

Proposed Submission Version Local Plan

PART A - About You

1. Please complete the following:

Please note the email address (if provided below) will be sent a full copy of the submitted response and a unique reference number.

Name of person completing the form: A.W.Pressage

Email address: [REDACTED]

2. What type of respondent are you? Please select one option only.
If you are an agent please select the type of client you are representing.

A local resident who lives in Warrington

3. Please provide your contact details:

	Contact details
Organisation name (if applicable)	-
Agent name (if applicable)	-
Address 1	[REDACTED]
Address 2	[REDACTED]
Postal Town	[REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Telephone number	[REDACTED]

PART B - Representation Form 1

1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

From the drop down list please select one option.

MD2 South East Warrington Urban Extension

2. What does your comment relate to? Please select one option.

None of the above

3. Do you consider the Draft Local Plan to be: Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No
Legally Compliant		X
Sound		X
Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate		X

4. If you have answered 'No' to any of the options in the above question then please give details in the box below of why you consider the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate.

Please be as precise as possible.

I object to the proposals for a South East Warrington Urban Extension. Specifically the proposal to build 4200 homes on green belt land.

The plan is not sound. My comments are as follows:

1. The figure of 816 houses to be built per year is much higher than the 2018 population growth data forecasts. There is no justification for the use of this figure.
2. The proposed number of houses does not appear to take account of the number of new houses already built in the area (on green belt land), over recent years. The areas of Grappenhall Heys, Appleton Cross and Pewterspear have already seen extensive development and new housing is still being built. The growth figures should not use the current number of houses as the baseline to determine the growth percentage, because extensive development has already happened. The total should consider the number of houses prior to the development in these areas. There is no justification for not taking existing and current developments into account.
3. The land was compulsory purchased by the government in 1974. The planning vision that appeared appropriate to the people involved in the purchase 47 years ago have no relevance today. The current population must be given right to determine what is appropriate in their area in the coming years. There is no justification in 2021 and beyond for the government continuing to own and develop land seized in previous generations.
4. According to the governments own website, 'The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.' The plan proposes the opposite of this and, as such, is not justified.
5. The NPPF demands that there should be "exceptional circumstances" before Green Belt boundaries can be changed and says that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should be approved only in "very special circumstances". No exceptional or very special circumstances have been presented in the plan to justify this green belt land development; hence the plan is not sound in meeting the NPPF demands.
6. The NPPF urges LPAs to maximise the use of suitable brownfield sites before considering changes to Green Belt boundaries. The plan is not sound in meeting the NPPF demands.
7. Lastly, the Representation form and the consultation process in general is presented in way that can only be fully understood by people with a professional legal and planning background. This appears to be designed to ensure that public opinion can be ignored when it does not fit neatly into what the process considers to be valid objections in the legal planning framework. As a consequence of this, the consultation fails to comply with the duty to co-operate.

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Draft Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified above where this relates to soundness. (NB please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.

Please be as precise as possible.

I consider the following modifications are necessary to make the Draft Local Plan sound:

1. The plan should be modified to meet the governments own definition of the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy. That is to ensure the Green Belt is correctly used to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The plan proposes the opposite of this. I suggest revised wording should confirm the Green Belt will be used to prevent urban sprawl and keep land permanently open.
2. The plan should be modified to ensure the NPPF demands are complied with in respect of the requirement for Green Belt boundaries to only be changed in "exceptional circumstances". I suggest revised wording should confirm the Green Belt boundaries will only be changed in exceptional circumstances.
3. The plan should be modified to ensure the NPPF demands are complied with in respect of the requirement that inappropriate development that is harmful to the Green Belt and should only be approved in "very special circumstances". I suggest revised wording should confirm inappropriate development that is harmful to the Green Belt will only be proposed and approved in very special circumstances.
4. The plan should be modified to ensure the NPPF demands are complied with in respect that LPAs are required to maximise the use of suitable brownfield sites before considering changes to Green Belt boundaries. I suggest revised wording should confirm maximum use of suitable brownfield sites will be made before considering changes to Green Belt boundaries.
5. The local plan should be modified to re-assess the figure of the number of houses to be built based on current population growth data forecasts.
6. The local plan should be modified to re-assess the figure of the number of houses to be built, not by using the current number of houses as the baseline to determine the growth percentage, but consider the number of houses that existed prior to the extensive developments in Grappenhall Heys, Appleton Cross and Pewterspear.
7. The land was compulsorily purchased by the government in 1974. The planning vision of 47 years ago has no relevance today. The current population must be given right to determine what is appropriate in their area in the coming years. The local plan should be modified to reflect the opinion of current residents not the planners in 1974 or those of developers and remote government bodies.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? Please select one option.

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

I have answered no because you state that written and oral representations carry the same weight and will be given equal consideration in the examination process, not in the belief that the opinions of local residents are being given fair consideration without oral representation.

You have just completed a Representation Form for MD2 South East Warrington Urban Extension.

Please select what you would like to do now?

Complete the final part of the form, Customer 'About You' questions and submit response **(Part C)**