

Proposed Submission Version Local Plan

PART A - About You

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)	Paul Dempster
Agent name (if applicable)	Paul Dempster
Address 1	██████████
Address 2	██████████
Postal Town	██████████
Postcode	██████████
Telephone number	██████████

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.

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).
see attached letter

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.

See attached letter

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.

See attached letter

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

8. If you wish to upload documents to support your representation form then please select 'choose file' below. You can upload a max number of 2 files (up to 25MB each).

If you are submitting more than one representation form please note: If this file upload supports more than one representation form then please do not attempt to upload the same file on subsequent forms. On additional representation forms please use the comments/file description box to type in the 'name of the file', or 'see previous form'.

If the file upload is a different document for additional representation forms then please continue to upload the file as normal.

- File: Warrington Local Plan Response.pdf - [REDACTED]

Comments/file description

Covering letter

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

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**)



Dear Sirs

Warrington Local Plan Response

I am writing in regard to the proposed Warrington Local Plan and specifically the South East Urban Extension. I would like to register the following concerns and objections. There are clear planning principles established within planning policy and it is therefore right that the Local Planning Authority (LPA) should adhere to and follow these policies to the same degree that they expect private developers to do so. On this basis it is not considered that the LPA has given sufficient consideration or justification in the production of its draft local plan to the following.

Development Within the Greenbelt

National planning policy is set out in a number of national framework documents, of relevance to greenbelt issues is NPPF Chapter 13 – Green Belt Land. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

It appears dubious that these established principles have been given due regard in the draft local plan in relation to the Southeast Urban Extension. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (paragraph 148). These circumstances have not been made clear or indeed justified.

When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations (paragraph 149). These are the standards required of developers and at the very least should be those to which the LPA adheres.

Paragraph 150 states that the following forms of development are not considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt providing they preserve its openness and so not conflict with the purpose of including the land within the Green Belt designation:

- a. Mineral extraction;
- b. engineering operations;
- c. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;
- d. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and

substantial construction;
e. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and
f. development brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or neighbourhood Development Order.

The above exceptions have a limited role in demonstrating appropriate development within the South East Urban Extension meaning that the bulk of the proposals must be regarded as inappropriate development.

The proposed Local Plan fails to demonstrate the exceptional/special circumstances that are the test for proposed development within the greenbelt which are normally required of developers and the same level of scrutiny should be required of the LPA.

PPG: Green Belt (July 2019)

Assessing the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt, where it is relevant to do so, requires a judgment based on the circumstances of the case. By way of example, the courts have identified a number of matters which may need to be taken into account in making this assessment. These include, but are not limited to:

- openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words, the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant, as could its volume;
- the duration of the development, and its remediability – taking into account any provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness; and
- the degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation.

The scale, extent and permanency of the local plan proposals have not addressed issues raised in the PPG and once again should be used as the standard for establishing future development within the South East Urban Extension.

Fiddlers Ferry Power Station

The emergence of Fiddlers Ferry Power Station as a windfall site provides the ideal opportunity to bring forward large scale brownfield development in replacement of development within the greenbelt. The owners of Fiddlers Ferry Power Station have made representations to the Local Planning Authority in plenty of time for incorporation into the local plan and there can be no justification for not including the relevant brownfield allocations for residential development within this local plan period.

Loss of Agricultural Land

In line with planning policy and the good practice and guidance provided within Planning Practice Guidance for the Natural Environment (2019) and Natural England's 'Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land' (2018) consideration must be given to the quality of agricultural land to be lost as part of any development. The agricultural land in the proposed South East Urban Extension has an Agricultural land Classification of Grade 3 (good to moderate). Once again, the Local Planning Authority do not seem to have considered agricultural land quality and the implications of its potential loss in the formulation of the draft Local Plan. This is an oversight that needs to be addressed.

On the basis of the above it seems clear that the Local Planning Authority need to further reconsider the contents of the Draft Local Plan in relation to the specific area of the South East Urban Development. The Authority must apply the standards that it is obliged to judge developers against in the development of its own strategic planning objectives.

I trust that the above issues will be fully addressed as part of this consultation process.

Yours sincerely

Paul Dempster