

Plan Process	
Is the old 2012 plan still active in lieu of a new one?	<i>It is and is still relatively up to date. Its weakness stems from the fact the developers challenged the Council's housing figures. That's why we are supportive of the need for a new plan.</i>
We cannot plan 28 days ahead in the Covid era - how long would the new plan be for 10 - 15 - 20 years?	<i>The Government requires a plan to cover at least 15 years although it should be broken down into 5 year segments and should be reviewed over the plan period.</i>
What time frame can we expect to see your vision for the alternative?	
Why aren't we looking at creating a local plan over 5 years and not 20 years especially with all the current changes we have seen..?	
	<i>One of our criticisms of the 2019 Proposed Submission Draft produced by the Council is the Council's ambition to plan for a 20 year period, which we consider an unnecessary challenge.</i>
	<i>The plan should look across a range of time frames</i>
With the White Paper, Planning for the Future, has it been considered that a review is an opportunity to identify under the three proposed zones, growth, and renewal and protected and local plans may have to be produced within 30 months. So you could waste time on a plan that may have to change, so is preparation not key to meet the proposed changes?	<i>We have said in the documents we have produced about a new vision that changes to the planning system must be taken into account, but accept the need that the Council should continue plan production to produce a clear planning strategy for the whole Borough, through engagement and consensus.</i>
Given the ongoing delay in producing a WBC Plan, what is the risk of having an even less favourable Plan being imposed on the Council by the Government?	<i>There is certainly a need to have a plan in place to properly direct development to the right locations, rather than allowing piecemeal development – this is why we want to support the Council in producing a sound plan as soon as possible.</i>
What can be done to stop developers exploiting the ongoing delay in	

<p>producing a Local Plan by submitting development proposals in areas which were excluded in the WBC plan? The recent proposal for 31 houses in Hatton is a case in point.</p>	<p><i>The current local plan still provides some robust policies which seek to ensure that development is only permitted in the right places.</i></p>
<p>Does the lack of a local plan lead to situations where individual politicians are making promises to their constituents that the local plan, ultimately, will be unable to keep, therefore setting unrealistic expectations for the future of Warrington?</p>	<p><i>The local plan is a key document when planning applications are considered and it is crucial that an up to date plan is in place as soon as possible. We have expressed concern that the current version of the plan is increasingly incapable of delivering against expected targets and requirements and that it will be found unsound when examined by Government Inspectors.</i></p>
<p>Are we at risk from developers exploiting the absence of a plan, and a 5 year land supply, to push through the developments they want?</p>	
<p>Why is the plan developer lead and not social need?</p>	<p><i>Developers are key to the implementation of the plan and it is important that the Council understands their needs and expectations, but the whole purpose of the planning system is to direct development into the most appropriate places in the wider public interest.</i></p>
<p>Development is driven by developers who are always attracted to green field sites....how we can change that.</p>	
<p>To what extent is the current plan driven by the potential for higher income from rates if the development is in the south?</p>	<p><i>Development should be focused on more difficult to develop, brown field sites and should provide for sustainable connections between places where residents of the Borough live, work and play.</i></p> <p><i>The key component of national planning policy is the requirement for development to be sustainable – socially, economically and environmentally sustainable and the plan must direct development to locations, consider uses, design and infrastructure which best meets this requirement.</i></p>

	<i>We think our new vision better reflects those requirements in comparison to the Council's current version of the plan.</i>
What can be done to ensure the council will review rather than just pause?	<i>The SWP has acknowledged the sense in the decision to pause the local plan process. We have highlighted a range of issues, mostly outside the Council's control which justify this pause. We believe this is an opportune moment to reflect on the work undertaken to date and amend and adjust the emphasis of the plan to reflect the changing world we all inhabit</i>
Is WBC receptive to this review proposal?	
Are Warrington council starting a new plan or just making minor changes to the existing plan	
Also, very demoralising for anyone to start a job from scratch. Would amendments be better than complete start from scratch?	
	<i>We would hope that we can demonstrate that there is an increasing public awareness of the importance of the plan and the need to get it right, in order for development across the whole of the Borough to benefit residents and businesses across the whole town.</i>
	<i>Above anything else we believe that changing circumstances make the chances of delivering the ambitious plans of the 2017 and 2019 versions of the plan highly unlikely.</i>
	<i>We are not necessarily talking about starting again, but adjustment and refocus, reflecting changes in circumstances. A new version of the plan which reflects consensus and understanding of a town centre focus plan, reducing inequality and increasing opportunity.</i>
Would abandoning current plan open floodgates for developers	<i>It is absolutely right to be aware of the potential problems of not having an up</i>

submitting other proposals on protected sites in lieu of an agreed plan.	<p><i>to date development plan. There are however sites allocated and available for development and areas protected by green belt and other planning policy designations. This highlights the importance of bringing together a sustainable, deliverable plan as soon as possible. It would even worse to take an unsound and undeliverable plan forward and that is our concern with the current version.</i></p>
Is it not the case that any plan is better than none....particularly when councils are obliged to have a plan or government will decide for them..	
How do you all feel Covid has impacted on the original plan, what is needed now and what did you feel was necessary previously that Covid has proved isn't necessary?	<p><i>Covid is one of the issues which we have highlighted as a prompt for pause and review.</i></p> <p><i>Hopefully the pandemic will soon be a thing of the past, but it will certainly have major impacts on the way we live, work and travel. It has clearly impacted on economic issues and changed many of the growth ambitions which underpinned the early work on the plan in 2016/17</i></p>
Co-operation and engagement	
Should there be an increased emphasis on engagement between developers and residents to collaborate in order to deliver proposals that would, generally, be more acceptable to residents to reduce the potential for future conflict through the planning process?	<p><i>Whilst we accept that there is a need for some degree of confidentiality, the SWP has raised concern with the Council over the level and nature of engagement and the degree of transparency.</i></p> <p><i>Comments on the PDO in 2017 are published but are heavily redacted and cannot be attributed to specific sources.</i></p> <p><i>The comments received by the Council on the 2019 Proposed Submission Version of the plan have not been published.</i></p>

	<i>The Council has alluded to updates to the evidence base which informs the plan but these have not been made public.</i>
Superb presentation. How do we SIGNIFICANTLY spread awareness better as many residents will not be aware of the limitations of the existing plan and the opportunities of an alternative? They will sleepwalk into this unless the council is changed. IE how do we ENGAGE and then MOBILISE people?	<i>Obviously the purpose of the SWP was to represent the views of the people we represent across South Warrington, but we believe that our vision to review and revise the plan would deliver a better plan for the whole of Warrington. In particular it would focus spending on infrastructure in the central areas of the town, especially the town centre.</i>
Is there a North Warrington working party and where is there involvement this evening as it affects the whole town and needs collaboration...?	<i>We have established contact with other groups and welcome the chance to demonstrate how our objectives are common to those promoted across the Borough and not just one geographical area.</i>
Nearly 40 years ago there was the campaign "keep Appleton Green" which really engaged residents. How do we replicate that level of engagement?	
How will we engage the public also outside successful consultants who have successfully created communities	
Has there been any cooperation with the other Parish Council in the north of the Borough?	
Can I ask do you think the current councillors and officers will be watching this presentation? Were they invited to watch this?	<i>All Borough Councillors, all Parish and Town Councillors have been invited to these presentations and provided with the documentation which goes with it</i>

<p>I see no evidence of Trafford liaising with Warrington Boro ref transport links but they continue to build close to the Warrington boundary and encourage traffic growth along the A6144 thro Lymm into Warrington. - Rat run thro to M6!!</p>	<p><i>We agree. One of the problems of not easily being able to see the comments of other parties is the inability to see what neighbouring council's have said about the Warrington Plan.</i></p> <p><i>It is absolutely critical to understand the ambitions of Greater Manchester and Liverpool and how that might influence the pattern of development appropriate for Warrington</i></p>
<p>Firstly, I think the SWP has done an excellent job and I wholly agree with the group's ideas and objectives, my question is how will the local plan work in conjunction with neighbouring borough's local plan? Warrington borders 2 major economic centres and we have to take advantage of that.</p>	
<p>Infrastructure</p>	
<p>What plans do the Borough have to keep education facilities in line with housing development?</p>	<p><i>One of greatest concerns with the development proposed in the plan is the lack of clarity over how all the new infrastructure – roads, schools, health facilities etc, can be funded and delivered alongside the development.</i></p>
<p>At £212m the WWL looks a dubious business case ... if the cost rises to £300m + is it worth supporting?</p>	<p><i>The development in south Warrington depends on huge investment in highways, much of which goes against ambitions to reduce congestion and improve air quality.</i></p>
<p>The 'urban suburb' ... does this plan recognise it and if so at what scale ... who would pay for the mysterious 'link road' from J10 to Grappenhall and would it be single or dual carriageway? Would it become an HGV rat run?</p>	<p><i>We struggle to see clear evidence as to how development can support the funding of all this infrastructure. There remain huge questions over the delivery of infrastructure in a timely manner in line with development actually taking place.</i></p>
<p>Why build more industrial spaces in south Warrington when so many spaces are empty or not being used. Can you give a justification</p>	

Section 106 contributions from Developers could be required to facilitate infra structure. Has the group considered this?	
Re Infrastructure ; Where does the Western Link Road and Port Warrington stand with this? Shouldn't that be paused until we understand the transport plan for the future?	
Housing	
The current paused plan has no mention of social housing - how does your plan see things	<i>Affordable and social housing is mentioned, but we are not clear how it will be delivered and more significantly will it be in the right place</i>
Why is massive housing development proposed in south Warrington on green land and not in north Warrington where there is more available and cheaper land	<i>Our main concern is the lack of common sense in removal large areas of land from the Green Belt when it is now clear that large areas of previously developed land will be available for development within the Plan period.</i>
Has any demand assessment been carried out for housing in town centre? Do people want to live in town centre? Or are we just proposing new housing to be located there because we want to protect green belt?	<i>We think there is scope to develop more housing in and around the town centre. This is not just about the town centre itself but the areas surrounding the centre. It is not about apartments but about a range of development.</i> <i>It is absolutely about making sure that the uses within the town centre shift to meet changes in the economy.</i>

Environment	
<p>How integral is green space to the vision for the alternative plan</p> <p>Beyond just protecting green belt on the periphery of town, what opportunities for ecological restoration/green infrastructure been identified in central areas of Warrington in these new proposals?</p>	<p><i>We have not produced an alternative plan but a vision which reflects our thoughts about the changes since the plan was originally produced, but we agree that part of creating a sustainable and a great place to live and work is totally dependent on having the right green spaces in the right location, protecting and enhancing the town's ecology</i></p>
<p>It's great to hear how much you're talking about the environmental emergency and air quality/ brown field sites. Is your plan committed to the environmental issues that are critical to all our futures - even when being "flexible"?</p>	<p><i>Our criticism of previous versions of the plan reflected the limited consideration afforded to issues of air quality. This particularly related to the way in which development proposed in the plan relied heavily on road based transport.</i></p>
<p>A report in the Journal of Cardiovascular Research suggests that 14% of Covid-19 deaths in the UK are linked to long term exposure to PM 2.5s; These PM 2.5s are caused by road/tyre/dust by cars and buses and clearly cars and buses need to be banned from the urban area. What transport plans are there without using rubber wheels in the built up area?</p>	<p><i>That is why our vision seeks to refocus development on the town centre and central areas of Warrington where there would be a far greater opportunity to use sustainable modes of transport.</i></p> <p><i>We have recognised that even if becomes possible to reduce emissions from vehicle engines – there is still a huge issue with particulates produced from road vehicles</i></p>
<p>Can we clean up the Mersey to make it attractive to riverside development as has happened alongside the canals in Manchester? It can be done.</p>	<p><i>We have flagged this issue and commented in the presentation about the opportunity to exploit canal and river frontages particularly in the town centre, recognising of the issues with flood risk</i></p>
<p>Not a question, a plea, don't forget the value of the River Mersey, now much cleaner and linked to Fiddlers Ferry!</p>	

Transport	
Is there a plan for improved cycle routes around Warrington	<i>Our vision seeks to support the shift of modes of travel to more sustainable means of transport including cycling</i>
We have been trying to talk to Labour leaders for a number of years but the leader and others would not see us. We are a leading light rail specialists based in Warrington yet the Council have spent £80,000 plus for data they could have had free if they supported local businesses	<i>The SWP is supportive of consideration of all alternatives to private car use and would of course urge the Council to consider all available sources of information to this end</i>
The traffic / highway proposals see no recognition of traffic problems east of the M6 why is this? Any holdups on Thelwall viaduct see diversions through Lymm and over Warburton Bridge. Why is there no recognition and resolution of this problem	<i>We welcomed the concept of publishing the Proposed Submission Draft of the Local Plan and the Local Transport Plan at the same time but have concluded that all this has really achieved is to show the disconnect between development proposals and the provision of a sustainable , non- car based infrastructure.</i>
Transport is Pan Warrington and District but LTP doesn't address this in any depth, why not?	<i>The best example of this was the expectation that many parts of the infrastructure would not be in place even at the end of the period covered by the Local Plan.</i>
Last year 2019, Andy Burham published a plan showing that Tramtrain is coming into Warrington. What will you do with it?	<i>We think that the pause in the local plan process and review of the way that development should take place, presents a real opportunity to look at this again, reflecting changes in the way we work, live and play.</i>
Interesting hearing about transport and other countries etc. However, European countries have long term plan of 20+ years for infrastructure and transport, independent of political parties. Could that ever happen in	

UK or Warrington.	
We are advised not to use public transport in these covid times what safe practical alternatives do we have? We need them!!!	<i>Absolutely correct, but if we looked to put development in places where the need to travel was reduced, we could use a range of different modes of transport – not just the private car.</i>
<i>Other topics</i>	
I would like to see a group of relevant professionals formed to participate in major Planning appeals where they occur locally.	<i>One of the benefits of group of local planning authorities acting together is the ability to pool resources and engage professionals to assist in representing the concerns of local people</i>
The Secretary of State called in the Stobart development but is now sitting on it, why is this? Is he waiting to see what happens with the local plan?	<i>We don't know.</i>
We are aware of the planning law changes for brown field sites. Are there any changes to green field planning rules	<i>The guidance is actually quite clear. There remains a presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt and encouragement for development on previously developed land</i>
Are there any examples of towns/cities in the country that have adopted a local plan that has really worked for everyone..? i.e. thinking outside the box	<i>Noted</i>
Andy, Sharon, Joe the catalysts for Altrincham and Manchester City Centre is Metrolink - connectivity and don't need cars	<i>Noted</i>

<p>What are the panel's views on the Central 6 consultation where the people of North Warrington wanted to prioritise the environment?</p>	<p><i>We think this type of consultation is part of what is wrong with the Council's approach to date.</i></p> <p><i>They have produced a series of "master plans" with no reference to the local plan and the wider planning system. They have no weight in planning decisions and make huge presumptions about policy and strategy which should properly be considered as part of the local plan.</i></p> <p><i>Consultations are narrow and whilst correctly directed at those most directly affected, there is no wider context.</i></p> <p><i>They might have value if used as part of the deliberations needed to provide for an effective and deliverable local plan and in that context priorities for local residents – environment, should inform the content of the plan.</i></p>
<p>Who pays the cost of decontaminating the sort of Fiddlers Ferry site or the Hospital site? Developers won't pay the whole cost?</p>	<p><i>Accepted, and clearly an issue, but it is our view that allocation of these sites for development gives the Council the chance to lead a discussion about the means of delivery, pulling together the existing owners of the site, potential developers and Government. Instead of using scarce resources on expensive and inappropriate infrastructure let's seek to direct resources which beneficially reuse brown field sites. The sites of other coal fired power stations are in process of the being redeveloped</i></p>