

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Response to draft Local Plan
Date: 14 November 2021 20:51:09

As a local resident of Stockton Heath and parent and grandparent, I am not opposed to the local plan in itself. I recognise WBC is obliged by national government to prepare for more home building and that this will improve control over the nature of private developments. I agree we are in great need of more social housing both rented and for sale at genuinely affordable prices. I therefore urge amendment to a more favourable formula re the Local Housing Allowance which has been skewed by recent hikes in prices.

I am very concerned that local authorities need more say to get definite early monies also from developers to provide infrastructure. There is a one off opportunity now with the climate change crisis, homeworking increase after covid and the all electric bus grant, to get more people out of cars ..and 2 and 3 car families.. In Stockton Heath 4000 more households in Appleton with 1 or 2 or more vehicles coming through is quite impractical.

I urge a more frequent bus service than hourly from Northwich with a minimum single return fare of £2 (not £4.95 as now) be provided with 5 years (not one year as in previous draft Local Plan) x 2 starter tickets per household funded by developers. As 200 homes come on stream each year the service would gain enormously.

I also urge WBC to arrange to declassify the London Rd section of the A49 by rerouting it along DARESBURY dualcarriageway from J11 or along A50 Knutsford Rd. This would allow WBC to impose traffic controls to reduce thru traffic and heavy lorries and further encourage sustainable travel inside the Borough.

My second issue is brownfield sites controls. The Plan proposes to prioritise building on Brownfield sites of which there are some in my parish Stockton Heath
Many, many objectors argue for an absolute prioritisation. I oppose unfettered development of brownfield sites.

My contention is that the Local Plan as currently drafted , needs to be amended to build in more protection in general and to be applied to specific sites before development is granted.

With regard to Policy Doc 3, points 5 and 6 on page 119, and the relevant reference to Green Infrastructure (GI):-

I RECOMMEND that the definition of the GI in the Glossary (page 263) be added to as follows :- 'including mature trees and hedges on the borders of, and screening, smaller brownfield sites'.

This is on the basis of our experience. Stockton Heath has very little green public space but the brownfield sites need planning protection to support the 2 corridors of biodiversity that run through the parish, namely Manchester Ship Canal and Bridgewater Canal.

Our 6 small SHLAA sites have c 500 mature trees and ancient hedges worthy of consideration for protection . WASH is recommending to Warrington Borough that, while NOT opposing development 'per se' , protection orders should be placed in advance on most of the mature trees round the borders of the sites in order to preserve biodiversity habitats and to act as pollution screens. Our parish council has supported this approach and the borough will have to weigh up commercial v.environmental concerns.

While objections can be raised as any individual planning application is considered, I consider that is often too late to save biodiversity. Therefore I urge formal clarification of the definition of Brownfield. The distinction between brown and green is currently too simplistic.

I trust my comments are clear and helpful to consideration of the next step from this draft a consultation stage

If you would like to discuss further, please contact me.

Susan Scales
Resident



Sent from my Galaxy