The plan fails to be consistent, around interpretation of the national planning policy and changing non-mandatory build targets. I'm sure you're aware that of recently (April 2023) 55 other local authorities have chosen to scrap such targets and review. This is not the climate to be committing to such a long term plan and change, based on flawed data and interpretation of ask. The significant changes since the draft in period just show how flippant thinking is for a long-term plan.

The justified and welcome removal of SEWEA (MD6) recognises that such a proposal is unreasonable and a false reduction in green-belt impact. Having previously removed the Western Link, the two policies weaken any such justification and their impact assessed.

### Infrastructure and services

Our infrastructure remains inadequate in which our roads are often at grid lock. As a resident of [REDACTED], I see daily, the queue of stationary traffic backing on one of the main artillery routes onto Grappenhall Road. Journey times are excessive (25min, 4 miles from South to North) and often unpredictable. There remains no resilience to wider incidents both highway and canal routes. These will only get worse without substantial prior investment in bringing our infrastructure to current capacity needs. The suggestion and prediction of moving to alternative mass transit is evidently not working, demonstrated by the notableness empty buses.

Schools, medical practices, leisure and waste services continue to be insufficient are require resolution before continuing housing expansion, The priority is miscalculated in continuing to meet demand. Having lived in Chapelford previously, experience shows these services are planned for acceptance, but then typically reduced and delivered late.

### Greenbelt

The significant impact on our green space still remains unjustified, negligent and morally unethical. 390 Ha still remains excessive, as parties continue to recognise more brownfield space - which need scan be met with a suitable housing target. Removal of greenbelt is simply negligent, long lasting harm and should continue to be only justified under exceptional circumstances. Releasing greenbelt for executive homes does not meet this requirement.

Whilst there is the suggestion that the land parcels remain weak in purpose for greenbelt, there is continued strong argument. This should be reviewed for a clear decision - not precedence through local plan.

Kind Regards

Phil Goodlad

████████████████████