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: Valerie Allen

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.

Plan as a whole

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.

Legal points
• WBC have not followed rules by looking for alternatives to taking green belt.
• There are several smaller brown field sites around the villages which should have been considered first.
• They have continued to use the same plan for Culcheth Glazebury and Croft as was previously proposed in 2019 and 2017 both of which were rejected. No consideration has been given to the last consultation when residents voiced their concerns with this type of development in greenbelt.
• Green Belt being considered weak is incorrect. This prime agricultural land acts as a clear boundary between two villages. It is only 5 years since last green belt boundaries were set.
• Taking the planned agricultural greenbelt will mean two villages Glazebury and Culcheth will merge, thereby resulting in urban sprawl.
• There have been multiple developments built during the time this plan has been evolving and yet we are still expected to give up our green belt for even more houses. Our villages have already fully contributed to the numbers required.
• This parcel of important greenbelt has the main gas supply for Culcheth running through it also the leet that fed the old watermill acts as a natural surface water drain to reduce flooding risks. This too runs through the land. Culcheth, Glazebury and Croft have a documented history of flooding.
• No local historic value incorrect –Culcheth, Glazebury and Croft - First railway – Historical water Mill – old water courses feeding said mill. The name Culcheth comes from a Celtic word meaning ‘back of the wood’ and the first mention of Culcheth is in a survey of the year 1212. Other listed buildings nearby.
• WBC the Government clearly states that green belt should not be used, except in exceptional circumstances.
• Green belt planned to be built on first in direct conflict with the rules.
• 6 weeks Consultation is not long enough to consider such an important proposal. Most people have no idea what is being planned. Only one location for plan displays and for public to gain information at Halliwell Jones. This exhibition was closed very early on 20th October when consultation didn’t close until 15th November.
• Local boards for each ward had to be collected by each Parish but very little information where and when.
• The paperwork to support the information boards was insufficient for the public to take a copy.
• Residents don’t all have computers and therefore cannot be expected to be completed online complicated forms. Why wasn’t every resident sent a letter?

Sound
• The plan total numbers have kept changing each time the plan has been resubmitted. The total number of residents living in Warrington has reduced over this time as confirmed by census – the numbers demanded are too high and set to attract from outside of the town. Culcheth Glazebury and Croft are still showing the same numbers for greenbelt without change. The effects of Covid-19 cannot be fully assessed until the pandemic is stable in terms of housing requirements and work locations.
• WBC say they have full support and agreement for their plan from the developer and the landowner. Is that really some formal approval?
• No greenbelt is needed to be used to meet the numbers before 15 years have passed. The greenbelt must be left until last as it is very likely it won’t be needed. More new homes are needed in the central wards not the periphery due to latter causing more transport issues.
• There is no real need for more houses in Culcheth Glazebury and Croft. The type of property on offer needs to be considered as good quality pensioner homes would release many family homes.
• There is no evidence given that WBC have considered alternatives, but they have continued to push

for this same plan yet again.
• WBC have failed to fully consult with all residents and have actively made it impossible for a good proportion to find out or comment on plan.

Fulfil Duty to cooperate
• WBC stated they will undertake a full and comprehensive programme of consultation.
• Councillors were only given a few days to read through over 700 pages of the plan before being asked to vote on it going to consultation. This document failed to have page numbering meaning cross-referencing was very difficult.
• On the first day the website had some issues so did not have access to the plan.
• WBC were told they were omitting a large proportion of the population from this consultation, but they have failed to rectify that.

Culcheth Glazebury and Croft specific issues.
• No consideration at all for alternative plans such as pensioner homes. If carefully planned many who live alone might opt to move to more usable homes releasing many large family homes onto the market.
• No consideration of the large number of homes built during the existence of this plan.
• The greenbelt must be saved as this is important for surface water drain via the natural culvert flowing through.
• Story Homes claim they have rights to 500 homes on the area and WBC have said they will take the remaining Greenbelt rather than leave it isolated.
• 500 homes equate to 1000 more cars, 1000 more children and 1000 more adults minimum.
• The combined sewer running through the villages is over capacity and regularly flood our due to back pressure.
• The Glazebury treatment plant cannot cope and the river Glaze becomes very swollen. Surface water drains in the village struggle to cope and engineering crew both WBC and UU state the system is overstretched already.
• Further homes will guarantee more issues and flooding. Tanking will not help much as the whole system can't cope now.
• The medical centre is struggling to meet demand and more patients will affect them badly.
• The schools are all oversubscribed now,
• WBC pulled out of all sports and leisure provision for our villages leaving the teams to sort out themselves.
• The main roads are all regularly congested and gridlocked so more cars would be impossible to cope with.
• The heavy traffic causes air pollution which affects everyone.
• WBC say they are focusing on building the town centre. This should be prioritised, and people can live where they work rather than live in periphery wards and have to travel.
• Housing needs to be near transport hubs, Cucheth, Glazebury and Croft have a limited bus service, with a total reliance on cars to get to work. The nearest station is Birchwood and Padgate some 5 miles away.
• There are no amenities in Croft, this plan will increase the total number of houses by 10%, a village with narrow country lanes, scant public transport, no shops, no medical centre, no youth provision, no elderly provision.
• Cycling is not an option of the narrow roads that are used as a rat run to the motorway with the main road through the village on a 'red route'. The road proposed as access for the development in Croft, comes out on an S bend with a primary school close by, with narrow footpaths and no visibility. The existing housing estate itself has narrow roads, with bin lorries regularly having restricted access.
• The children of Croft Primary school once had greenbelt to three sides, this plan will reduce it to one, with disturbance to children's education during the building phase and houses overlooking the playground post construction.
• No consideration is given of the extra traffic through the villages with the recent Public Inquiry on Parkside approving the link road to Junction 22 on the M6 and the building of warehouses on the border of Warrington with St Helens and the lost of greenbelt and agricultural land in the region brought about by this.
• Redevelopment of other parcels of land that are coming up in the near future, have not been taken into consideration, e.g., the hospital site, Bank Quay Unilever, Padgate Campus and the decline of the retail requirement throughout Warrington as a whole with many units and shopping remaining unoccupied during and post lock down.
• Climate Change has not been considered in this report, especially taking into consideration the discussion around COP26 and crisis the world is facing, more building on greenbelt is not the answer.
• Warrington already has high levels of emissions from vehicles, which will increase vastly with Parkside now approved and Omega 2 on the cards.
• Brexit and Covid have taught us that we need food security in our Country and the loss of agricultural land throughout Warrington will reduce our capacity to produce.

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 in the comments in number 4, Greenbelt should only be used in exceptional circumstances.

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:
See comments in number 4

You have just completed a Representation Form for Plan as a whole.

Please select what you would you like to do now?

Submit response (I am a Developer / Landowner / Group / Organisation)