

# 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:** Sarah Naylor

**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
<b>Organisation name (if applicable)</b>	-
<b>Agent name (if applicable)</b>	-
<b>Address 1</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Address 2</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Postal Town</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Postcode</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Telephone number</b>	[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.

MD6 South East Warrington Employment Area

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

None of the above

**If a paragraph or policy sub-number then please use the box below to list. (For example - Policy MD2.1 part 3 or paragraph 10.2.13 etc as applicable).**

The entire policy md6

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

	Yes	No
<b>Legally Compliant</b>		X
<b>Sound</b>		X
<b>Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate</b>		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 have only answered no because I would have liked the option of Don't Know rather than just yes or no. I am not someone conversed in legalities so I cannot comment on whether something is legally compliant, sound or compliant with duty to co-operate. That is not for me to decide.

5. If you answered 'Yes' to any of the options in question 3 then please give details in the box below the reasons why you support the legal compliance or soundness of the Draft Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate.

Please be as precise as possible.

See above - Don't know

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.

As mentioned above I do not know whether the local plan is legally sound etc as I do not have a legal background so I am not able to provide any response as to how to make the local plan legally compliant or sound.

I would however, like to discuss the issue for which I have raised this representation.

There are a number of reasons why the SE Employment Area should be removed from the plan:

1. Traffic - development of this location will put junction 20 of the M6 under enormous strain. This junction is already congested, especially at rush hours. Adding 100s of additional HDVs and many more cars onto this already strained part of the network would cause these roads to grind to a halt.
2. Air Quality - this area (the M6 and M56 corridors) are designated as an Air Quality Management Area. This increase in traffic volumes will result in increased emissions and therefore increase concentrations of nitrogen dioxide in this sensitive location. The additional vehicles will also increase pollution levels at nearby sensitive receptors (houses, schools and nurseries) with the potential for associated health impacts for residents.
3. Green belt - the loss of this green belt would be detrimental to the local area and this proposal seems as though it is a sly way of getting the Six 56 development to be granted permission (a development by Langtree which could be considered to be a conflict of interest for WBC). It just seems as though WBC are trying to remove the green belt status of this land because the Six 56 development (and not forgetting the recently rejected Eddie Stobarts application) are not able to provide good enough justification to allow them to be built upon green belt, so WBC are proposing to remove the green belt status purely to allow these developments to go ahead without the green belt hurdle.

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

You have just completed a Representation Form for MD6 South East Warrington Employment Area.

Please select what you would you like to do now?

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