

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: James Sullivan

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) | James Sullivan |
| 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.

MD4 Peel Hall

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

Both 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).

4.3.9
10.4.2
10.4.4
10.4.6
MD 4.3
10.4.8
10.4.9
10.4.12

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

| | Yes | No |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Legally Compliant | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Sound | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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.

4.3.9 is unsound with regard to provision of local centres / retail - there is no current requirement at the site location for additional retail facilities. The proposed development would compete with existing convenience stores and may result in existing residents in Fearnhead suffering a net loss of facilities

10.4.2 is unsound. The community does not meet the definition of 'sustainable'. As was amply demonstrated during the 2018 and 2020 Public Inquiries, the site is landlocked, the homes which are planned would only be accessible by car and cycling beyond the site would be at negligible levels - as Satnam's traffic survey showed to be the case currently

10.4.4 is unsound and demonstrably inaccurate. See notes for 10.2 above

10.4.6 requires clarification. Please state unequivocally the transport measures which would be put in place. At the Public Inquiries in 2018 and 2020 there were no reasonable measures proposed by the developer to mitigate the very significant transport challenges generated by the development

MD 4.3 - several areas of concern:

1. The 30% affordable homes target - this has been allowed to be breached many times in the past by WBC. This statement is not sufficiently detailed to ensure compliance
2. Sports facilities - an agreement has been reached with the developer that the taxpayer will fund the ongoing maintenance of the sports facilities. I believe this to be not Legally Compliant, as the decision did not involve any public consultation
3. Local shops are likely to displace existing shops which serve Fearnhead, resulting in loss of local amenity for existing citizens
4. Public transport services to the site are negligible in the developer's proposals. This site will overwhelmingly be served by car, which means that it fails the test of sustainability
5. MD 4.3 paragraph 24 states "Development should not introduce a level of vehicular activity into the existing surrounding neighbourhoods which would change the character of these established residential areas." This is not possible given the existing road network and the access and egress points shown on the map. There would be significant change to the character of established neighbourhoods
6. Air quality mitigations fail to include impact on the A49 AQMA. I believe this omission to be not legally sound, given the Council's responsibilities to its citizens
7. Noise barrier mitigations are not covered adequately. The developer claims that their noise barrier will satisfy the relevant thresholds. The Local Plan should require the noise barrier to be constructed in full, and its effectiveness independently assessed, before any building works take place
8. Flood protection. The mitigations are welcomed but are not sufficiently stringent. The risk to local residents from flooding should also be covered by a bond provided by the developer, to cover a fixed number of years from the start of development

10.4.8 I do not accept that the site performs well against the Local Plan's Sustainability Appraisal. As noted earlier, this is a 1980s style development which is dependent on the car

10.4.9 - not a sustainable site, hence unsound

10.4.12 These facilities would displace existing businesses

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.

Peel Hall should not be in the Local Plan at all. It is a site which was rejected by the New Towns Corporation for reasons of flood risk, successive planning applications have been rejected because the site is landlocked and would cause intolerable increases to an already saturated road network.

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.

Yes, I 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:

As a member of the Rule 6 party at the 2020 Public Inquiry I would like to summarise some of the evidence provided by the Rule 6 party. Alternatively, I would be happy for another representative of the Rule 6 party to speak

You have just completed a Representation Form for MD4 Peel Hall.

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)**