





1 Introduction	2
2 Schedule of Responses - Issues	3
3 Schedule of Responses - Building Blocks	87
4 Schedule of Responses - Next Steps	113
5 Schedule of Responses - Infrastructure	114
6 Next Steps	137

1 Introduction

1.1 The Core Strategy Objectives and Options Report was the subject of informal consultation in July and August 2010. An initial four week period to receive responses was given which lasted until the 13th of August. Due to the informal nature of the consultation, responses have continued to be accepted after this date.

1.2 This report sets out all of the consultation responses received during and since this consultation and gives an initial response from Planning Officers as to how the comments will be taken forward in the Core Strategy production process. The responses to the Key Issues objectives and options are set out first, followed by those that were received for individual building blocks.

1.3 Much work has been carried out since the consultation period on the objectives and options consultation closed with additional pieces of evidence and research being undertaken as well as meetings and discussions with stakeholders. Work on the Core Strategy document has therefore progressed as a result of the consultation and additional work and two documents looking specifically at housing and employment requirements over the Core Strategy period are now the subject of consultation. These documents will set out in much more detail future proposals for the Core Strategy and will enable more meaningful engagement of stakeholders in the selection of a preferred option.

2 Schedule of Responses - Issues

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
GENERAL			
CSOO/2	Mr. Peter Briggs	<p>Following receipt of your letter dated 19 July regarding the above and referral to the report on the website, may I advise you of the following comments from the members of Appleton Parish Council: 1 Strategic Option 2 It is recommended that, due to the perceived sufficiency of brownfield sites to accommodate residential requirements for the foreseeable future, the HCA sites at Appleton Cross, Grappenhall Heys and Pewterspear should be redesignated from the 'amber' area to the 'pink' area - 'Areas where development would be restrained over the plan period'.</p> <p>2 Stockton Heath and South Warrington - Objectives/Options Former New Town Housing sites - Grappenhall Heys, Appleton Cross, Pewterspear. The preferred option is (ii) 'Include in the Green Belt' and therefore exclude the plan objective for these areas due to the inadequacy of the roads infrastructure to accommodate any further housing development.</p> <p>3 Warrington Rugby Union Football Club As a 'green open space', it should remain as such and not be nominated for consideration as a housing site in the SHLAA.</p> <p>4 The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements - Objectives/Options Barleycastle Trading Estate. The option - 'The current policy framework would remain appropriate.' is unacceptable with strategic intervention required on the grounds that there should be no further expansion unless the access road infrastructure both from the Estates onto Barleycastle Lane and Barleycastle Lane itself up to and including its junction with Grappenhall Lane/B5356 are substantially improved.</p> <p>5 The Villages - Land at Stretton Road/Arley Road, Appleton Thorn. Unsuitable for inclusion in the SHLAA as a potential long term housing site as road infrastructure inadequate to accommodate any further increase in traffic.</p>	<p>1 Comment noted. This is an issue that is to be considered further in the context of determining the overall level of housing to be planned for in the core strategy, and the assessment of the capacity of available sites to deliver this. This will be set out in the next stages of work.</p> <p>2 To make this strategic change to the extent of the Green Belt would require the demonstration of very special circumstances and none are identified. The Green Belt was established very recently in 2006 following a thorough examination of all the issues.</p> <p>3 & 5 Inclusion of a site within the SHLAA carries no implication that it will be developed or allocated for development. The SHLAA is a pool of sites for assessment as the document makes clear.</p> <p>4 There is limited capacity for additional development within the designated area of the former airfield and there is no intention to extend this area. The current policy approach ensures that the traffic impacts of any further development are assessed and taken into full account.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/3	Civil Aviation Authority	<p>Whilst the CAA would not wish to comment on such plans, where officially safeguarded aerodromes lie within the Council's area of jurisdiction, we recommend that the Council considers the need of such aerodrome(s) within your development plan and consult with the aerodrome operator (s) / licensee (s) directly.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the comments above, the following, whilst by no means a comprehensive list of all development/aviation related issues, might provide useful background material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Other' Civil Aerodromes. Operators/licence holders of civil aerodromes other than those that are officially safeguarded are advised to take steps to protect their locations from the effects of possible adverse development. To this end local authorities might agree to accept a 'non-official' safeguarding map from any local aeronautical site. If the Council has agreed to hold such maps, it should approach the site operator directly for comment on planning matters. Local planning authorities are asked to respond sympathetically to requests for non-official safeguarding maps at the request of any aerodrome operator or local planning authority. ODPM Circular 1/2003 (Annex 2, paragraph 13) refers. • Telecom Installations. Whilst it is noted that the General Development Order states that applications for masts within 3km of an aerodrome should contain evidence of notification to the CAA or aerodrome operator, the appropriate contact is the aerodrome operator. Notification to the CAA will result in advice to contact the aerodrome operator. • Wind Turbines. All wind turbine proposals, whether prior to, or at, formal planning application stage, should be notified to both the CAA's Directorate of Airspace Policy and to the Ministry of Defence (Defence Estates). • High Structures. Notwithstanding the requirements of local aerodrome operators to consider the impact of structures within their (officially or unofficially) safeguarding area, away from the immediate vicinity of an aerodrome, tall structures might nevertheless constitute an aviation hazard. In view of this, there is a mandatory lighting requirement for structures of a height of 150m or more. Moreover, away from aerodromes, even structures less than 150m high may need to be lit by virtue of their nature or location they constitute a significant hazard to air navigation. It is recommended that all proposed developments over 90m in height should be notified to the Directorate of Airspace Policy (DAP) and comment sought relating to the need or otherwise for aviation obstruction lights. <p>Additionally, to cater for the need to record in aviation documents and charts structures extending 91.4m (300ft) above ground level, local planning authorities are asked to inform the CAA/DAP about developments that might breach this level.</p>	Comments noted.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/9	David Percival Strategic Planning Group Leader Salford City Council	<p>DfT / ODPM Circular 1/2003 (Annex 2, paragraph 30-32) refers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Venting and Flaring. Venting and flaring of gas should be anticipated with mineral extraction. This might have a potential impact upon the safe operation of aircraft in the immediate vicinity. With this in mind, should planning permission be granted, it would be essential to establish whether such releases of gas would constitute a potential danger to overflying aircraft. If there were such a danger, the site would need to be promulgated to the aviation community along with advisory avoidance criteria. <p>Salford City Council is unable to comment on the overall strategy for Warrington given the lack of detail on the proposed scale and distribution of development. Further representations will be made once this detail is available.</p>	Further consultation will take place when more information is available.
CSOO/12	Steven Broomhead NWDA	<p>As currently drafted the vision refers to Warrington having unrivalled access to national transport infrastructure <i>through the regional transport interchange</i>. This needs further explanation as it is not referred to elsewhere.</p> <p>The consultation paper sets out detailed objectives on a range of thematic and area-based issues. However, it would be helpful if further clarity was provided on the two key strategic issues of the amount of new housing and employment land provision during the plan period.</p> <p>The consultation paper refers to the coalition Government's intention to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies. As you will be aware, the Secretary of State revoked Regional Strategies with immediate effect on 6th July 2010. With regards to future housing provision, paragraph 1.15 and Housing Objectives H1 and H6 indicate that in the absence of RSS the Council will only be able to determine whether a housing figure is needed when the Government issues further guidance on future changes to the planning system. However, guidance issued with the decision to revoke Regional Strategies indicates that Core Strategies still need to establish housing numbers and maintain a 5 years supply of housing land. The key issue would therefore appear to be whether the Council retains the housing figure from RSS or decides to review it, having regard to more up-to-date evidence.</p>	<p>Rather than the phrase 'through the regional transport interchange' we will use the more familiar expression 'through its role as a key transport hub'</p> <p>It is agreed that the provision of housing and employment land are two key issues for the Core Strategy. Work has progressed following the Coalition Government's stated intention to abolish RSS and two papers setting out options for future housing and employment provision have been published for consultation.</p> <p>Reference will be made to Central Warrington as a strategic regional site and as the context for a number of individual sites, in the next round of consultation.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>This is, in our view, a key strategic issue which will need to be addressed before the Preferred Options stage. It is essential that future economic growth is supported by an appropriate supply and range of new housing.</p> <p>Objective E1 is to identify sufficient land to meet demand for economic development between 2003 and 2026. The associated options are to maintain the current level of economic development; plan for a reduced level of economic development; or plan for an increased level of economic development. However, the consultation paper provides no indication of the amount of land that would be provided under these options. In order to make informed comments, it would have been helpful to see indicative figures for each option, taking account of recent take-up rates and evidence of future demand.</p> <p>The economy section contains references to Omega and Central Warrington, both of which have been designated as strategic regional sites by the Agency. Omega South was designated in December 2001. In July 2009, the NWDA Board reaffirmed the designation of Omega South and identified Central Warrington as an additional strategic regional site. Whilst the town centre section of the consultation paper refers to sites within Central Warrington such as Bridge Street, Time Square, the market, Wireworks and Central Station, it makes no specific reference to the Central Warrington strategic regional site.</p> <p>As you will be aware, PPS12 (paragraphs 4.6 - 4.7) says that Core Strategies may allocate strategic sites for development, but cautions against the inclusion of non-strategic sites. We suggest that, rather than treating the above sites in isolation, the Core Strategy provides an overarching context for the Central Warrington strategic regional site, based on the following purpose which we have already agreed with the Council:</p> <p><i>The Central Warrington strategic regional site provides the opportunity to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Generate growth especially in indigenous sectors and higher value jobs;</i> ● <i>Bring forward knowledge based investment sites; and</i> ● <i>Create a high quality, sustainable environment with improved linkages to the town centre.</i> <p>With regard to the Bridge Street area the consultation paper notes that the Council has extended its landholdings in this area. As this was achieved with assistance from the NWDA, we would not support Option 1 (i.e. 'no further action'). We would support options (ii) or (iii), although the</p>	<p>Support for options 2 & 3 for the Bridge Street area noted.</p> <p>A strategic location is identified diagrammatically on the key diagram, and has no defined site boundaries.</p> <p>A strategic allocation is a specific proposal that allocates a key site with precise boundaries for a specific development, with an associated delivery plan.</p> <p>We will clarify the objectives for WW2 and WW3. Reference to PPS4 will be added. Local and sub-regional strategies rather than policy would be a better term, embracing the Regeneration Framework, and 'Realising the Potential' for example.</p> <p>Opportunity to comment on more specific options for Omega will follow, together with associated supporting information.</p> <p>The draft purpose for Omega is noted with interest: we would envisage some difficulty in interpreting 'nationally and regionally significant' and 'inward investment' in a planning policy (and particularly decision making) context. Also, significance might arise from the cumulative effect of a number of individually less significant developments through clustering</p> <p>The background information relating to the Atlantic Gateway and the Climate Change Action Plan is noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>distinction between identifying the area as a strategic location and defining it as a strategic allocation is not entirely clear to us as both options would promote the area for a similar range of town centre uses.</p> <p>The consultation paper acknowledges that many of the sites identified within it raise no strategic issues. Having regard to the advice in PPS12, we would suggest that such sites are better dealt with in the Land Allocations DPD rather than the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The section on West Warrington identifies objectives and options for the Omega site. We suspect that Objectives WW2 and WW3 relate to the non-strategic and strategic elements of the site respectively, although due to the layout of the report, this is not absolutely clear. Clarification would be helpful.</p> <p>With regard to the options identified for Omega, option (i) is to revise the existing masterplan 'in the context of current local and sub-regional policy'. It is not clear which particular policies are being referred to here, although it would also seem appropriate to have regard to national planning policy changes set out in PPS4 ' <i>Planning for sustainable Economic Growth</i> ' (2009).</p> <p>The remaining options both entail 'reconsidering options', either for the strategic element of the site (option ii) or the site as a whole site (option iii). As with option (i), these options also imply a need to revise the existing masterplan. All three options are thus in line with the Council's overarching Strategic Option 2 which identifies Omega as an area where development will be reviewed and selectively promoted. What is not yet clear, however, is how any of these options might change the potential mix of land uses at Omega. The options make no reference, for example, changing market demand and economic conditions. In the absence of such information, we are not in a position to make informed comments on the options.</p> <p>Following the Agency's review of strategic regional sites, in June 2009 our Board Members identified the following draft purpose for Omega:</p> <p><i>Omega s intended to provide a flagship site to attract inward investment. The strategic regional site will:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Act as a regional flagship for inward investment by providing a site which has the environment, space and flexibility to provide a unique offer within the region; and</i> • <i>Accommodate nationally and regionally significant new development in the region, with particular emphasis on manufacturing and process industry inward investment.</i> 	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/13	Scottish and Southern Energy plc	<p>We note that the objective for Port Warrington makes reference to NWDA involvement in the Atlantic Gateway concept. Following work undertaken on behalf of the Agency by consultants Ekosgen, a non-statutory framework document for the Atlantic Gateway was published in Liverpool City Regions, including Warrington Council. Partners are still considering how best to take forward the Atlantic Gateway Framework.</p> <p>On a matter of detail, the Regional Climate Change Action Plan (referenced on page 23) was jointly prepared by NWDA, 4NW, GONW and the Environment Agency.</p>	
		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the above consultation. These comments are made on behalf of SP Manweb plc, the electricity distribution network operator (DNO) for the Warrington area. SP Manweb's DNO licence covers Merseyside, Cheshire and North Wales and covers the electricity network at 132kV and below. Network above 132kV is the transmission network and is the responsibility of National Grid. SP Manweb is keen to be involved in developing planning policy documents as it is required from time to time to bring forward schemes which require planning permission. These include substation developments and overhead line proposals. Recent projects in the Warrington area include the 132kV overhead line reinforcement project between Carrington and Lostock and the new 33kV primary substation in Higher Lane, Lymm. Such projects are required to be considered against planning policies and so it helps both in the design and implementation stages to have policies which help guide the location, siting and design of these developments.</p> <p>Turning to the above document, it is noted that electricity supply is referred to in paras 4.7 to 4.13 with 4.7 to 4.9 referring to electricity distribution. These paras however then go on to refer to National Grid which is better placed in paras 4.10 to 4.12.</p> <p>In terms of referring to background information on behalf of SP Manweb, I understand you have a copy of the latest Long Term Development Statement which should contain text relevant to these sections and leave this to you to decide how much to include.</p> <p>In referring to the LTDS, I would also refer you to Appendix A5 which lists proposals in Cheshire, in particular, C14 which refers to work at Fiddlers Ferry. This is the project which I have recently spoken to your colleagues about and enclose the draft Project Briefing Note. The purpose of this proposal is to improve supplies on the west Warrington circuits which are currently short of the required Ofgen regulatory standard of electricity supplies (referred to as 'P2/6'). SP Manweb has</p>	<p>Comments welcomed. A response to the issues raised are included in the Infrastructure Consultation Paper.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/7	John Smith Equality and Human Rights Commission	<p>recently committed investment for building a new 132KV grid substation which would resolve this problem. I would suggest that this project should be included in your capacity assessment. Maybe we could meet over next few weeks to discuss?</p> <p>In respect of other aspects of the network, and assuming the implementation of the Carrington - Lostock circuit on which work is due to start in 2011, these are operating as per required operational standards. This however is not to say that there is adequate capacity for future development. Such increases in supply would need to be in the first instance the subject of connection applications which would be made by developers promoting development schemes. These connections may require work at varying voltage levels and would be assessed at the time the applications are made.</p> <p>As discussed, and from my experience of dealing with similar infrastructure plans, it would be a good idea to list the key development sites and list against these the anticipated developer partner if known. For most, I imagine SP Manweb is likely to be a delivery partner rather than lead partner. For the Carrington - Lostock and Warrington West projects we would of course be lead partners.</p>	Comments noted
CS00/24	Turley Associates on behalf of MEPC Birchwood Park General Partner LTD	<p>As you are aware, Birchwood Park is a long established and successful business park and is one of the largest employment sites in the borough. My client, as the owner of the park, is committed to long term investment in it and continuing its development to provide high quality employment opportunities, building on its success to date.</p>	<p>The 10 year Masterplan was produced in 1998 and as the comment states 'Birchwood Park is a long established and successful business park'. While there is no denying the importance of this site for</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>It is in this context that I make these comments, and set out below representations specifically relating to the Strategic Option and objectives and options contained within the Economy, East Warrington and Sustainability and Climate Change sections.</p> <p>Strategic Option</p> <p>I note that the Issues and Options sought views on which areas constituted 'strategic sites' and categorised these sites depending on the degree of promotion or restraint that would be applied to growth. Our representations to this earlier document highlighted the omission of Birchwood Park as a Strategic Site, despite recognition of its importance within the Core Strategy evidence base, and resultant non-classification within the above categories as a significant oversight.</p> <p>The Strategic Option set out within the introduction to the Objectives and Options document again omits Birchwood Park, in spite of the most recent evidence base making numerous references to, and acknowledgement elsewhere within the current consultation paper, of Birchwood Park's importance.</p> <p>I would reiterate that Birchwood Park is subject to a 10 year masterplan which has been partly implemented and its development and growth will continue through the Core Strategy plan period. It is, therefore, essential that the emerging Core Strategy supports its role within the Borough and as part of wider Birchwood area, supporting its ongoing regeneration and the development of Birchwood Park.</p> <p>It is my repeated contention that the chosen Strategic Option, as currently worded, underplays the current profile, role and historic success of Birchwood Park and will potentially hinder economic growth to the detriment of the stated objectives and vision underpinning the Core Strategy. MEPC, therefore, objects to the exclusion of Birchwood Park as a 'Strategic Site' and requests that it is included within either of the first two categories, i.e. areas where development would be promoted or would be reviewed and selectively promoted through monitoring and management.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>It is encouraging that the Core Strategy Objective and Options recognises the importance of Birchwood Park to the borough as a source of high quality employment, which generates significant amounts of employment and investment in the borough. However, my client objects to the current wording of Strategic Option 2 which is not consistent with the acknowledged role of Birchwood Park to the borough (which is implicit throughout the rest of the document) and I request that the</p>	<p>the Warrington economy, the evidence suggests that the land remaining available for development amounts to some 10ha, and with all due respect to the quality and importance of the established business park, there are no strategic issues that need to be addressed in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Further details of the future level of economic growth in the borough will be made available shortly.</p> <p>See further references in the East Warrington section.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/69	Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes	<p>suggested changes are incorporated to ensure that the Core Strategy places the appropriate level of priority on it. A promotional approach should also be adopted with regard to Birchwood Park and its role within East Warrington, reflecting its ongoing role as a flagship employment location of sub-regional importance.</p> <p>In addition, a positive approach should be taken to the level of economic growth that the borough should be seeking to accommodate, ensuring that future investment and economic opportunities are artificially constrained.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the site contributes to the 5yr supply of housing land</p> <p>It is agreed that 380 dpa is the borough's 'option 1' number: there is no suggestion that this should be reduced.</p> <p>Comments on the apartment market and the extent of the regeneration area are noted.</p>
		<p>We have previously submitted comments at the Issues and Options stage (23/03/09) and draft Core Strategy stage (letter of 17/2/10). Since then, we have secured an interest in the former G&J Greenalls site south of Loushers Lane in Warrington. The site benefits from an outline planning permission (Ref.2007/12085) for up to 178 dwellings plus secure elderly accommodation, and we have recently held meetings with planning officers when our draft Reserved Matters layout for the housing element was tabled for comment. Alternatively, a new planning application could be submitted. If the latter route were pursued, we wish to ensure that the planning policy framework is supportive of the site's regeneration for residential development. Since the outline consent was granted (on 26th February 2008) there have been no material changes to policy to support a departure from the position that the site is wholly suited for residential development and therefore your Core Strategy should support this and not prejudice this position in any way. Should the latter be the case, we reserve the right to make further submissions to protect our interest. The site is not only suitable but deliverable and available and, as an existing commitment, will contribute to the Council's first 5 year housing supply.</p> <p>We provide the following comments specific to your draft (Refined) Objectives and Options:</p> <p>1. Reference is made in the introduction to recent changes to Central Government policy (ongoing). In terms of RSS, your 6,840 minimum housing target (net) is the same as your Option 1 position and we are therefore encouraged by (and support) the maintenance of this minimum level of housing growth which supports continued economic development in the Borough. We will resist any efforts to reduce this target figure and seek a Core Strategy based upon at least 6,840 new homes (net) and to not treat that figure as a ceiling but as a minimum, as intended;</p> <p>2. Strategic Option 2 - given the poor state of the apartment market and the lack of any indication of its return, we caution against the emphasis on town centre and waterfront sites which are clearly intended for higher density residential development. As with our competitors, Bellway</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>Homes has been re-planning consented sites in order to remove the apartment element. In securing new sites (which we are, as we are debt free and have funds for land acquisition) we are seeking to typically build 2 storey houses. The reason for this is simple - due to the ongoing credit crisis, this sector of the housing market has fared better. Banks are not lending for apartments and there are few in the market seeking such properties and if they are, there are plenty that remain empty. As a consequence, an apartment-led policy approach to these 2 sites will not deliver regeneration or new homes, and lower density housing should therefore also be considered. As a consequence, the Core Strategy will need other sites elsewhere in order to deliver your Option 1/RSS requirements. This will include Regeneration Areas, which are referred to as the older parts of Warrington Town. As this is a Refined Stage in the Core Strategy, these areas should be clearly defined and an O.S map provided in the Core Strategy that defines precisely the Regeneration Areas. Our site at G&J should be included as a Regeneration Area or within a wider such area, as it is PDL and is part of the wider transformation of the area away from its historic brewing activities. Should this site fall outside of the 'green' (preferably) and 'amber' (at a minimum) areas within Option 2 we will object to the Core Strategy accordingly as we strongly believe that the redevelopment of the site is not to be restrained by evolving policy;</p> <p>3. Policy WI - support, as it recognises the need to meet a range of demands including family housing;</p>	
CSOO/35	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Para 1.1.4 - The possibility of a case being made for affordable housing development in Lymm is acknowledged. However, if an adjustment is to be made to Strategic Options Table then it is considered that it needs to be specific to the reason why it is considered that Lymm needs to be added to the 'amber area'. In other words rather than just adding "Lymm" to this section a more precise form of words should be used relating to the case that has been advanced, i.e. "Development within the built footprint of Lymm in order to provide affordable housing".</p> <p>Development Management Paras 1.16 - 1.18 - It is noted that the policy basis for the assessment of planning applications has changed significantly following the recent Government decision to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies. The approach to date will have been one of ensuring that Regional policies are not being duplicated</p>	<p>The change suggested in response to para.1.14 would be contrary to PPG2 which sets out the approach to development within settlements 'inset' within the green belt. The change proposed by the Council relates to the status of Lymm as a 'building block' and not the management of development within it.</p> <p>With regard to paras 1.16 - 1.18 the Council is well aware of the need to address the implications of the intention to abolish RSS. This does not affect the status of the adopted UDP saved policies.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/56	Richard Frudd Indigo Planning Limited	<p>in LDDs; however, it will now be important to assess what gaps that have been created following the abolition of the NW RSS now need to be filled by the LDD - particular attention in this regard is drawn to the Environmental Management Policies in the NW RSS.</p> <p>Page 9 Vision in 2026 The Trust remains concerned about the excessive domination of economic considerations within the overall Vision at the expense of other sustainable development objectives. The lack of aspiration for the Borough's heritage and natural environment resources remains a significant gap. The Trust would expect to see the overall Vision committing to the safeguarding and enhancement of its valued assets - especially as these are of themselves important to the economy of Warrington, especially in terms of its attractiveness for tourism as well as its role in improving the quality of life of residents, employees and visitors (it is noted that the economic vision [page 17] includes a specific aspiration to improve the visitor economy). The overarching need to address climate change both in terms of reducing emissions and adapting to those changes that are now unavoidable also needs to be encompassed within this part of the Core Strategy. Appropriate overarching Objectives in respect of environmental resources and climate change also need to be incorporated into this part of the Vision. It is noted that whilst subsequent Objective E4 includes a specific reference to new economic development addressing the challenges of climate change there is no such consideration in the housing objectives.</p> <p>W2 - it is considered that both options need to be pursued - they are not alternatives.</p> <p>W3 - Option ii is considered to be the most appropriate having regard to the wider role of Green Infrastructure, the need to ensure that it secures a range of multi-functional benefits, and its strategic and local importance as part of an Adaptation Strategy to address climate change impacts.</p> <p>W4 - agreed.</p>	<p>The points raised in response to page 9 are addressed in later pages of the document, notably BE1 and pages 21-23. It is however agreed that a reference to climate change / sustainable construction would be a helpful addition to H12.</p> <p>Comments relating to W2, W3, and W4 noted.</p>
		<p>We write to provide some initial brief comments in respect of the above document on behalf of our clients, PRUJIM, in advance of the submission draft Core Strategy being published for consultation later in the year.</p> <p>The comments are focused on the vision and objectives for 'Warrington's Centres', and should be read within the context of PRUJIM's longstanding property interests and investment in various sites across the Borough, not least the Riverside Retail Park adjoining the town centre.</p>	<p>Comments noted and will be taken into account as we move towards preferred options</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>PRUPIM are supportive of the overall vision to support the vitality and viability of Warrington town centre and other centres within the defined shopping hierarchy. They also recognise the requirement (Objective WC4) to protect these centres from "...the harmful impacts of inappropriate retail development in edge of centre and out of centre locations" [Indigo emphasis]. However, edge or out of centre retail development need not necessarily be 'harmful', or 'inappropriate'. This will be determined having regard to the full facts of each case.</p> <p>Three potential policy options are outlined as a means by which to prevent such harmful impacts, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "i) Maintain current general policy reflecting national policy in terms of sequential and impact test; ii) Introduce more specific policies explicitly limiting edge and/or out of centre retailing to bulky goods whether changes of use, new development, or extensions to existing stores; iii) Set local thresholds for sequential and impact tests for new floorspace." <p>PRUPIM strongly object to Option (ii) being incorporated within the emerging Core Strategy. The imposition of a blanket requirement for all new floorspace outside of the town centre to be restricted to 'bulky goods' retail use is without planning policy (PPS4) foundation and represents an unnecessarily arbitrary approach which is unlikely to pass the 'soundness' test (PPS12). Furthermore, it would have the effect of deterring future investment in the town which would assist its economic vitality and viability.</p> <p>Nowhere in PPS4 does it suggest that all forms of out of centre retail development should be resisted, or that such arbitrary restrictions should be placed on its use. Rather, a comprehensive 'impact' test (alongside the sequential test) has to be passed in order to secure support for any such proposal; consideration of this test will form the basis for a judgement to be made as to whether it is necessary and reasonable to impose a restriction on the nature of retail goods which can be sold from the proposed development (i.e. whether or not there is a need for a 'bulky goods' restriction).</p> <p>In summary, PRUPIM support Option (i) which would maintain the approach of adherence with national policy, thereby ensuring that the policy meets the 'soundness' test, whilst providing sufficient control and scope to protect and maintain the vitality and viability of the established shopping centres.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/61	Turley Associates on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	<p>We trust that the above comments are self explanatory and that they will be taken into account in preparation of the submission draft Core Strategy. In the meantime, should you have any queries on the matters raised then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Strategic Options</p> <p>Firstly, Sainsbury's would like to express there continued support for the Council's identified aspiration to revitalise Warrington town centre and specifically strategic option 2 which does not restrain development within the 'suburban' areas of the town.</p> <p>Objective WC1</p> <p>Objective WC1 sets out a need to provide for retailing in the borough over the plan period 2011 - 2026. Whilst the updated retail and leisure study provides evidence that there is currently no need for further retail allocations, a policy should be included within the Core Strategy to allow district and local centres to continue to serve the retail needs of local communities.</p> <p>Objective WC4</p> <p>Objective WC4 seeks to protect the town centre and other centres identified in the retail hierarchy from the harmful impacts of inappropriate retail development in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations. As recognised within the consultation document, the updated retail and leisure study for the borough recommends the designation of a new neighbourhood centre at Chapelford Urban Village and Sainsbury's support this revision to the retail hierarchy.</p> <p>In relation to new planning applications for new edge and out-of centre retail developments, Sainsbury's would wish to see the current general policy approach maintained, reflecting national planning policy within PPS4 in terms of sequential and impact test.</p> <p>Objective WC5</p> <p>Objective WC5 seeks to set guidelines for the level of additional provision that would be appropriate to the role, function and catchment of the centres within the borough. With respect to the options identified, Sainsbury's support the current policy approach continued, with no specific reference</p>	<p>The comments made and preferences expressed will be taken into account as work proceeds.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/133	Gerry McCann Croft Parish Council	<p>to floor space limits for different types of centre stipulated. The impact of such developments should be determined, in accordance with national planning policy guidance, through Retail Impact Assessment thereby ensuring that the proposal is of an appropriate scale.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving your confirmation of receipt. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>The parish council has no comments to make on the Local Development Framework.</p>	Noted
CSOO/124	Peel Land and Property Limited	<p>Peel fully supports the Council's ambitions and growth aspirations for Warrington and wishes to see Warrington play its full role within the Region. Peel believes that the Core Strategy should act to support the delivery of these aspirations and ambitions and should not include potentially restrictive objectives or policies, which might reduce future flexibility and responsiveness.</p> <p>For these reasons Peel supports the options presented which relate to growth and flexibility, for example, Objective W1, H4, H5, H6, E1, WC8 and RA4.</p> <p>Peel also supports the references made to Atlantic Gateway within the Core Strategy. Playing an active role in this concept will assist the Council in realising its key objectives, to the benefit of the Borough and the wider North West Region.</p> <p>However, Peel believes that some of the objectives presented run the risk of restricting the growth that the Council wants to achieve. For example, limiting development and/or flexibility in the supply and/or location of housing and employment land could, in the long term, affect the ambitions of the Borough. This coupled with the changing planning policy landscape being created through changes being made by the Coalition Government suggest that the Council should be more rather than less ambitious. Examples of potential restrictive policies/objectives that might, if adopted, reduce flexibility include: Objectives W4, H1, H7 and option (i) of Objective E1.</p> <p>By way of example, Peel notes that at (1) of paragraph 1.14 of the consultation document that: <i>'document within the built footprint of the larger villages of Lymm and Culcheth should be added to the 'amber' area to enable opportunities to provide affordable homes'</i>.</p>	<p>The Council's ambitions and growth aspirations are based upon the potential of the town centre and older parts of the town through regeneration, and the maintenance of the Green Belt for as far as can be seen ahead is central to the basis of achievement of them. This was the basis upon which the Green Belt boundary was adopted in the 2006 UDP. This approach is consistent with the strategies of our neighbouring Councils, and others in North Cheshire and the Mersey Belt. It has the overwhelming support of Warrington's communities as expressed during preparation of the UDP.</p> <p>The Council is not aware of any significant change to the 'planning policy landscape' or any other factor that would amount to very special circumstances and justify a change to the Green Belt. Statements made by the coalition government have</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/148	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of client	<p>Elsewhere the consultation document it is stated that there should be: '... no need to consider strategy options that involve a review of the Green Belt at this stage or during the plan period' (Objective W4).</p> <p>However, Peel believes that the Council should retain the potential for Green Belt review - to retain flexibility and to be able to adjust strategies to achieve wider Core Strategy objectives. The importance of delivering housing in areas attractive to the market is recognised in Objective W1, and this is welcomed.</p> <p>By way of another example, potentially limiting (in policy terms) new housing in Lymm and Culcheth to 'affordable housing' further restricts flexibility and potential both for the Borough and for these settlements and their communities.</p> <p>The Council should consider scope for housing types other than affordable, for example, housing to meet local needs, Lifetime Homes, special needs and rural housing, all of which have important and beneficial roles to play both within and adjacent to the current boundaries of these important rural settlements / communities.</p> <p>Promoting and encouraging a range of sites which are genuinely deliverable and are attractive to the market will be critical in securing housing provision, which in turn can help underpin wider social, economic and environmental regeneration strategies across the Borough, at sub-regional and regional levels.</p> <p>Peel believes that the Core Strategy should allow for (in policy terms) future consideration of justified Green Belt alterations, during the plan period and where appropriate, in order to deliver the variety of housing which the Borough requires both now and in the future.</p>	<p>reaffirmed their commitment to the Green Belt, and the status of saved policies in adopted development plans.</p> <p>It is not agreed that there is no scope for flexibility and responsiveness within the approach set out to date. Significant development opportunities exist at the edge of the town of Warrington to the north, west, and south, without the need to alter Green Belt boundaries. There is even less need to alter the Green Belt boundaries of inset settlements in the countryside such as Lymm and Culcheth, as mentioned. Incidentally, these are not 'rural' settlements in terms of the rural/urban characterisation of 2004 that PPS3 advises should be used.</p> <p>Discussion papers setting out options for future development requirements in the wake of intended RSS abolition are now available.</p>
	<p>Our particular interest relates to land at Booth's Lane, south of Lymm. This site has been submitted to the LDF and SHLAA process although a location plan is enclosed for ease of reference. However we trust that these comments also assist you on the emerging Core Strategy as a whole.</p> <p>We note that the plan is at an early stage, but there are a number of sections of the consultation document which we wish to make comments on. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Strategic Options; ● Housing; 	<p>Many of the issues raised, particularly relating to housing, the economy, and the countryside/settlements, repeat the comments made earlier in the process and have been responded to.</p> <p>The intended abolition of RSS is of course a new factor, and we are currently preparing a note relating to future housing</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Economy; • The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements • Tourism and Leisure; and, • Lymm. <p>Strategic Options</p> <p>Section 1 sets out that the council's preferred strategic option for the Core Strategy is provided by 'Option 2': Prioritising development on Inner Warrington brownfield sites with selective release of other sites.</p> <p>In the recent past, planning policy has directed housing into Central Warrington. The housing restriction policy that has been in place has emphasised this. We consider that in light of the revocation of the RSS, now is the appropriate time to review the amount and distribution of housing development to be delivered in the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 would rely too heavily on meeting the annual housing requirement through inner Warrington brownfield sites. We consider that such an over reliance would compromise the borough meeting its overall vision and is not in conformity with the Council's own evidence on housing need.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in inner Warrington would mainly deliver 1 and 2 bedroom flats, often for private rent, and does not meet the requirements for family housing. There is a recognised shortage of family housing at national and local level. In Warrington, the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 68.7% of new dwellings should be market accommodation, 4.1% intermediate and 27.2% social rented. • Greatest market requirement is for larger 3 and 4+ bedroom units with relatively little net demand for additional flats. <p>The study also recognises that Warrington has house prices above the North-West average, and first time buyers struggle to get onto the housing market.</p>	<p>and employment land provision in the borough. This will be mindful of guidance issued with the revocation order that government recognises that LPAs may wish to proceed on the basis of their 'Option 1' numbers, or continue with figures that were in the RSS. In Warrington's case, as indeed is mostly the case across the Region, the Option 1 number was the same as the figure contained in Approved RSS, and is the figure on which the Adopted UDP is based. The status of the UDP remains unchanged by the intended abolition of RSS.</p> <p>We note the comments relating to Option 2, but would point out that this ignores the 'monitor and manage' approach and the inclusion within this option of the selective release of other sites; the criteria for which have yet to be detailed but will relate monitoring to objectives and delivery to embrace the issues raised about the mix of housing. The contention that brownfield sites do not meet the requirements for family housing is not supported by evidence.</p> <p>Significant greenfield options are available within the scope of the three defined strategy options without any need to look at land within the Green Belt, if required to meet housing needs.</p> <p>The presumption that the starting point is that Green Belt boundaries will remain unchanged is fully justified and the</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>We consider that the requirement for 2, 3 and 4 bedroom family housing, including affordable housing, can only be met through the allocation of land outside inner Warrington which will require the release of greenfield / Green Belt land. We do not disagree with the priority to develop previously developed sites, but to meet its housing needs the Council needs to cast it net wider.</p> <p>The consultation document sets out that objective W4 is to maintain the permanence of the Green Belt and protect it from inappropriate development. It continues to state that the evidence demonstrates that development needs can be met without the need to consider any areas or sites currently in the Green Belt. No options are therefore provided, and it is identified that the Core Strategy will look to continue this policy approach.</p> <p>We object to the assertion that Green Belt boundaries will remain unaltered throughout the plan period, as the scale and type of housing needed in the borough is yet to be determined. Such a policy does not accord with the Council's development needs as can be seen from the following studies.</p> <p>The 2007 SHMA identified some 999 new households in Warrington per annum which is significantly above the RSS figure of 380 dwellings per annum. This figure was not updated as part of the 2009 SHMA as paragraph S38 stated that " <i>The report does not make any attempt to establish the overall requirement for housing as this is largely set out in targets already in place for the Borough</i> ". With the RSS now revoked the Council needs to demonstrate its housing need.</p> <p>The latest DCLG household projections (2006 based) state that the number of households in Warrington will increase from 81,000 in 2006 to 97,000 in 2026. This equates to 800 new households per annum.</p> <p>Therefore to be so prescriptive at this early stage in the plan process as to the Council's preferred option is prejudging the existing and emerging evidence base. We consider that to satisfy specific housing need Option 2 cannot be relied upon.</p> <p>Conclusions</p>	<p>comments made fail to establish very special or exceptional circumstances. The new government has also reconfirmed the commitment to maintain green belt boundaries, and threats to the green belt appear to have been a significant consideration in the intention to abolish RSSs.</p> <p>Therefore while it is appropriate to give further consideration to the level of housing and employment to be planned for in the Core Strategy, and the note being prepared takes account of the SHMA and DCLG forecasts, it is entirely appropriate that this should be addressed within the strategic constraint of the green belt boundary.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/15	Rose Freeman Theatres Trust	<p>In the recent past, planning policy has directed housing into Central Warrington. The housing restriction policy that has been in place has emphasised this. We consider that in light of the revocation of the RSS, now is the correct time to review the amount and distribution of housing development to be delivered in the borough and for a realistic housing requirement to be set to meet housing need.</p> <p>Employment land, retail and housing needs, particularly outside the Warrington urban area cannot be met solely through the continued focus on brownfield sites in central Warrington. Further land is required in settlements such as Lymm to meet development needs that would ensure the long term sustainability of settlements and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>We therefore consider that development opportunities, including potential amendments to Green Belt boundaries, should be considered through the Local Development Framework. We question the predetermined view that the Green Belt boundary is to remain throughout the entire plan period when the Council's own SHMA identifies the need for substantially more housing.</p> <p>We object to Lymm being considered within the 'countryside and its constituent settlements' category. We consider that it should be a Key Service Centre and identified as suitable for housing, employment and retail growth to meet the needs of settlement and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>We would be grateful for your consideration of these representations and taking a full part in the emerging LDF process.</p>	<p>These comments will be taken into account as work proceeds.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>i) There are so many Objectives that we would be surprised if any had been missed. We are pleased to see that cultural facilities are included in HP4 but would like to point out that the protection and enhancement of existing leisure and cultural facilities is of paramount importance as these provide vital elements for town centre uses.</p> <p>ii) Our recommendation would be that for succinctness and clarity each Objective heading should have only one objective which would be sufficient to provide a 'platform' for subsequent more detailed policy descriptions. The detail in all the objectives would be brought out in the accompanying text to each policy and in the Reasoned Justification. There are so many objectives which, if all are transferred to the draft Core Strategy, will make the whole DPD too large and unmanageable.</p> <p>iii) With regard to HP4, W2 and WC3 options for the current policy approach should acknowledge existing town centre uses as well as providing for deficits. Current policy approaches usually ignore existing assets although we are pleased to see your Parr Hall is recognized in TC5.</p> <p>iv) Where appropriate policies should protect and promote your existing established community, cultural and leisure facilities as without such a policy it could become difficult to retain an essential community asset particularly where land values become higher for an alternative use. The Trust particularly asks that the document provides sufficient protection to ensure continued theatre use in other venues particularly where buildings providing performance arts may not be covered by listing or conservation area designations, or may be affected by proposals which come forward for other development sites. This should include performing arts facilities that stand-alone, are part of other facilities, or are contained within educational or community buildings.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>Please add page numbers. The Contents listings have page numbers but none of the pages are numbered!</p> <p>We look forward to being consulted on the next Core Strategy stage. Development Management Polices, Planning Obligations and town centre Area Action Plans.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments																																							
CS00/23	Duncan Richardson Neighbourhood and Community Services	<p>I would make the following observations on the core strategy.</p> <p>At 5.16 I am sure others will point out that the Government has now withdrawn the BSF programme.</p> <p>Strategy now needs to reflect aspiration to improve secondary and primary infrastructure, Children's Services should advise.</p> <p>At the section for community centres, there is no reflection of the present Council's community centres and community houses infrastructure at the following venues :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="671 752 1318 1749"> <thead> <tr> <th>CENTRE</th> <th>ADDRESS 1</th> <th>ADDRESS 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bewsey Gym</td> <td>Lockton Lane</td> <td>Bewsey</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BewseyPark Pavilion</td> <td>Troutbeck Avenue</td> <td>Bewsey</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Burtonwood Community Centre</td> <td>Green Jones Brow</td> <td>Burtonwood</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capesthorne Community Centre</td> <td>Orange grove</td> <td>Orford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Croft youth & Activity Centre</td> <td>Smithy Lane</td> <td>Croft</td> </tr> <tr> <td>College Close Community House</td> <td>1 College Close</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Culcheth Age Concern Centre</td> <td>Jackson Avenue</td> <td>Culcheth</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dallam Community House</td> <td>7 Harrison Square</td> <td>Dallam</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fearnhead Cross YAC</td> <td>Insall Road</td> <td>Padgate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greenwood Community Centre</td> <td>Greenwood Crescent</td> <td>Orford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Longshaw StreetCommunity House</td> <td>Longshaw Street</td> <td>Bewsey</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meeting Lane Community Centre</td> <td>Helston Close</td> <td>Penketh</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CENTRE	ADDRESS 1	ADDRESS 2	Bewsey Gym	Lockton Lane	Bewsey	BewseyPark Pavilion	Troutbeck Avenue	Bewsey	Burtonwood Community Centre	Green Jones Brow	Burtonwood	Capesthorne Community Centre	Orange grove	Orford	Croft youth & Activity Centre	Smithy Lane	Croft	College Close Community House	1 College Close		Culcheth Age Concern Centre	Jackson Avenue	Culcheth	Dallam Community House	7 Harrison Square	Dallam	Fearnhead Cross YAC	Insall Road	Padgate	Greenwood Community Centre	Greenwood Crescent	Orford	Longshaw StreetCommunity House	Longshaw Street	Bewsey	Meeting Lane Community Centre	Helston Close	Penketh	<p>Additional information welcomed, and comments noted.</p> <p>Proposals for 'community hubs' will need to be mindful of the Council's adopted policies for the location of community facilities and services, and for the focus for such development in the established network of local and neighbourhood centres.</p>
CENTRE	ADDRESS 1	ADDRESS 2																																								
Bewsey Gym	Lockton Lane	Bewsey																																								
BewseyPark Pavilion	Troutbeck Avenue	Bewsey																																								
Burtonwood Community Centre	Green Jones Brow	Burtonwood																																								
Capesthorne Community Centre	Orange grove	Orford																																								
Croft youth & Activity Centre	Smithy Lane	Croft																																								
College Close Community House	1 College Close																																									
Culcheth Age Concern Centre	Jackson Avenue	Culcheth																																								
Dallam Community House	7 Harrison Square	Dallam																																								
Fearnhead Cross YAC	Insall Road	Padgate																																								
Greenwood Community Centre	Greenwood Crescent	Orford																																								
Longshaw StreetCommunity House	Longshaw Street	Bewsey																																								
Meeting Lane Community Centre	Helston Close	Penketh																																								

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments																								
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Nora Street Community House</td> <td>15-17 Nora Street</td> <td>Howley</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Oakwood Neighbourhood Centre</td> <td>62-64 Whitethroat Walk</td> <td>Oakwood</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Padgate Community Centre</td> <td>Station Road</td> <td>Padgate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Radley Common Community Centre</td> <td>Grasmere Avenue</td> <td>Orford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sandy Lane Community Centre</td> <td>Sandy Lane</td> <td>Stockton Heath</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sankey Bridges Community Centre</td> <td>Old Liverpool Road</td> <td>Sankey Bridges</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Westy Community Centre</td> <td>Bridgewater Avenue</td> <td>Latchford</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Whitcross Community Centre</td> <td>Lexden Street</td> <td>Bewsey</td> </tr> </table>	Nora Street Community House	15-17 Nora Street	Howley	Oakwood Neighbourhood Centre	62-64 Whitethroat Walk	Oakwood	Padgate Community Centre	Station Road	Padgate	Radley Common Community Centre	Grasmere Avenue	Orford	Sandy Lane Community Centre	Sandy Lane	Stockton Heath	Sankey Bridges Community Centre	Old Liverpool Road	Sankey Bridges	Westy Community Centre	Bridgewater Avenue	Latchford	Whitcross Community Centre	Lexden Street	Bewsey	<p>Table 1</p> <p>The Council is currently reviewing this provision and a new strategy to reflect present needs will be produced in early 2011.</p> <p>The Council is also looking to deliver a number of Community Hubs across each of the 5 neighbourhood areas linked to the core Neighbourhood Hubs. The vision for these Community Hubs will be to deliver sustainable community buildings linked to facilities for statutory agencies which reflect the needs and interests of the local community they serve.</p> <p>Section 6 around sport and leisure needs to reflect sports facility strategy and neighbourhood hub development. Target of one neighbourhood hub per neighbourhood area as per development at Orford Park.</p>	
Nora Street Community House	15-17 Nora Street	Howley																									
Oakwood Neighbourhood Centre	62-64 Whitethroat Walk	Oakwood																									
Padgate Community Centre	Station Road	Padgate																									
Radley Common Community Centre	Grasmere Avenue	Orford																									
Sandy Lane Community Centre	Sandy Lane	Stockton Heath																									
Sankey Bridges Community Centre	Old Liverpool Road	Sankey Bridges																									
Westy Community Centre	Bridgewater Avenue	Latchford																									
Whitcross Community Centre	Lexden Street	Bewsey																									
CS00/59	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	We write further to the above referenced consultation, thank you for allowing us the opportunity to comment. Waste Recycling Group (WRG) operate Arpley Landfill site and actively manage the adjacent Moore Nature Reserve. Both facilities provide valuable strategic services to the people and businesses in the Warrington and wider area, although the life of the Arpley landfill	The comments are noted and welcomed. The respondent raises a number of significant issues involving the Arpley landfill site which must be addressed within																								

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>is currently consented to 2013 and the management of the Nature Reserve to 2016 it is considered there is scope, subject to planning approval, to extend management of both facilities well into the proposed plan period.</p> <p>Detailed comments are presented on the relevant sections of the report below, where appropriate extracts from the consultation have been repeated in italics for ease of reference.</p> <p>Strategic Options</p> <p>WRG support the promotion of the Arpley Meadows area for future development. This area borders the existing consented landfill boundary and future development of should be planned mindful of the landfill development, that can in time provide a complimentary adjacent development.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste - Vision in 2026</p> <p>There will be a reduction in the amount of waste sent to landfill as waste is moved up the waste hierarchy, however there will always be some waste (that cannot be economically reused, recycled or recovered) sent to landfill and we are pleased to see that this has been acknowledged within Warrington's vision.</p> <p>WRG agrees with the Warrington vision to ensure sufficient landfill capacity remains within the Borough throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The vision states "<i>The only wastes sent to landfill constitute waste with no further potential for recycling or re-use</i>". WRG suggests that the proposed statement is too restrictive and may lead to significant financial burdens for the Council and businesses within the Warrington area as although many wastes can be recycled, and are, some that technically could be are not as the cost is simply too high or the facilities not locally available (or in some cases nationally). A revised wording of "<i>The only wastes sent to landfill shall constitute waste with no further economic potential for recycling or re-use</i>".</p> <p>Minerals and Waste - Objectives and Options</p> <p>WRG broadly supports the objectives MW1 through to MW3. Regarding the proposed options, WRG considers Option iii appropriate; specific sites should be allocated for strategic large scale waste management facilities supported by criteria based policies.</p>	<p>the Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that the site has historically provided landfill capacity which has been used to meet the sub regional/regional needs for landfill. It is also known that a substantial void will remain when the current planning permission expires in October 2013. The suitability of the Arpley landfill site to continue to provide capacity to meet sub regional landfill needs will be assessed within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>There are a number of documents which supported the production of RSS which are acknowledged as material considerations for emerging Core Strategies. The Council will have regard to the role these documents will have in developing Core Strategy policies.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/127	<p>Rachael Thorne Peel Environmental Limited</p>	<p>We also consider that policy MW3 should be broadened to support the extension of existing facilities before the development of new. This will ensure the use of existing sites are maximised and reduce the need to develop new sites. This point is especially important as Policy EM13 within the North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) required, wherever possible, that existing sites "should be used in preference to other sites where waste management activities have not previously been located". Now that the RSS has been revoked that Policy is no longer afforded any weight. The principle of this approach within the region has however clearly been accepted. It is now be the role of the Local Development Documents to carry this forward. For this reason, Policy MW3 should be amended to specifically reference extensions to existing sites.</p> <p>Policy MW4 states "To reduce the amount of waste imported into the Borough...having regard to sub regional and regional needs...". WRG considers this is likely to be met by the natural completion of a number of landfills in the Warrington area combined with a reduction in tonnage to landfills as waste is moved up the waste hierarchy. This same reduction in landfills, repeated across the North West, will likely result in the remaining landfills acting as sub regionally and regionally important facilities and this should be acknowledged within the policy.</p> <p>As stated in previous submissions, Peel Environmental Limited own, manage and develop all waste and minerals assets owned by the Peel Group. Of relevance to Warrington is Peel's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ownership of Arpley Landfill site • Ownership of Rixton New Hall site and • Development of a network of Coal Bed Methane producing sites throughout Peel's UK landholdings. <p>As such, Peel Environment provides the following comments in response to the consultation document.</p> <p>Peel Environmental agrees with the Mineral and Waste Objectives MW1, MW2, MW3 and MW4. These objectives recognises that whilst waste should be treated at as a high a level of the waste hierarchy as possible, there is still a need to ensure appropriate capacity of landfill for residual waste. It is also important to have regard to regional and sub-regional needs for waste management facilities as specified in MW4.</p>	<p>Comments are noted along with the general support of the objectives.</p> <p>The suitability of the Arpley landfill site to be identified as a specific site for waste management will be addressed within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comments on minerals are appreciated. The safeguarding of minerals and definition of areas of search will be addressed within the Core Strategy or future Allocations DPD.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>In terms of the options available for Objectives MW1 - MW3, Peel considers that the most appropriate option is option (iii) which is a mixture of option (i) and (ii). It would seem appropriate to identify specific sites for a range of waste management facilities in the Core Strategy, as well as set out a clear criteria based policy for the assessment of planning applications in the Core Strategy. In particular, Peel considers that Arpley Landfill site should be identified as a specific site for waste management uses within this section of the Core Strategy to help achieve Objective MW3.</p> <p>Peel Environmental also agrees with Minerals and Waste Objectives MW5 - MW7. MW5 is important to ensure viable minerals resources are protected from development. It is also important to only permit mineral extraction where it can be done sustainably (MW6) and ensure aggregate extraction is undertaken in accordance with regional and sub-regional apportionment targets (MW7).</p> <p>In relation to MW5 - MW7, Peel Environment would suggest that option (iii) would be most appropriate for these objectives to include both option (i) and option (ii), which will identify and safeguard important minerals resources and set out a clear criteria based policy for the assessment of planning applications.</p> <p>Important minerals resources should be identified and safeguarded within the Core Strategy. In particular, as recognised within the previous Refined Vision Consultation Report, the licence area for coal bed methane should be included within subsequent stages of the strategy. In addition, further to Peel's previous consultation response's and the identification of a potential Area of Search for sand and gravel at Rixton New Hall within the Council's commissioned study into Mineral Resource in Warrington, Peel Environmental would welcome this being taken forward in subsequent stages of the plan.</p> <p>Peel Environmental also welcome the reference in the Countryside and Constituent Settlements section of the consultation document to the importance of Arpley Landfill site. As stated, it is an operational landfill site that has planning permission to continue operating until 2013. Peel Environment considers that this site should be identified within the Core Strategy for waste management purposes in accordance with objective MW3 (as stated previously), as there is sufficient capacity remaining to provide landfill facilities into the plan period.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/125	Mr Mark Flaherty Communications coordinator Peel Energy Limited	<p>Peel Energy is largely supportive of the policies contained within the consultation document and the approach taken, which seeks to balance environmental protection with the need for a responsible and secure energy supply.</p> <p>Peel Energy is supportive of the overall 2026 vision for the Borough in relation to sustainability and climate change. The vision envisages that <i>'new development is generating a substantial amount of its energy needs from renewable sources'</i> and Peel believes this will (where practicable) be an important aspiration. However, it is considered that the vision should be widened in its scope to acknowledge that the supply of energy is an issue for the new and existing development alike. It is therefore requested that the final vision is clear that the issue of energy generation is also one of standalone generation and not just onsite energy generation schemes as the statement may presently suggest.</p> <p>Peel Energy specifically supports Objective S1 and the intention to generate more energy from renewable and low carbon sources. This will be an essential policy for the Borough to increase security of energy supplies and to meet carbon emission reduction targets.</p> <p>In terms of options for delivering Objective S1, Peel Energy favours Option (i). The Core Strategy should contain specific energy related policies that have appropriate principles accounting for the requirements of this type of development in relation to energy generation schemes, Peel Energy would only support Option (ii) for site specific proposals if the site was put forward with a sound evidence base for its suitability. Industry developers should be encouraged to promote generation sites they know are technically and commercially viable. Any site specific proposals should in no way prejudice any other planning application for renewable development</p> <p>Peel Energy does not support Option (iii). Applying overall design principles to renewable and low carbon development would not reflect the reality of its nature and may hinder increased generation.</p>	<p>Comments welcomed. It is agreed that the scope of the vision would be appropriately widened by adding 'and/or using' after 'generating', deleting 'new' from before 'development', deleting 'needs' after 'energy' and adding 'and low carbon' before 'sources'.</p> <p>It is agreed that the term 'renewable and low carbon' should be used instead of 'renewable'.</p> <p>The preferences and other views expressed are noted and will be taken into account in due course.</p>
CSOO/126	Peel Ports Limited	<p>Peel Ports supports the intended identification of locations for uses generating substantial freight movements which utilise rail or water and objectives which seek to increase the movement of freight by rail and water. Such objectives are entirely consistent with Peel's aspirations to develop Port Warrington from its existing operation as a road based distribution facility to become a multi-modal port facility. Port Warrington should accordingly be allocated for such purposes within the relevant LDF documents.</p>	<p>Support for the principles of locating freight related development is welcomed. However there is insufficient evidence to support the specific allocation of Port Warrington at the present time. The current approach of identifying the existing operation as a Major Developed Site in the</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/132	The Peel Group	<p>With reference to Objectives T5, Peel Ports support the increased movement of freight by rail and water on the Manchester Ship Canal whilst ensuring a minimal impact through increased swing bridge openings. Indeed, on the latter point the Manchester Ship Canal Company are engaged with Local Authority (Sustainable Transport Unit) in terms of developing an operational protocol to manage and mitigate in respect of the swing bridge openings.</p> <p>Peel Ports requests that Port Warrington be regarded as a Strategic Location within an extended major developed site in the Green Belt. This is reflective of the site recently gaining planning permission and there is potential to further promote the facility through the LDF by identifying possible future expansion lands and setting out criteria, including the demonstration of exceptional circumstances necessary to allow further development.</p>	<p>Green Belt remains appropriate. There is no basis at the present time for extending the extent of the Major Developed Site, the criteria for which are effectively defined as the built footprint of the site, in PPG2 Annex C.</p> <p>Should further more specific and deliverable proposals emerge in due course, they will need to be justified in terms of exceptional circumstances through a planning application. When built, there may be a case for extending the boundary of the defined area to match the new footprint.</p>
CSOO/134	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>Peel is keen to work in partnership with the Council to seek to meet shared objectives. These objectives include seeking and securing long lasting social, economic and environmental regeneration and growth. Peel fully supports objectives within the consultation document that strive towards these objectives.</p> <p>Peel is however concerned that certain policies and/or objectives may limit the Council's flexibility to respond to future market conditions and development/delivery circumstances and needs. Peel wishes to encourage the Council to be bold and ambitious within the Core Strategy and throughout the LDF and to allow flexibility and responsiveness for beneficial proposals to be considered in policy terms on their merits during the plan period i.e. the next 15 to 16 years.</p> <p>Peel looks forward to subsequent consultation stages in the preparation of the Local Development Framework and the opportunity of making more detailed submissions at these stages, and would of course welcome the opportunity to meet with the Council to discuss its proposals further.</p>	<p>Concluding comments noted. The points raised have been addressed in the above responses. Clarification is needed however on the phrase 'considered in policy terms on their merits'.</p>
CSOO/134	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	Please note we generally support the whole strategy.	Comments noted

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
INTRODUCTION			
CS00/29	Mr Andrew Leyssens United Utilities	<p>United Utilities notes that the initial assessment and appraisal processes undertaken by the Council has led to a conclusion that the most appropriate strategic framework for the Core Strategy is Option 2.</p> <p>In this regard, United Utilities wishes to refer back to all the comments which were made on its behalf by HOW Planning on 19 March 2009 to the Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation (February 2009). Specifically, United Utilities wishes to highlight that whilst Lingley Mere Business Park, for which planning permission exists, is adjacent to Omega, it is a separate entity and should be acknowledged as such in any Core Strategy document.</p> <p>In relation to Strategic Option 2, United Utilities notes the content of the table under paragraph 1.12. In particular, this states:</p> <p><i>' Areas where development would be reviewed and selectively promoted through monitoring and management.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suburban areas of the town - Omega - HCA sites at Appleton Cross, Grappenhall Heys and Pewterspear.' <p>It would be helpful if the Council clarified what is meant by the need to review and selectively promote development in these areas. It is not clear whether there remains in principle support for built development at these sites or whether there is a desire to revisit the mix of uses identified. It is important to note that there has been significant investment by the various partners involved in sites like LingleyMereBusinessPark however, current economic conditions are dictating the rate of delivery. It is likely that such strategic sites will be delivered over a lengthy period and given the investment to date it is important that there remains a commitment to the delivery of such sites in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The intention is to review the mix of land uses at Omega, not the principle of development. It is envisaged that this will consider the opportunity to introduce a mix of land uses to support delivery of sustainable development, but the principle land use will continue to be for employment purposes. The status of the planning permission at Lingley Mere will not be affected, and it will be for United Utilities to consider whether or not they wish a review to include land in its control.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/46	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>The Strategic Road Network [SRN] within Warrington is comprised of sections of the M6, M62 and M56. The M6 is the longest motorway in the UK and runs from the M1 at junction 19 to join the A74 south of the Scottish Border at Carlisle. The M62 runs from Liverpool to Hull, apart from the short section around the north of Manchester which is numbered as the M60. The M56 is the primary link from North Wales and the M6 to Manchester and Manchester Airport. These routes are deemed to be of national importance and as such the Agency would be concerned if any proposed development sites or land allocations were to have an adverse impact upon their safety and / or operation.</p> <p>Moreover, the Agency should be concerned if, through land use planning policy, the development of land were to increase levels of traffic on the network to those which could potentially create capacity problems in the future. As such the Agency is keen to have an early involvement in the formulation of planning policy in conjunction with the Council.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council will continue to liaise with the Highways Agency throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy, specifically on the results of testing the Strategy through the Multi Modal Transport Model.</p>
CS00/14	Ron Bent Bents Garden Centre	<p>At Bents Garden Centre we have been a very successful business because we have always had a vision about how we want to conduct our business. We have listened to our customers, we have carefully monitored the customer market in which we operate we have monitored our competition and we have set our business direction accordingly.</p> <p>Over the past 30 plus years I have seen very many changes occur in the market which I have served: who would have dreamt of glasshouses with opening roofs in which the public could buy plants all year round? Who would have dreamt of a restaurant with seating for over 400 customers and over 100 staff and 17 chefs? Our business never stands still and as Chairman it is my job to 'look over the horizon' to try and anticipate market changes many years in advance and to then help adapt our business accordingly. As our business has got bigger so it is even more important that we try to predict the future. The Council's planning policies, and other policies, can play a significant part in our future. The Council's planning policies, and other policies, can play a significant part in our future by controlling us through the planning application system.</p> <p>When you think that our employee wage is over £3m per annum, that we have over 300 employees and over 50 sub-contractors, that we invest £500,000 annually in our 'bricks and mortar' and £100k in staff training, then such influences as Council policy are very important in our performance.</p> <p>My 'vision' of the business is that we are entering a period of tremendous competition from two areas: Tesco's (and other 'grocery' multiples) and the internet. Food sales growth at Tesco's (and other 'grocery' multiples) and the internet. Food sales growth at Tesco's has now been surpassed</p>	<p>While the Council aims to support successful local enterprises, it is not agreed that the designation of the Garden Centre as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt is appropriate given the location and character of the site.</p> <p>There may however be merit in a different approach.</p> <p>The main garden centre building and the car parking area fronting Warrington Road are currently included within the settlement boundary of Gazebury, while the more open areas to the north and east are within the green belt.</p> <p>However the settlement boundary passing through the garden centre does not appear to reflect current circumstances 'on the ground', and there may be scope to consider a detailed alteration, the effect of which would be to include more of the site within the settlement boundary. This would result in more flexibility in the</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>by their sale of non-food goods. They have bought the Dobbies Garden Centre chain and are rolling out very large (10acres+) 'garden centre' developments throughout the UK. Their goal is to set up 100 sites, each with sales of £10m+ per annum, a total of £1bn in sales per annum.</p> <p>We are already seeing their arrival in the north-west, at Southport, Speke, Preston and Nether Alderley. It isn't just Tesco's who are moving into the home and garden market; Asda have 24 home centres (Asda Living) in the UK which sell home and garden leisure products.</p> <p>The internet is a major challenge to us. It is estimated that by 2020 nearly 40% of garden products will be brought via the internet. You only have to look at the websites of Dobbies/Tesco's, and Asda and John Lewis for example, to see how much they now offer and at very low prices (Asda are offering a three-piece metal garden furniture and accessories.</p> <p>We do not have the buying power to compete with such operators and must therefore stay in business by offering something else, in line with our family traditions and history. This 'something else' (our 3 P's, namely: our home grown plants; our excellent people; and our innovative products) needs to adapt but to do so we need a certain degree of flexibility in what we can do and how we do it. We never want to move away from our 3 'P's' but we need to be able to plan with confidence and surety our future development. We are also looking at developing 'localness', whereby we seek to maximise our support for local suppliers of plants, foodstuffs, dry goods etc. This might mean creating 'incubator' units, for example, for local food producers to rent, enabling them to have a low rent kitchen/food preparation room in which they can make products such as cheese, jam/chutneys, drinks, confectionery, biscuits etc which we will sell through our shop. Likewise craft units/workshops can be rented to make garden furniture, metalwork, concrete/stone garden ornaments, gates and fencing etc. I see our future being based upon 'theatre', service, information all of which distinguish us from the internet retailers.</p> <p>We are looking to develop the leisure side of our business with gardens, nature walks, picnic areas, an arboretum, country skills zone (for example dry stone walling, hedge laying, birds of prey flight zone and so on). Our involvement with schools is increasing every day and we see this as an important part of our future development. In all of these initiatives we are looking to offer something that the big multiples don't do so well, but never losing sight of the one thing that defines us - our plants.</p> <p>I recognise and accept the need for planning control over the use of land; it is essential for the proper use of a scarce resource. What I would like is for our garden centre to be recognised as a major developed site in the Green Belt whereby we can work with the Council on developing</p>	<p>approach to the initiatives referred to by Mr Bent than the suggested Major Designated Site approach.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/60	Paul Daly Sport England	<p>the site in the future in a way which is good for all concerned, our customers, our staff, our neighbours, the wider community, our suppliers and so on. When you prepare your Strategic Option for the Borough we would welcome the opportunity of meeting with you to discuss in more depth our vision for the future for our business and how this ties in with the Borough's overall key issues and objectives.</p> <p>1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION</p> <p>Sport England is the government agency responsible for building the foundations of sporting success by creating a world-leading community sport system of clubs, coaches, facilities and volunteers.</p> <p>Sport England has a particular interest in the operation of the statutory planning system in terms of the protection, enhancement and provision of opportunities for sport and active recreation, both facility and non-facility based. Added to the statutory duty to protect playing fields through the planning system, there is a wider objective of using spatial planning to help create a more active and healthy population. Putting sustainable communities and quality of life at the heart of policy making ensures that a wide range of issues are addressed in parallel. Sport England argues that creating a more active and healthy population through the protection, enhancement and provision of opportunities for sport is a key ingredient of achieving this aspiration and should be commensurately reflected in planning policy.</p> <p>Missing objectives</p> <p>Sport England encourages policies which seek to protect, enhance, and provide (where appropriate) facilities for sport and recreation based upon a sound evidence base. The objectives in the consultation document appear to include protection, enhancement and provision of Green Infrastructure, but is not entirely clear whether this would encompass all sports facilities. For example, it is unclear whether Green Infrastructure includes all indoor and outdoor sport facilities set out within PPG17, ie would a sports hall, a swimming pool or an athletics track be regarded as Green Infrastructure?</p> <p>Sport England would therefore recommend that there are objectives which seek to protect, enhance and provide sport and recreation facilities. Such objectives could be included within the Health, Crime and Public Safety section given that sport plays an important role in improving health and</p>	<p>We will review the objectives to make clearer reference to the inclusion of built facilities in references to sport and recreation in the relevant sections of the document, for example in the definition of green infrastructure.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/33	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Mr M Waheed	<p>reducing health inequalities as well as developing strong, sustainable and cohesive communities; reducing anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime; increasing skills, employment and economic prosperity; and improving the life chances and focusing the energies of people.</p> <p>Our particular interest relates to land east of Lymm. These sites have been submitted to the LDF and SHLAA process although a location plan is enclosed for ease of reference. However we trust that these comments also assist you on the emerging Core Strategy as a whole.</p> <p>Strategic Options</p> <p>Section 1 sets out that the council's preferred strategic option for the Core Strategy is provided by 'Option 2': Prioritising development on Inner Warrington brownfield sites with selective release of other sites.</p> <p>In the recent past, planning policy has directed housing into Central Warrington. The housing restriction policy that has been in place has emphasised this. We consider that in light of the revocation of the RSS, now is the appropriate time to review the amount and distribution of housing development to be delivered in the borough.</p> <p>Option 2 would rely too heavily on meeting the annual housing requirement through inner Warrington brownfield sites. We consider that such an over reliance would compromise the borough meeting its overall vision and is not in conformity with the Council's own evidence on housing need.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in inner Warrington would mainly deliver 1 and 2 bedroom flats, often for private rent, and does not meet the requirements for family housing. There is a recognised shortage of family housing at national and local level. In Warrington, the 2009 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 68.7% of new dwellings should be market accommodation, 4.1% intermediate and 27.2% social rented. ● Greatest market requirement is for larger 3 and 4+ bedroom units with relatively little net demand for additional flats. <p>The study also recognises that Warrington has house prices above the NorthWest average, and first time buyers struggle to get onto the housing market.</p>	<p>Many of the issues raised, particularly relating to housing, the economy, and the countryside/settlements, repeat the comments made earlier in the process and have been responded to.</p> <p>The intended abolition of RSS is of course a new factor, and we are currently preparing a note relating to future housing and employment land provision in the borough. This will be mindful of guidance issued with the revocation order that government recognises that LPAs may wish to proceed on the basis of their 'Option 1' numbers, or continue with figures that were in the RSS. In Warrington's case, as indeed is mostly the case across the Region, the Option 1 number was the same as the figure contained in Approved RSS, and is the figure on which the Adopted UDP is based. The status of the UDP remains unchanged by the intended abolition of RSS.</p> <p>We note the comments relating to Option 2, but would point out that this ignores the 'monitor and manage' approach and the inclusion within this option of the selective release of other sites, the criteria for which have yet to be detailed but will relate monitoring to objectives and delivery to embrace the issues raised about the mix of housing. The contention that brownfield sites do not meet the requirements for family housing is not supported by evidence.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>We consider that the requirement for 2, 3 and 4 bedroom family housing, including affordable housing, can only be met through the allocation of land outside inner Warrington which will require the release of greenfield / Green Belt land. We do not disagree with the priority to develop previously developed sites, but to meet its housing needs the Council needs to cast it net wider.</p> <p>The consultation document sets out that objective W4 is to maintain the permanence of the Green Belt and protect it from inappropriate development. It continues to state that the evidence demonstrates that development needs can be met without the need to consider any areas or sites currently in the Green Belt. No options are therefore provided, and it is identified that the Core Strategy will look to continue this policy approach.</p> <p>We object to the assertion that Green Belt boundaries will remain unaltered throughout the plan period, as the scale and type of housing needed in the borough is yet to be determined. Such a policy does not accord with the Council's development needs as can be seen from the following studies.</p> <p>The 2007 SHMA identified some 999 new households in Warrington per annum which is significantly above the RSS figure of 380 dwellings per annum. This figure was not updated as part of the 2009 SHMA as paragraph S38 stated that "The report does not make any attempt to establish the overall requirement for housing as this is largely set out in targets already in place for the Borough". With the RSS now revoked the Council needs to demonstrate its housing need.</p> <p>The latest DCLG household projections (2006 based) state that the number of households in Warrington will increase from 81,000 in 2006 to 97,000 in 2026. This equates to 800 new households per annum.</p> <p>Therefore to be so prescriptive at this early stage in the plan process as to the Council's preferred option is prejudging the existing and emerging evidence base. We consider that to satisfy specific housing need Option 2 cannot be relied upon.</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>In the recent past, planning policy has directed housing into Central Warrington. The housing restriction policy that has been in place has emphasised this. We consider that in light of the revocation of the RSS, now is the correct time to review the amount and distribution of housing development to be delivered in the borough and for a realistic housing requirement to be set to meet housing need.</p>	<p>Significant greenfield options are available within the scope of the three defined strategy options without any need to look at land within the Green Belt; if required to meet housing needs.</p> <p>The presumption that the starting point is that Green Belt boundaries will remain unchanged is fully justified and the comments made fail to establish very special or exceptional circumstances. The new government has also reconfirmed the commitment to maintain green belt boundaries, and threats to the green belt appear to have been a significant consideration in the intention to abolish RSSs.</p> <p>Therefore while it is appropriate to give further consideration to the level of housing and employment to be planned for in the Core Strategy, and the note being prepared takes account of the SHMA and DCLG forecasts, it is entirely appropriate that this should be addressed within the strategic constraint of the green belt boundary.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>Employment land, retail and housing needs, particularly outside the Warrington urban area cannot be met solely through the continued focus on brownfield sites in central Warrington. Further land is required in settlements such as Lymm to meet development needs that would ensure the long term sustainability of settlements and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>We therefore consider that development opportunities, including potential amendments to Green Belt boundaries, should be considered through the Local Development Framework. We question the predetermined view that the Green Belt boundary is to remain throughout the entire plan period when the Council's own SHMA identifies the need for substantially more housing.</p> <p>We object to Lymm being considered within the 'countryside and its constituent settlements' category. We consider that it should be a Key Service Centre and identified as suitable for housing, employment and retail growth to meet the needs of settlement and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>We would be grateful for your consideration of these representations and taking a full part in the emerging LDF process.</p>	
ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
WHERE IS WARRINGTON?			
CSOO/18	<p>Janet Belfield</p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>Where is Warrington? - Vision in 2026</p> <p>We would welcome revisions to the Vision to include issues important to the natural environment. Issues important to Natural England for the natural environment include conservation and enhancement of local landscape (and townscape) character and quality, biodiversity and geodiversity, conserving and enhancing opportunities for recreation and access to the countryside and green spaces, and adapting to the effects of and mitigating the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Objective W1 Maintaining a Forward Supply of Housing</p>	<p>It is considered that the matters raised in relation to the vision for 'Where is Warrington' are fully and appropriately addressed elsewhere in the document. It is not necessary or appropriate to group all relevant policies together in a 'natural environment' section, provided all the relevant policy areas are addressed in the Strategy.</p> <p>Support for the strategic approach to Green Infrastructure is noted, and a reference to the need to also 'enhance' will be added.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>We would expect to see links here to Borough Assessments of the need for housing in the Borough. Whilst the RSS has been abolished there needs to be clear evidence to support the Borough's direction for housing development.</p> <p>Objective W3 Green Infrastructure (GI)</p> <p>We wholly support a policy direction that sets GI at its heart. The wording needs to include "enhance" alongside conserve, diversify and extend. Any GI policy needs to contribute to a network of GI to link sites and features to fully grasp the concept of multi-functional spaces. We broadly support a strategic policy for delivery of GI in Warrington.</p> <p>Concluding Comments</p> <p>We would welcome an overarching "Natural Environment" section/policy to compliment those relating to Warrington's Centres and Built Environment. Natural Environment matters are currently spread across several other themes.</p> <p>Biodiversity Duty</p> <p>Biodiversity is a core component of sustainable development, underpinning economic development and prosperity, and has an important role to play in developing locally distinctive and sustainable communities. All local authorities and other public authorities in England and Wales now have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. The Duty aims to raise the profile and visibility of biodiversity, to clarify existing commitments with regard to biodiversity and to make it a natural and integral part of policy and decision making.</p> <p>The Duty is set out in Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Communities Act (NERC) 2006 and states that:</p> <p>"Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity".</p> <p>Guidance is available in the Defra publication, "Guidance for Local Authorities in Implementing the Biodiversity Duty".</p>	<p>Issues relating to the evidence base for housing supply are acknowledged and are referred to elsewhere in the document.</p> <p>The Council is fully aware of its duties under the Natural Environment and Communities Act 2006.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>We would welcome demonstration in the Core Strategy of how Warrington is implementing this Duty as part of its planning function.</p> <p>Further information</p> <p>The advice given in this letter is made for the purpose of the present consultation. We would of course expect to be included as a consultee in relation to any additional matters that may arise as a result of, or are related to, the present consultation.</p> <p>Should you wish to discuss this response please do not hesitate to contact me at the above address.</p>	
CSOO/19	<p>Mr Tom Ferguson Planning Policy manager Mersey Forest</p>	<p>Welcome reference to green infrastructure in the Vision and Objective 3</p> <p>Would seek clarification in Option 3 on exact meaning of strategic linkages in relation to green infrastructure. Is this specifically spatial in the sense of greenways and corridors or more functional recognising the role of green infrastructure in supporting the objectives of other agendas such as health, education etc. If the former we would suggest that any policy development also accounts for the wider functional role as well</p>	<p>The need to consider linkages in both spatial and functional terms is acknowledged</p>
CSOO/47	<p>Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency</p>	<p>Objective W1 is to 'maintain a forward supply of land in sustainable locations that will be attractive to the market and will bring benefits to their host communities'. The Agency welcomes the focus on sustainable locations however we would suggest that this could be expanded to 'sustainable and accessible locations' in order to ensure that accessibility is not overlooked.</p> <p>The Agency also considers that the document would benefit from a definition of 'sustainable locations' within the glossary. This would provide clearer guidance as to the characteristics which are considered key to sustainable locations.</p> <p>Objective W2 is to 'promote the development of the town centre including its role as a transport hub for the borough and the wider region'. The Agency supports this objective along with the options to secure improvements to train stations and linkages between elements of the transportation network.</p>	<p>The amendment suggested is agreed and reference to 'accessibility' will be added.</p> <p>In due course the Core Strategy will bring forward a policy with specific locational and accessible locations, and this will obviate the need for definition in the Glossary.</p> <p>The Agency's support for Objective W2 is welcomed.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/58	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	<p>1. Where is Warrington? Vision in 2026... Green Infrastructure has many more functions than 'to provide the framework for development'; for example, the provision of Ecosystem Services such as flood and pollution control, temperature mitigation etc etc.</p> <p>2. Objective W3 There 'is' (rather than 'may be') a need to consider the value etc of GI at a more strategic level.</p> <p>3. Objective W4 Green Belt If the GB is to be unaffected by development needs as stated here why does the 'Vision' qualify the GB as 'largely unaltered' and make reference to 'local alterations' in the GB?</p> <p>4. Sustainability and Climate Change. Vision in 2026... No figures or targets are given here for carbon footprint reduction, renewable energy generation etc etc. How will the success of the strategy therefore be judged?</p> <p>5. Green Infrastructure Objective GI1 Some of the space and habitat for wildlife should not be accessible to people.</p> <p>6 Options: The CWT would support Option ii) which is to integrate all aspects of GI into a single policy</p> <p>7 Objective G14 Add its provision of Ecosystem Services to this list.</p> <p>8. The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements Vision in 2026... add 'biodiversity' to the end of the first paragraph</p> <p>9. Locations: The Mosses Option ii) should probably refer to 'Natural England' rather than the Countryside Agency (which was broken up in 2006)</p> <p>10. Conclusions and Next Steps A small typo in bullet point 6: The Town Centre is vibrant 'and' is etc. Does 'more' in this sentence mean 'additional'?</p> <p>11. Glossary Green Infrastructure also includes farmland.</p>	<p>1 The multi-functional nature of green infrastructure is recognised in the section dealing more specifically with it.</p> <p>2 There is no need to change this. The comment is actually expressing a preference for Option 2.</p> <p>3 The absence of any need to justify a strategic review of the extent of Green Belt in the borough does not exclude individual instances where there may be a case for a detailed local boundary change, for example to reflect changes 'on the ground'.</p> <p>4 The definition of indicators and targets will follow in the next or later stage of preparation.</p> <p>5 Public access will be a matter for site management at a very specific local level, and need not be referenced in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>6 Support for Option 2 noted.</p> <p>7 It is not clear that this would add anything significant to the text.</p> <p>8 It is agreed that this would be an appropriate addition.</p> <p>9 It is agreed that the reference will be changed as suggested</p> <p>10 The error will be corrected. More does mean additional in this context.</p> <p>11 Noted</p>
CSOO/107	Mr Colin Griffiths	The Detailed Objectives.	Comment noted

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Managing Director Satnam</p>	<p>With regard to the specific aspects of the Objectives raised within the document we note as follows: W3 -Multi-functional network of green infrastructure - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall will allow for the extension of the existing green infrastructure network through the site as part of a comprehensive development proposal for the site.</p>	
CSOO/135	<p>Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun</p>	<p>Add words in bold to W1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting sustainable economic growth in the local and sub-regional economy • Supporting investment in jobs and services in the town centre and supporting embryonic businesses. <p>W4 - Support</p>	<p>Support welcomed. It is agreed that these are appropriate changes to W1.</p>
HOUSING			
CSOO/30	<p>Mr Andrew Leysens United Utilities</p>	<p>Housing Objectives H6 and H7</p> <p>United Utilities wishes to support Objectives H6 and H7 which acknowledge the need for a supply of housing land that is sufficiently flexible to respond to market changes and unforeseen circumstances. In this regard, United Utilities supports the need to set criteria for the release of additional sites for housing development where justified.</p>	<p>Support for these matters is welcomed and noted</p>
CSOO/25	<p>GVA Grimley Ltd</p>	<p>Objective H3 - To manage housing supply to prioritise developments that support the regeneration of the town centre and older parts of town.</p> <p>We would accept that there is an ongoing need to deliver regeneration. However if Warrington is to continue to meet its growth aspirations (economic, social, community etc) it is important that the town delivers a diverse supply of land to the market. Whilst the regeneration areas make up one element of that supply, there is a danger in prioritising such locations that the requirement of the market are not met, and the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The ability of the strategic options identified to deliver an appropriate level of housing and economic growth is being examined and the outcomes will be made available in the near future. If a criteria based approach is adopted the additional criterion will be given due consideration in relation to mixed use developments.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/48	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>anticipated rates of economic growth and delivery are undermined. A balanced offer for new residential development which includes the regeneration areas alongside other parts of the form (such as Omega) would deliver that required diversity to supply.</p> <p>Objective H7 - The criteria for the release of sites for housing development</p> <p>We would support the identification of a comprehensive set of criteria within the Core Strategy, are which is able to respond to local circumstances in addition to the elements listed under H7. We would also suggest the inclusion of an additional criteria relating to where development can assist with site delivery, support viability and encourage development.</p> <p>The Agency would suggest that objective H2, which is to 'ensure that at least 80% of housing development takes place on previously developed land,' should also make reference to that land being supported by sustainable transport infrastructure, with good accessibility levels.</p> <p>The Agency welcomes the intentions contained within the twelve objectives and do not need to make any further comments.</p>	<p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the document, for example T1: this objective relates purely to the re-use of previously developed land.</p>
CSOO/36	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Housing H9 - Especially in the context of making additional potential provision for affordable housing within particular settlements it is considered that a criteria based approach would be the most appropriate.</p>	<p>The comment appears to relate to H7 rather than H9, and is noted.</p>
CSOO/101	Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes	<p>H2 - 80% on PDL. The development of the G&J site will contribute towards meeting this target;</p> <p>H4 and H5 - the 5 year supply issue is part of the Plan, Monitor and Manage approach which has formed part of the planning system for many years so we expect that this monitoring of delivery element will need to continue;</p> <p>Rural exceptions policy - clearly with the new 'Localism' agenda this cannot be ruled out and it is up to the local planning authority, in consultation with the community, to decide on the policy for delivering new homes in your smaller settlements. Your SHMA</p>	<p>Comments noted. Housing delivery options are being examined and there will be further consultation on the outcomes in due course.</p> <p>The need to address viability issues is acknowledged.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/108	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	<p>clearly indicates a need which cannot be ignored. We believe that the new Government has already been clear on this matter and your Core Strategy should therefore contain policies that define the criteria for the delivery of new homes to these areas;</p> <p>Development Viability - a key consideration to the delivery of new homes and the regeneration of PDL sites is the viability of development in difficult economic circumstances. Whilst Warrington is performing better than the Regional average it remains true that each site and proposal has to be viable if it is to be realised, and Core Strategy policies must therefore make allowance for this if it is to enable investment rather than prohibit it. Within the scope of the Core Strategy, this means attention to policies relating to: Sustainable development; affordable homes; public open space; infrastructure and community (S106 costs essentially). All such policies (eg. S1, S2, S3) must be sufficiently flexible (Note. RSS Policy EM18 makes allowance for viability to be assessed);</p>	
CS00/71	Janet Belfield Natural England	<p>H1 -Delivering sufficient housing whilst respecting Greenbelt boundaries -It is, of course, noted that Peel Hall is not located within the Greenbelt.</p> <p>H7 -To set criteria based policy for the release of additional sites when required -This approach, in our view, may not be the most appropriate means of ensuring that the objectives of the Core Strategy are achieved. A more sure means of ensuring the fulfillment of the strategy would be a strategic allocation within the Regeneration Area, for development at Peel Hall.</p>	<p>It is correct to say that Peel Hall is not in the Green Belt, and it is also a greenfield site and the priority for development is previously developed land, as it should be (Para 36, PPS3). If it proves necessary to allocate a strategic site, or identify a strategic location, it will be necessary to set out criteria to be used in identifying and assessing the options (Para 38).</p>
CS00/71	Janet Belfield Natural England	<p>Objectives H1 - H12 Housing</p> <p>We welcome references to 'growth within environmental limits'. Natural England's overall policy position in considering growth and development requires, amongst other things, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary growth has minimum impact and maximum benefits for the Natural Environment. • It takes place in the most sustainable locations. 	<p>The comments are welcomed and primarily relate to matters that are already being addressed through the Core Strategy. A discussion note relating to housing requirements including reference to the SHMA will be issued shortly.</p> <p>If it is necessary to make further allocations of land for development, alternative locations will need to be thoroughly assessed from a number of</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/136	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental capacity is central to decisions. High standards of environmental design should be attained, including that the design should ensure a fit with surrounding countryside and the landscape setting Green Infrastructure should be an integral part of creating sustainable communities. New development must be equipped to cope with climate change and extreme weather events. <p>We would welcome references here to comprehensive evidence of Housing Assessments that set out the needs for housing within the borough that will be fulfilled by the Core Strategy. The environmental capacity of an area to accommodate development should be comprehensively assessed, inform the locations for development and form part of any evidence base.</p>	<p>perspectives, including environmental impacts. The primary means will be through Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
CSOO/136	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>Add bold parts to H7</p> <p><u>Objective</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to supplement the supply of affordable homes / social housing <p><u>Performance of Current policy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would have to go through the SFA Directive process <p>H8</p> <p><u>Performance of Current policy</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of social housing for rent. <p>H9 - Support</p> <p>H10 - Object unless addition of Social Housing</p> <p>H11 - Add Located within or edge of settlements</p>	<p>H7,H8, H10 References to social housing will be added</p> <p>H11 Locational considerations are dealt with elsewhere</p> <p>Other supporting comments noted</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/89	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Mr M Waheed	<p>H12 - Support</p> <p>Our comments on the housing distribution should be read in conjunction with our comments on the preferred strategic option.</p> <p>PPS3 is supportive of providing housing to meet all housing needs. Paragraph 10 seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality housing that is well designed and built to a high standard. • A mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural. • A sufficient quantity of housing taking into account need and demand and seeking to improve choice. • Housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. • A flexible, responsive supply of land - managed in a way that makes efficient and effective use of land, including reuse of previously developed land, where appropriate. <p>Paragraph 38 identifies the need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability. Paragraph 10 clarifies that the planning system should "deliver a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural."</p> <p>PPS7 states that in planning for housing local authorities should have regard to PPS3 and make sufficient land available, either within or adjoining existing villages, to meet the needs of local people.</p> <p>The '2026 vision' for housing states that opportunities will be "taken elsewhere within the borough where needed to secure a more balanced housing offer with increased choice, affordability and equality for Warrington's residents". We fully support this objective. We consider that it further emphasises the need to provide housing in locations where it is needed. Specifically, we consider that further housing is required outside the Warrington urban area where there is significant demand for new affordable and market housing.</p>	<p>These comments rely on the premise that Warrington has a 'rural area' and confuses urban and rural, not relevant to Warrington, with town and countryside, which is relevant to Warrington. PPS3 advises that LPAs should use the Rural and Urban Area Classification 2004. At Borough level Warrington's classification is 'Other Urban'. At super output level the Borough is divided between urban, less sparse town and fringe, and less sparse village and dispersed. No part of the Borough is sparse town and fringe, nor sparse village and fringe. Lymm is within an area classed as less sparse town and fringe. Any argument that suggests that Warrington should adopt a strategy or approach founded on guidance for 'rural' areas is misguided, and is rejected.</p> <p>The strategic approach to the countryside in the borough, in common with all other LPAs in the Mersey Belt and North Cheshire is led by PPS2 and the purposes of the Green Belt. This is well established and has been debated and examined exhaustively in the context of the adopted UDP which is still relatively recent and very much a material consideration. With regard to the sites specifically referred to the Green Belt purposes of assisting urban regeneration, preventing urban sprawl, and stopping encroachment onto open countryside are just as relevant today. This strategic approach also enjoys the support of local communities.</p> <p>Comments regarding the need to address the housing needs of the whole community including the elderly are noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>We have not commented in detail on the housing requirement and the available supply at this stage. We understand that a further consultation is to take place shortly which will specifically consider the housing requirement, at which point we will present a full response. However in advance of that consultation, we advise that the starting point for formulating the annual requirement should be paragraph 33 of PPS3, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Government's latest published household projections and the needs of the regional economy, having regard to economic growth forecasts. ● Local and sub regional evidence of need and demand. ● Advice from the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU). <p>As we have set out above, these sources, particularly the Council's SHMA and DCLG household projections strongly support a housing requirement in excess of the approved RSS.</p> <p>Finally, it is also important that the needs of the elderly are quantified through the Core Strategy. The need for this type of accommodation was found in the 2007 SHMA, which states:</p> <p>"A shortage of accommodation for older people was a problem identified during the community and stakeholder consultation. The survey showed that older persons would prefer a bungalow or flatted accommodation. There was also a demand for sheltered accommodation with a warden from 29.6% of older households that intend to move (a much smaller proportion of households expected this)."</p> <p>Therefore it is important that the housing needs of the whole community are provided for through the LDF.</p>	
CSOO/149	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of client	<p>Our comments on the housing distribution should be read in conjunction with our comments on the preferred strategic option.</p> <p>PPS3 is supportive of providing housing to meet all housing needs. Paragraph 10 seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High quality housing that is well-designed and built to a high standard. ● A mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural. 	<p>These comments rely on the premise that Warrington has a 'rural area' and confuses urban and rural, not relevant to Warrington, with town and countryside, which is relevant to Warrington. PPS3 advises that LPAs should use the Rural and Urban Area Classification 2004. At Borough level Warrington's classification is 'Other Urban'. At super output level the Borough is divided between urban, less sparse</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sufficient quantity of housing taking into account need and demand and seeking to improve choice. • Housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. • A flexible, responsive supply of land - managed in a way that makes efficient and effective use of land, including re-use of previously-developed land, where appropriate. <p>Paragraph 38 identifies the need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to enhance or maintain their sustainability. Paragraph 10 clarifies that the planning system should <i>"deliver a mix of housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of tenure and price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban and rural."</i></p> <p>PPS7 states that in planning for housing local authorities should have regard to PPS3 and make sufficient land available, either within or adjoining existing villages, to meet the needs of local people.</p> <p>The '2026 vision' for housing states that opportunities will be <i>"taken elsewhere within the borough where needed to secure a more balanced housing offer with increased choice, affordability and equality for Warrington's residents"</i>. We fully support this objective. We consider that it further emphasises the need to provide housing in locations where it is needed. Specifically, we consider that further housing is required outside the Warrington urban area where there is significant demand for new affordable and market housing.</p> <p>We have not commented in detail on the housing requirement and the available supply at this stage. We understand that a further consultation is to take place shortly which will specifically consider the housing requirement, at which point we will present a full response. However in advance of that consultation, we advise that the starting point for formulating the annual requirement should be paragraph 33 of PPS3, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government's latest published household projections and the needs of the regional economy, having regard to economic growth forecasts. • Local and sub-regional evidence of need and demand. • Advice from the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU). 	<p>town and fringe, and less sparse village and dispersed. No part of the Borough is sparse town and fringe, nor sparse village and fringe. Lymm is within an area classed as less sparse town and fringe. Any argument that suggests that Warrington should adopt a strategy or approach founded on guidance for 'rural' areas is misguided, and is rejected.</p> <p>The strategic approach to the countryside in the borough, in common with all other LPAs in the Mersey Belt and North Cheshire is led by PPS2 and the purposes of the Green Belt. This is well established and has been debated and examined exhaustively in the context of the adopted UDP which is still relatively recent and very much a material consideration. With regard to the sites specifically referred to the Green Belt purposes of assisting urban regeneration, preventing urban sprawl, and stopping encroachment onto open countryside are just as relevant today. This strategic approach also enjoys the support of local communities.</p> <p>Comments regarding the need to address the housing needs of the whole community including the elderly are noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>As we have set out above, these sources, particularly the Council's SHMA and DCLG household projections strongly support a housing requirement in excess of the approved RSS.</p> <p>Finally, it is also important that the needs of the elderly are quantified through the Core Strategy. The need for this type of accommodation was found in the 2007 SHMA, which states:</p> <p><i>" A shortage of accommodation for older people was a problem identified during the community and stakeholder consultation. The survey showed that older persons would prefer a bungalow or flatted accommodation. There was also a demand for sheltered accommodation with a warden from 29.6% of older households that intend to move (a much smaller proportion of households expected this). "</i></p> <p>Therefore it is important that the housing needs of the whole community are provided for through the LDF.</p>	
THE ECONOMY			
CS00/26	GVA Grimley	<p>Objective E1 - Employment land</p> <p>Given the lifespan of the plan there is no apparent requirement to plan for a reduced level of economic development within the town. As stated earlier within this submission, it is intention of the JV that Omega delivers the range and scale of employment opportunities envisaged in the original masterplan exercise.</p> <p>Objective E3 - Making provision for employment land</p> <p>The objective covers the amount and locational requirements of business and the need to identify locations within the Borough as part of the Core Strategy. In any such discussion it should be borne in mind that Omega has the benefit of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A planning permission (valid for 15 years) on Phases 1 and 2 for B1, B2 and B8 uses. 	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. Objective E1- On moving towards a preferred option the Council's evidence base will be used to make assessments for future policy. It is agreed that the Core Strategy must plan for the long term future growth of Warrington. A discussion note setting out the position in more detail will be issued shortly. The Core Strategy will ensure that Omega is identified as being capable to deliver a range and scale of employment opportunities and will be a key business location within Warrington, complementing business locations in central locations.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/32	Mr Andrew Leysens United Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An approved Masterplan and Development framework for the site as a whole (Phases 1 -5) which established the range of business uses. • A VDP commitment to the business uses contained within the masterplan. <p>As such Omega is and will remain the primary business location within Warrington and any emerging policy framework should reflect its established strategic role and function.</p>	Support noted
CSOO/49	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>Objective E7</p> <p>In respect of Objective E7, one of the issues identified is to consider the scope for establishing a more pro-active approach to the management of the countryside and the diversification of the rural economy.</p> <p>In accordance with Planning Policy Statement 4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2009), United Utilities wishes to support this issue.</p>	<p>Comments noted and welcomed. A preferred option may look to take forward an amalgamation of options as we would agree these do not always need to be mutually exclusive. All preferred options will be supported with evidence.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/37	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Once again, the Agency considers that these three options should be not mutually exclusive and elements of each should contribute to future policy.</p> <p>Economy E6 - the wording set out here only considers the potential for new tourism attractions rather than assessing the value and potential of existing attractions, in particular those based upon the natural environment and cultural heritage, and how these can be utilised to promote the unique sense of place that Warrington has and grow its tourist economy.</p>	<p>The wording states "Enhance the tourism offer in the borough through increasing and diversifying attractions where appropriate" . This does not specifically refer to new attractions. All types of tourism attractions including the natural environment & cultural attractions are embraced by this.</p>
CS00/137		<p>Vision - And what Warrington's own community needs - Diversity of skill for self needs. And diverse of opportunities - crafts/caring fits.</p> <p>E1 - Support</p> <p>E2 - Add Including return to countryside farm land wildlife uses</p> <p>E3 - Add Start-up Businesses</p> <p><u>Options</u></p> <p>E4 - i) Support</p> <p>ii) Add - Introduce specific guidance for sustainable economic development</p> <p>E5 - a) Support</p> <p>b) Support</p> <p>E6 Add with support of community</p> <p>E7 - And meets needs of rural community and meets needs of rural community instills jobs</p>	<p>It is agreed that a reference to start-up businesses is appropriate in E3.</p> <p>E4(ii) The suggested change is agreed.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/109	<p>Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satmam</p>	<p>E1 -The allocation of land for economic development -We are of the view that the continued allocation of Omega for strategic employment purposes is vital for the future economic wellbeing of Warrington. As set out in the document, there is no local evidence of an over supply of employment land (indeed there is a shortfall on historic requirement figures) and there is no other site within Warrington which is as well placed for strategic employment provision. It is located directly off the national motorway network in a central location between Liverpool and Manchester, and has good connections to the ports and airports of Liverpool and Manchester. It lies within easy reach of other commercial uses which would support large scale employment development on the Omega site.</p> <p>It will be essential to maintain Omega as an employment site so as to ensure that any inward investment has the opportunity of locating to the Omega site, as other more centrally located sites, whilst they may support the Town Centre of Warrington to a greater degree than development at Omega, may not suit those specific occupiers who are looking for a strategic site with easy access to the larger scale conurbations and international markets.</p> <p>It is important also to maintain the flexibility within Warrington's future employment land supply for the development of the next generation of employment parks, so as to ensure the future wellbeing of Warrington's economy, both locally and regionally.</p> <p>Also, the Omega site itself is intrinsically unsuitable for mixed uses: it is physically separated from the existing area of Warrington by major roads, and with no support uses nor an existing community to assimilate 'would be' future residents. Also such a proposal would be against the important objectives of bringing development and life changing improvements into the Regeneration Area.</p>	<p>Comments noted. An employment land review is being carried out as part of Core Strategy work. This will ensure an appropriate and flexible supply of employment land over the Core Strategy period based on previous employment land take up rates. Although the current allocation will be reviewed, the level of employment land required in the borough over the plan period means that Omega will likely form part of this land supply. The flexible supply required means that a range of sites should be provided, and the scale and nature of the Omega site distinguishes it from other sites in the borough.</p> <p>It is appropriate, however, to consider whether all of Omega is required over the Core Strategy period and whether there are legitimate reasons to consider alternative uses on parts of the site. In view of deliverability issues, the Council has a responsibility to review the continued allocation of the site (PPS4, policy EC2.1.h).</p>
CSOO/72	<p>Janet Belfield Natural England</p>	<p>Objectives E1 - E7</p> <p>What is the value of the natural environment to the Borough's economy? We would welcome coverage of the value of the natural economy to the Borough in this Vision. We'd like to draw your attention to the work of Natural England's Natural Economy North West Team and their legacy here. Green Infrastructure has a role to play across policies and the value of GI to the Borough's economy should not be under estimated.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Additional information provided by Natural England will be considered and amendments made where appropriate in due course.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/90	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Mr M Waheed	<p>We would welcome policy content that strongly supports and clearly identifies the role of the natural environment in contributing to economic and social benefits, including health, across policies. Natural England's own Green Infrastructure guidance can be found through our website. This Guidance articulates our position in relation to green infrastructure planning and delivery, which is increasingly recognised as an essential part of sustainable spatial planning. This is due in no small part to the role of green infrastructure as a 'life support system', able to deliver multiple environmental functions, and to play a key part in adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change.</p> <p>We would welcome links here to sustainable transport networks and the economic benefits that relate to them.</p>	<p>This statement is not supported by the evidence. RSS identified an oversupply of employment land in the Cheshire and Warrington <i>sub-region</i>, not just in Warrington Borough. In fact, the Sub-regional and Core Strategy evidence suggests that there is not a significant oversupply of employment land in Warrington Borough and that the RSS oversupply may have arisen in other parts of the sub-region. The latest Employment Land Availability Statement 2010 indicates only a marginal oversupply in employment land in the longer term and there remains a healthy forward supply of 14 years from 2010.</p> <p>It is not considered that Warrington has "Key Service Centres". The whole borough is heavily influenced by the town of Warrington itself, and other centres are more akin to Local Service Centres both within the town and in the larger villages. The town and other nearby urban areas provide the main sources of employment in the borough, and in this regard Lymm is no different to suburban areas of the town such as Thelwall, Woolston and Pewterspear.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/98	<p>Lewis Evans Turley Associates</p>	<p>The vision for economic growth correctly recognises the contribution that the provision of high quality employment sites can make towards improvements in the borough's economic performance and the level of investment that they encourage. The complementary role that sites such as Birchwood Park will play in relation to more central sites is also specifically acknowledged.</p> <p>The vision reflects the evidence base which supports the importance of Birchwood Park and is supported by my client. However, this again raises questions over the validity of not identifying Birchwood Park as an important Strategic Site.</p> <p>Objective E1</p> <p>The objective considers the need to identify sufficient land to meet demand for future economic development over the period 2003-26. A number of options relating to the level of economic growth are suggested; they include planning for reduced or increased levels of growth, or maintaining the forward plan at current levels.</p> <p>In considering which option should form the basis for the Core Strategy's approach to economic development, it is important to recognise that, despite a deep recession in recent years and an uncertain economic outlook, the business growth rate in Warrington has grown at more than 5 times the national average, as set out in the Employment Land Review 2009 which forms part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy.</p> <p>This demonstrates that Warrington is an established and successful business location and that the Core Strategy should seek to support and build upon this level of success with an increased level of economic development planned (or at least a continuation of the current levels). It is important that the Core Strategy is robust and fit for purpose over its entire plan period; planning for a reduced level of economic growth may reflect short term economic conditions but is, ultimately, likely to significantly constrain long term future economic growth and investment in the borough, undermining the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Considerable employment opportunities also exist within the defined inset villages and further employment development is not discouraged.</p> <p>Comments noted and welcomed. On moving towards a preferred option the Council's evidence base will be used to make assessments for future policy. It is agreed that the Core Strategy must plan for the long term future growth of Warrington and that planning for a reduced level of economic growth may reflect short term economic conditions but could constrain long term future growth and investment in the borough, undermining the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/150	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of client	<p>We note that the present situation identifies the oversupply of employment land in Cheshire and Warrington. However, the employment land supply in Warrington is heavily reliant upon a small number of large sites, such as the Omega site. We are concerned that there is an insufficient supply of employment land in other areas of the borough.</p> <p>The vision for 2026 makes no reference to increasing employment opportunities within and adjoining the other key settlements. We consider that the vision should seek to ensure that the local economic needs of all of the settlements in the borough are met to ensure a close homes/job balance. We therefore consider that the vision needs to incorporate a commitment to increasing the amount of employment land in and around the identified Key Service Centres and specifically Lymm.</p> <p>Tourism and Leisure</p> <p>We support HP4 which is to provide sport, recreational and cultural facilities in locations which are accessible for all. The consultation document states that the Council aim to continue the current policy approach aims to ensure an appropriate level of provision of open space and recreation facilities in each area and these are directed towards the most accessible places i.e. existing centres in accordance with current policy. We support this approach however it is imperative that each settlement has the necessary facilities to maximise its self containment.</p> <p>Furthermore, we consider that there it would be appropriate to locate a business park south-west of Lymm. This area is well connected to the M6 motorway and a business park in this location would not result in additional traffic going through the settlement. Whilst these matters can be addressed through a Site Allocations DPD we consider that the Core Strategy should make provision for such a development. We support the identification of the land at Booths Lane/Cherry Lane as a strategic allocation in the core strategy. We would welcome further discussions with the council on this matter.</p>	<p>This statement is not supported by the evidence. RSS identified an oversupply of employment land in the Cheshire and Warrington <i>sub-region</i>, not just in Warrington Borough. In fact, the Sub-regional and Core Strategy evidence suggests that there is not a significant oversupply of employment land in Warrington Borough and that the RSS oversupply may have arisen in other parts of the sub-region. The latest Employment Land Availability Statement 2010 indicates only a marginal oversupply in employment land in the longer term and there remains a healthy forward supply of 14 years from 2010.</p> <p>It is not considered that Warrington has "Key Service Centres". The whole borough is heavily influenced by the town of Warrington itself, and other centres are more akin to Local Service Centres both within the town and in the larger villages. The town and other nearby urban areas provide the main sources of employment in the borough, and in this regard Lymm is no different to suburban areas of the town such as Thelwall, Woolston and Pewterspear. Considerable employment opportunities also exist within the defined inset villages and further employment development is not discouraged.</p> <p>Support and comment on objective HP4 is noted.</p>
SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE			
CSOO/17	Jonathon Burns DPP	I write on behalf of my client; Derwent Holdings Limited (DHL) in response to the above consultation. This letter specifically addresses matters relating to DHL's land interest at Alban Retail Park and the Fiat Warehouse site on Winwick Road.	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>As you will be aware the Fiat Warehouse site is allocated as an existing employment area by Warrington UDP Policy EMP4 whilst Alban Retail Park has no policy allocation.</p> <p>The following representations are made on the Objectives and Options document.</p> <p>Objective S1 - Sustainability</p> <p>Whilst DHL support this objective it is important that any supporting supplementary planning document that is prepared is consulted on at an appropriate time prior to its adoption to allow it to be reflective of local needs and conditions.</p>	
CS00/50	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>The Agency does not feel that the objectives set out in S1 - S5 address the aims of reducing the need to travel and increasing the use of sustainable modes. Whilst reference is made in S1 to encouraging the use of less energy for transport, the Agency considers that stronger guidance is needed to reflect the importance of reducing the need to travel and increasing travel by sustainable modes. This could be incorporated within objective S1 or set out in an additional objective within this section.</p>	<p>These aspirations form part of the vision but have not been carried through to the objectives. It is agreed that they should form part of the objective(s). Consideration will be given to whether it is most appropriate to incorporate the aims within objective S1 or set out an additional objective.</p>
CS00/38	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Sustainability and Climate Change Vision - the current wording in the first sentence does not set out any aspiration for adapting to climate change impacts contrary to the expectations of the Supplement to PPS1. The wording at the end of the second paragraph sets adaptation solely in the context of safeguarding natural resources as opposed to the wider range of environmental impacts that will need to be addressed as part of an adaptation strategy - e.g. species migration and the role of wildlife corridors as part of the overall Green Infrastructure resource. In respect of 'stewardship of the natural environment' it is considered that a more positive stance is needed that encompasses improvements in both the quantity and quality of this resource. Adaptation is also missing from the 'Current Policy Approach'.</p> <p>S1 - the location of development will also have a potential impact upon reducing emissions by reducing journey lengths and encouraging alternatives to the private car. Option ii) and iii) are preferred - relevant policies and an SPD (as per option i) are a useful starting point but it is considered that the further steps suggested in the other options also need to be pursued.</p>	<p>Vision - Comments noted. Vision to be amended to reflect these aspirations.</p> <p>S1 to S4 - Comments noted.</p> <p>S5 - Comments noted in respect of policy options. Objective to be amended to give more emphasis to creation, restoration and enhancement of biodiversity and heritage assets. This section also needs to be read alongside 'The countryside' building block objectives. The Green Infrastructure and Built Heritage sections are also relevant.</p> <p>Evidence Base - Agree with comments. LBAP's to be included as part of evidence base.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/110	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Sathnam	<p>S2 - it is considered that an overall target should be set, but that this should be supplemented by specific requirements in respect of key development sites - Options ii) and iii) are therefore supported.</p> <p>S3 - it is considered that a specific climate change policy should be developed and that it should cover the wider approach to adaptation.</p> <p>S4 - Option iii) is supported as the overall approach needs to have regard to national advice, but also to set it in a local context having regard to the particular circumstances of Warrington - especially those relating to the Mersey and its floodplain.</p> <p>S5 - the approach here needs considerable further development - especially in the light of the abolition of NW RSS and the advice in the recently issued PPS5 on heritage. The issues to be addressed are very broad and have distinctive characteristics that would be very difficult to bring together in a single policy - especially in the context of international, national and local designations. Accordingly an approach based upon a range of separate policies is supported, but these will need to be up-dated having regard to the latest national advice and the gaps resulting from the loss of RSS policy. There also appear to be some gaps in terms of the areas identified in the first column, e.g. landscape character and considerations such as tranquility. As worded the first column only deals with 'safeguarding and prudent use' - the latter term is not really applicable to biodiversity and heritage - and does not consider the potential, which should be pursued, for creation (in terms of new areas of habitat value), restoration (e.g. in terms of landscape character) or enhancement (e.g. of the historic environment) - it is considered that all these matters will need to be addressed.</p> <p>Evidence base - it would appear that BAP documents/targets ought to be part of the evidence base, along with information about the historic environment (as a baseline at least EH's Heritage Counts work and the regional work on The Value of Heritage) and landscape character assessment work.</p>	Comments noted.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/73	<p>Janet Belfield</p> <p>Natural England</p>	<p>Objectives S1 - S5</p> <p>We wholly support paragraph 2 of the Vision that states: <i>"The borough is exercising careful stewardship of the natural environment and has acted to safeguard vital natural resources including water, air, and soil, which help to both mitigate and adapt to climate change."</i></p> <p>The Core Strategy should secure policies to both adapt to climate change which is 'locked in', reduce the contribution to future climate change, and to mitigate its effects on the natural environment. The Core Strategy should include a policy commitment to developing area-wide adaptation to climate change (such as land allocations for adaptation/mitigation) and provides strong support for measures that reduce the area's contribution to future climate change such as by setting targets or minimum standards to achieve such measures. Any policy direction should contribute to a sense of place and be meaningful to Warrington.</p> <p>Biodiversity is mentioned in Objective S5, the Core Strategy can create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) targets. We would welcome specific references in the Core Strategy to this. LBAPs identify the action required at a local level to deliver UK and regional targets for habitats, species, public awareness and involvement. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of importance in the more local context of their geographical area. These targets can then be used for monitoring the performance of the Core Strategy. In the North West we have operating LBAPs for Cumbria, Lancashire, North Merseyside, Cheshire (including Wirral), and Greater Manchester. Further information about Biodiversity in the UK is available on the internet (www.ukbap.org.uk).</p>	<p>The suitability of bringing forward Peel Hall if needed to meet development requirements, will be assessed through the Core Strategy along with all other identified options.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Support noted in respect of the vision.</p> <p>Comments noted, and will be taken into account in relevant policy wording in due course. Targets for monitoring purposes will be considered at the next stage of the process.</p> <p>Reference to LBAPs will be added to the evidence base.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/138	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>Current Policy Approach</p> <p>Add reducing loss of the natural carbon sink - woods and countryside land.</p> <p><u>Options</u></p> <p>S1 - Support</p> <p>S2 - Support</p> <p>S3 - Support</p> <p>S4 - Support</p> <p>S5 - Support</p>	<p>An appropriate reference to natural carbon sinks will be added, as there is a strong policy framework in place to protect trees and woodland, and the green belt is acting to prevent losses of open countryside.</p> <p>Other supporting comments welcomed.</p>
CSOO/93	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Sustainability and Climate Change. Vision in 2026... No figures or targets are given here for carbon footprint reduction, renewable energy generation etc etc. How will the success of the strategy therefore be judged?</p>	<p>The vision is not the appropriate place to set targets for carbon reduction or renewable energy generation. The intention was for targets to be set through appropriate policies once evidence had been provided to support targets through the LCR RECS.</p> <p>However, it is clear that the Buildings Regulations are now Government's preferred mechanism for delivering carbon savings in new development. The current direction of policy suggests that this target-setting approach will be supported only up to 2013, and so in the current context, assembling a suitable evidence base to support a specific carbon reduction requirement may not be cost-effective for the short period that targets would be in effect.</p> <p>Nevertheless, carbon footprint reductions, could still be measured through the NI 186 (Per capita CO2 emissions in the LA area) that Local authorities are</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/100	Turley Associates on behalf of MEPC Birchwood Park General Partner Ltd	<p>Objective S2</p> <p>The provision of energy supply from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources, as advocated by this objective is supported in principle by my client. However, it is important that the policy approach for doing so is flexible and takes account of the ability of other sustainability measures (i.e. energy efficiency, sustainable building methods etc) as means of achieving a reduced carbon footprint. Recognition should also be given to the need to flexibly apply targets if they are introduced, having regard to the evidence base, individual circumstances and viability. Such an approach would be best expressed by option (ii).</p>	<p>already required to collect on an annual basis. Any additional monitoring requirements will be assessed when the detailed policy(s) are developed.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is recognised that the policy approach will need to be flexible and take account of other sustainability measures and technical and economic viability.</p> <p>The Council's policy approach will be informed by the Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study that has been undertaken in collaboration with the Merseyside authorities, Halton and West Lancashire District Council's.</p>
CSOO/146	Daniel Whitney Mosaic Town Planning Ltd	<p>The 'vision' for the Borough does not address the need for free-standing sites to provide for the generation of renewable and low carbon energy. Such sites will clearly be needed to address the issue of climate change by increasing energy efficiency.</p> <p>3.2 It is recommended in paragraph 19 of the Supplement to PPS1 : Planning and Climate Change that the Core Strategy should "identify suitable areas for renewable and low-carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure the development of such sources, but in doing so take care to avoid stifling innovation including by rejecting proposals solely because they are outside areas identified for energy generation". This should be taken into account when progressing with the production of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Objective S1</p> <p>3.3 Our client is supportive of Objective S1 which aims to "reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and the borough's carbon footprint", in particular through "generating more energy from renewable and low carbon sources".</p>	<p>Vision - Comments noted. Vision to be amended to reflect these aspirations.</p> <p>S1 – General support for objective noted. It is not considered necessary for the objective to acknowledge that there is not a requirement for a need to be demonstrated.</p> <p>S2 – General support for objective S2 is noted and for option 2 to be the mechanism for meeting these aims. It is considered that bullet point 3 of objective S1 encompasses the need for free-standing sites for the production of renewable and low carbon generation. The need for criteria based policies is acknowledged and will be considered at the next stage of the process.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>3.4 This is encouraged in the Supplement to PPS1: Planning and Climate Change which states that " <i>In developing their core strategy...planning authorities should provide a framework that promotes and encourages renewable and low carbon generation. Policies should be designed to promote and not restrict renewable and low energy and supporting infrastructure</i> " (parag. 19)</p> <p>3.5 As is acknowledged under Objective S1, there is only limited reference to the use of renewable energy in the current policy and this therefore needs to be addressed. While there is currently no evidence base to support this policy, a Climate Change evidence study is currently in progress.</p> <p>3.6 In line with paragraph 19 of the Supplement to PPS1, the Objective should also acknowledge that there should be no requirement for " <i>applicants for energy development to demonstrate either the overall need for renewable energy and its distribution, nor question the energy justification for why a proposal for such development must be sited in a particular location</i> " .</p> <p>3.7 A Climate Change Strategy for Warrington has been produced within which it is noted that " <i>renewably-sourced electricity is in short supply and may carry a significant premium over 'standard' supplies.</i> " By helping support renewable supplies on sites such as our clients at Latchford through Objective S1, this will also help to reduce its cost in the longer-term.</p> <p>Objective S2</p> <p>1. 3.8 Our client is supportive of Objective S2 which aims " <i>to secure a proportion of the energy supply of new developments from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources</i> ". This is also encouraged in paragraph 19 of the Supplement to PPS1.</p> <p>2. 3.9 It is recognised in the Climate Change Strategy for Warrington that " <i>The continued maintenance of a sustainable energy supply will remain one of our key actions and climate change will be given due weight in our decision making process.</i> " It also recognises the importance of attracting " <i>more sustainable energy...businesses to the town</i> ". This " <i>would boost employment and enhance Warrington's leadership role in climate change. The energy sector is an important employer within Warrington.</i> " .</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>1. 3.10 This objective should take into account the need for free-standing sites for the production of renewable and low carbon generation.</p> <p>2. 3.11 A mechanism also needs to be put in place for the competing objectives for sites. For example, at sites which are designated for the protection of open space where development is restricted, criteria should be set for the allowance of essential developments such as renewable and low carbon energy production, particularly if such sites are not in public use and suffer from constraints.</p> <p>3. 3.12 The Council give three potential options in order to meet the aims of Objective S1. Given that the RSS has now been revoked, we would support Option 2 in bringing forward a local policy with local targets and requirements and appropriate technical justification and viability assessment.</p>	
ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
TRANSPORT			
CSOO/20	Mr Tom Ferguson Planning Policy manager Mersey Forest	In Objective T6 welcome reference to the potential to increase the functionality of green infrastructure to facilitate walking and cycling	Supporting comments noted.
CSOO/51	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	Objectives T1 - T10 set out the transport objectives, with the evidence base for these cited as the Warrington Local Transport Plan 2 and 3 (in development), Warrington Transportation Framework and Multi Modal Transport Model. The Agency welcomes the use of this evidence base and is encouraged by the objectives in general terms as they sustain the message of promoting sustainable travel modes and reducing the need to travel.	<p>Comments and support noted.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Capacity Assessment is a vital part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy and as such it will feed into the options for the objectives.</p> <p>Whilst the Parkside development is not currently going forward, regard has to be had to proposals within St. Helen's Core Strategy and the future</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/39	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Policy T4 is 'to ensure that any commuting into or out of the borough is as sustainable as possible, making best use of public transport including strategic park and ride facilities.' The Agency would comment that the capacity of public transport should be considered, with the Warrington Infrastructure Capacity Assessment [ICA] feeding into the options for this objective.</p> <p>Policy T5 is 'to increase the movement of freight by rail and water.' The options consider the Parkside site as a potential site to contribute to increasing the movement of freight by rail and water. Given that the Parkside development is not currently going forward, the Agency consider that thought should be given to how the objective will be achieved specifically in relation to movement of freight by rail.</p> <p>With regard to options associated with objectives T8 and T9, the Agency's preferred option would be ii) <i>include a general accessibility policy in the Core Strategy supported by site specific DPD/SPD to achieve improvements</i>. This option is considered to be the most robust and most likely to achieve accessibility improvements.</p>	<p>potential of the Parkside area. We will look at re-phrasing objective T5 to reflect longer term aspirations for the area.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Agency's preferred option for objectives T8 and T9, and the reasons for this, are noted.</p>
CSOO/111	Mr Collin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	<p>T1 - welcomed.</p> <p>T6 - supported - it is considered that it would be beneficial to identify specific opportunities for improvements, along with delivery mechanisms- even if this needs to be in a separate document prepared in parallel with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>T10 - options ii) and iii) are supported.</p> <p>T1 -Ensuring new residential development is built in sustainable locations - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to achieve a high level of sustainability as it will extend into the existing established communities within North Warrington and so have easy walking, cycling and public transport links to existing facilities.</p> <p>T2 -To maintain and enhance centres identified in the retail hierarchy - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to enhance the existing local provision and provide local services of a standard and range which will improve the offer of this part of Warrington for its existing and future residents.</p>	<p>Comments and support noted. Consideration will be given to adding further detail to Core Strategy policy to identify where improvements to the network could take place and where delivery mechanisms can be specified.</p> <p>If it proves necessary to identify a strategic allocation in order to accommodate development needs over the plan period, it will be necessary to identify alternative locations on the basis of rational and comprehensive criteria, and to thoroughly and impartially assess each of the options (including sustainability appraisal and environmental assessment) from a range of perspectives, not least in terms of transport and traffic impact considerations.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/74	Janet Belfield Natural England	<p>T4 - To ensure that any commuting into or out of the Borough is as sustainable as possible - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall provides for incremental growth to an existing neighbourhood of Warrington. The site will have no easy or direct access onto the strategic motorway network and will, therefore, feed traffic through the existing urban area, with all of the advantages and opportunities there for the usage of public transport.</p> <p>This is able to be contrasted with any proposed residential development at the Omega site, which has a direct and easy route onto the strategic motorway network which will result in high levels of car-borne commuting to Liverpool, Manchester and beyond.</p> <p>T6 - Green infrastructure -A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to provide the opportunity to extend the existing green network (Peel Hall Park) through the site</p>	Supporting comments noted.
CS00/139	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>Objectives T1 - T10</p> <p>We welcome a Vision that aspires for a strong, integrated, reliable transport system with real alternatives for people to using a private car.</p> <p>We broadly support policies that ensure sustainable development in sustainable locations with access to a sustainable transport network. We agree it is essential for employment sites and residential areas to be readily accessible to each other, as should green infrastructure and opportunities for sustainable transport between them.</p> <p>We fully support conserving and enhancing walking and cycling networks to provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles; green infrastructure; improving air quality and congestion; and adaptation to and mitigation of the impacts of climate change.</p>	Comments noted. These points will be relevant at the stage when policies are being drafted.
		<p>Vision - Support whole generally</p> <p>Add Seek to use canal for water public transport</p> <p>T2 - Add - Ensure development of all kinds are located in sustainable efficient transport routes and also avoid rat running.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/80	Jonathon Burns DPP	Objective T2 - Transport DHL recognise that although there are transport implications that follows from the 'town centre first' approach, it is unclear how the options highlighted relate to transport issues. As this appears to be a duplication of objective WC4 it is recommended that this is either removed or rewritten to address any transport issues this objective may raise.	Comments noted. It is important to recognise that these are centres of accessibility for a range of services and facilities, not just retailing. Objective T2 will be cross-referenced with retail objectives as we move forward.
WARRINGTON'S CENTRES			
CSOO/27	GVA Grimley Ltd	Objective WC1 - Retailing within the Borough; District and Neighbourhood centres This objective refers to the Councils Retail and Leisure Study which suggests that there is no need for further retail allocations in the Borough, particularly in terms of main foodstore provision. Our concern with this position is that the study potentially overlooks the under provision of food retail floorspace in the west and north west residential areas of the town. In particular the study acknowledged but makes no positive response on two key points namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inadequacy of existing food retail provision which is focussed on (Asda at Westbrook). • The additional residential and employment growth anticipated in this part of the town (Omega, Chapleford etc). We acknowledge that reference is made to new small scale provision within the emerging Chapleford proposals, however there is a real danger that the approach advocated within objective WC1, supported by the retail study, will result in significant under provision of floorspace to serve this part of the town. This can only give rise to qualitative deficiencies which will perpetuate an unsustainably pattern of retail journeys. There is scope for new retail and local centre provision to be made as part of the emerging Omega proposals.	Comments noted. Recommendations made in the Councils Retail and Leisure study are accepted by the Council. The study has considered provision for convenience capacity across the borough. Evidence suggests that there is insufficient capacity available to support another superstore in Warrington at this time. There is a recognised qualitative gap in local provision, particularly for the number of local centres without an anchor convenience store. On this basis, recommendations for future proposals should be located in the town centre or other centres provided they are of an appropriate scale. This would therefore address local retail floor space issues.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/112	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	WC6 -Improvements of existing district and neighbourhood retail centres -See the comments above at CT2.	Comments noted.
CSOO/81	Jonathon Burns DPP	<p>Objective WC1 - Warrington's Centres</p> <p>It is understood that this development plan period runs up to 2026 whilst this objective is based on an evidence base which assesses qualitative need in the medium (2016) and long term (2021). Whilst it is our client's professional opinion that the updated Warrington Retail and Leisure Study is flawed in its approach and that there is demonstrable need for future retail developments in the borough at 2010, even using the assumptions within the study there is demonstrated residual need by 2021 that is not taken up by any existing commitments or strategies. Given that the Core Strategy plans for the development period to 2026, we disagree with the option set out within the objective.</p> <p>This option therefore fails to recognise the identified qualitative need up to 2021 identified within the Warrington Retail and Leisure Study Quantitative Assessment Update (2009) and any other need beyond this period up to the end of the development plan period up to 2026. DHL also questions why this objective only seeks to promote the Time Square/Bridge Street and Wireworks initiatives as the updated Retail and Leisure Study concludes that these initiatives will not fully match the identified medium term need (2016) (Para. 6.9) let alone need beyond 2016 as identified above.</p> <p>Objective WC2 & WC3 - Warrington's Centres</p> <p>DHL support the recognition of the impact of key stores relocating to the Golden Square Shopping Centre extension has had on other parts of the town centre and in particular the defined primary shopping frontages on Bridge Street and Buttermarket Street. Due to this change it would not be suitable to retain the policy allocations as existing and therefore option i is considered unsuitable.</p>	<p>Objective WC1 - Warrington's Centres</p> <p>The Council does not accept the view that the Retail Study and Update conclusions are flawed. The Council stands by the conclusions and consider it to be a sound evidence base on which to take forward the Core Strategy. No evidence has been presented by DPP to support their contention that it is flawed. In the absence of any evidence, including sight of an alternative assessment from which their conclusions are drawn, the Council cannot comment further. We would invite such evidence to be submitted for consideration urgently.</p> <p>We do not draw the conclusion referred to about the need to identify and support other initiatives to meet identified needs.</p> <p>Objective WC2 & WC3</p> <p>We note the comments made on each of the options and will take them into account as we move forward to the next stage.</p> <p>Objective WC4</p> <p>Comments noted. The restriction of additional retail development on an edge of centre or out of centre sites is justified through national policy in PPS4 and</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>Options ii and iii are considered more suitable to address this objective. It is considered that option iii, which does not seek to define primary shopping frontages, would be the most suitable option due to the uncertainty over any future development on the Times Square/Bridge Street site which is likely to result in the demolition of a high proportion of shopping frontages in this area.</p> <p>Objective WC4 - Warrington's Centres</p> <p>DHL do not support option ii to issues b and c. Any policy that would seek to restrict all retail development on edge or out of centre sites to bulky goods uses could hamper future regeneration proposals which may require an element of edge of centre or out of centre retail development to help enable the regeneration, with bulky goods floorspace often difficult to let and therefore being unattractive to developers. It is essential that if this option were taken forward in the Core Strategy that it is fully justified and amended to recognise the potential need for nonbulky retail development in regeneration priority areas. This will require a robust assessment, and should be subject to proper consultation prior to adoption.</p> <p>It is imperative that any local threshold identified as option iii, to issues b and c, are fully justified as set out in the PPS4 practice guidance (para. 7.4). This requires local planning authorities to consider the scale of known proposals, the vitality and viability of town centres; the cumulative effects of recent developments; the likely effects on a town centre strategy and the impact on any other planned investment.</p>	<p>local evidence e.g. Martin Tonks Retail and Leisure Study and Warrington Retail Centre Report. The application for any new retail developments with non-bulky comparison goods could be direct competition with the town centre and therefore would potentially compromise vitality and viability.</p> <p>The establishment of local thresholds would allow retail centres to be enhanced in relation to the retail hierarchy. This would ensure that development is of an appropriate scale to the centre the catchment it seeks to serve. The Warrington Retail and Leisure Study recommends appropriate floor spaces to be taken forward in the Core Strategy.</p>
BUILT ENVIRONMENT			
CSOO/40	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Built Environment Vision - the references to enhancement of the historic environment and securing well-managed/looked after built and natural environment assets are welcomed.</p> <p>Current Policy Approach - as already noted there will be significant gaps as a result of abolition of RSS which will need to be picked up at the local level.</p>	Comments noted and welcomed. The need to review the scope of policies in the light of the demise of RPG13 is recognised and will inform the drafting of strategic and development management policies.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>BE1 - the objective is appropriate, well worded and supported accordingly. In terms of current policy it is considered that there are likely to be gaps having regard to the abolition of RSS and the fact that PPGs 15 and 16 have been superseded by a much briefer document....so in terms of the Options it is considered that additional policy guidance will be needed, for example to pick up the approach to local (undesignated) assets.</p> <p>BE2 - the objective is agreed and supported; in terms of the option it is considered that if the wider benefits of heritage, including as part of regeneration proposals and in supporting the visitor economy, are to be realised that option i) is not appropriate and that options ii) and iii) should be pursued.</p> <p>BE3 - objective welcomed, and option ii) needs to be pursued to pick up the important current policy gap in terms of sustainable construction.</p>	
CSOO/75	Janet Belfield Natural England	<p>Built Environment Objectives BE1 - BE3</p> <p>We broadly support objectives and policy direction to identify, conserve and where appropriate enhance the built environments of Warrington. We also support a policy direction that facilitates sustainable design and construction. We would welcome policy that conserves and where appropriate enhances biodiversity, landscape and townscape character and quality, and development that contributes to a sense of place in urban as well as rural areas. We would also welcome minimum targets and standards for sustainable design and construction which can be monitored as part of the wider Core Strategy monitoring process.</p>	Comments noted, and will be further taken into account in drafting development management policies, and associated targets and indicators.
CSOO/140	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	Support	Support welcomed

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE			
CS00/21	Mr Tom Ferguson Planning Policy manager Mersey Forest	<p>This objective is strongly supported. The reference to the MerseyForest is welcomed and the Forest is committed to supporting Warrington in the delivery of these objectives</p> <p>The vision relating to Where is Warrington refers to links to other areas in the sub region when talking about green infrastructure. This is not really reinforced either in W3 or this green Infrastructure section. There may be some implied wider references such as Red Rose forest and when referring for example to the SankeyValley. However it is suggested that the importance of considering Warrington's green infrastructure in the wider sub-regional context merits a more specific reference in this section</p>	<p>Comments noted in respect of the importance of Warrington's GI in the wider sub-region.</p> <p>Vision and objective GI to be amended to address this point.</p>
CS00/41	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>Green Infrastructure Vision -</p> <p>mostly welcomed and supported, but in terms of habitats and species the impacts of climate change need to be considered so the following addition would be appropriate: "...identified and protected, including in accordance with a strategy to adapt to the impacts of climate change." Recognition of the importance of the multi-functional benefits of green infrastructure is apt and welcomed.</p> <p>GI1 - The objective is well worded and comprehensive, it is to be commended. In terms of the options in respect of principles it is considered that both approaches should be pursued, i.e. separate policies relating to the relevant aspects of GI, e.g. biodiversity, flood control; together with an over-arching policy that sets out the broad, co-ordinated approach to GI in respect of safeguarding, improving (including adding to multi-functionality) and its role in climate change adaptation. In terms of sites/networks options then iii) is supported.</p> <p>GI2 - This objective is also supported; in accordance with the response to GI1 it is considered that option ii) should be followed.</p> <p>GI3 - The inclusion of this objective is also supported as this is an important element of a GI network. In terms of the options it is difficult at present to see a case for a general health promotion policy, albeit that the Trust would not object to this; however, it may be more appropriate to follow options i) and iii)</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>GI Vision will be amended as recommended. See response to CS00/38 also.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/57	Mr Nick Sandford	<p>GI4 - The objective is strongly endorsed - it is clear that a more pro-active approach to landscape management/restoration is required. In this context option i) is inadequate and therefore option ii) is supported.</p> <p>GI5 - The objective is supported, and indeed considered necessary in the context of PPS7 and current best practice; the current policy is clearly not sufficient and accordingly options i) and ii) are necessary - arguably using i) to identify the key issues that arise from the current LCA work and how they will be addressed, and ii) to provide more detailed requirements in terms of the content and assessment of individual proposals.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust manages a large number of small urban woods in Warrington, which we inherited from the former Warrington and Runcorn Development Corporation.</p> <p>Whilst there is much to commend your suggested approach of having an overarching policy on green infrastructure and taking a holistic view, we would not like to see this at the expense of a strong policy on certain elements of GI, and in particular woodland.</p> <p>In particular, we would like to see a policy which gives strong and preferably absolute protection to ancient woodland and also to ancient and veteran trees. Strong protection for these assets is currently set out in PPS9 and we would like to see your Core Strategy give equally strong protection.</p> <p>We welcome the positive references in Objective GI1 to the role which a well connected network of green infrastructure can play in enabling adaptation to climate change. You mention the urban heat island effect but there is a well recognised specific role for trees in helping to counteract increases in urban temperatures during periods of hot weather (research by the University of Manchester). Some effect could be obtained by other forms of greenspace but trees have been shown to be particularly effective and can also deliver a wide range of other social and economic benefits for local communities. Woodland has been shown to be particularly useful for providing areas for healthy exercise, as it has an ability to absorb large numbers of people.</p>	<p>Comments noted in respect of ancient woodland and veteran trees.</p> <p>Objective GI1 - comments noted in respect of cooling effects of trees.</p> <p>Evidence base to be amended to include Woodland Trust report called "Woodland Actions for Biodiversity and their role in water management" and the "North West Regional Forestry Framework".</p> <p>Comments noted in respect of revisions to the North West Regional Forestry Framework. The existing policy approach in the UDP already seeks to contribute to the implementation of the MerseyForest. This policy approach will be retained and expanded to include the North West Regional Forestry Framework initiative.</p> <p>In respect of comments relating to the last bullet point of objective GI1 and the request to extend this to including "improving access</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>You also mention the role of green infrastructure in flood alleviation. The Woodland Trust has recently produced a report called "Woodland Actions for Biodiversity and their role in water management" which sets out clearly research from many quarters which shows a role for tree planting and woodland creation in improving water quality and alleviating certain types of flooding. This report is available on our website at www.woodlandtrust.org.uk</p> <p>We welcome your commitment to extend green infrastructure "where appropriate" but we would like to see a more specific commitment to substantial woodland creation and tree planting. The North West Regional Forestry Framework is currently being revised to include an aspiration of a doubling of woodland cover and this is the scale of aspiration which we would like to see reflected in your Core Strategy.</p> <p>We welcome the mention in the last bullet point of GI1 of the importance of improving access to sport and recreation opportunities. We would like to see your Core Strategy extend this concept to improving access to the natural environment, including woodland. We would comment and approach based on access standards such as the Natural England Access to Natural Greenspace Standard. We would also like you to consider our Access to Woodland Standard which aspires that:</p> <p>Everyone should have a wood of at least 2 hectares within 500 metres of their home and everyone should also have a wood of at least 20 ha within 4km of their home.</p> <p>We have just produced a revision of our Space for People report which sets out the Woodland Access Standard and shows how each local authority performs against it. Our figures show that in Warrington 17.6% of residents have a 2ha wood within 500m of their home and 71% have a 20ha wood within 4km. For comparison, the corresponding figures for Halton are 22% and 88%, which shows that there is scope for more woodland creation to give even better access to woodland for people in Warrington.</p>	<p>to the natural environment, including woodland". It is considered that this point is already addressed in the second bullet point of objective GI1. The reference to "nature" is intended to capture nature in its widest sense including wildlife and all the natural environments, including woodland.</p> <p>Comments noted in respect of setting standards for access to the natural environment. Targets for monitoring access to open space (including the natural environment) and sports/ recreation provision will be considered at the next stage of the process.</p>
CSOO/113	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	GI1- GI2, -Green Infrastructure in future development - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to provide for a sustainable and holistic approach to eco development.	Comments noted.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/76	Janet Bellfield Natural England	<p>Objectives GI1 - GI5</p> <p>We would fully support commitment to a plan led approach to deliver Green Infrastructure (GI) through provision of a single integrating GI policy. We would welcome a framework for an integrated network of multi functional GI with specific sites mentioned for conservation, enhancement, or inclusion in the network. Policy should seek to realise the potential of greenspace for multi-functional use and benefits, including access to natural green spaces. We want the Core Strategy to include standards for green space provision and suggest that you research our own GI Guidance and our Accessible Natural Green Space Standards. Other Councils have adopted these standards.</p> <p>Natural England's Access to Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt) give a useful minimum standard for the extent and quality of provision which should be expected. Information regarding ANGSt is available through our website .</p> <p>Natural England believes that everyone should have access to good quality natural greenspace near to where they live. 'Nature Nearby' provides a broad range of benefits to people and the quality of their lives, covering all the ecosystem services we depend on. This guidance is aimed at parks and greenspace practitioners and their partners, particularly decision makers, planners and managers of green space. It describes the amount, quality and visitor services of accessible natural green spaces that we believe everyone is entitled to, and provides advice on how they can be delivered.</p> <p>Nature Nearby - Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance(2010) can be found here .</p> <p>The following references may also be useful to you as evidence in working towards the next stages of the Core Strategy:</p> <p>The North West Climate Change Partnership delivers the North West Climate Change Action Plan as well as offering a variety of other advice and information. This is available from www.climatechangenorthwest.co.uk and should also be useful to you in relation to the work on the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>The following guidance may also be useful to you:</p> <p>"Climate change and biodiversity adaptation: the role of the spatial planning system". Natural England commissioned report. April 2009.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Council currently has adopted standards for the provision of green space, which are contained in the Open Space and Recreation Provision SPD (2007). The Playing Pitch Strategy (2003) and Open Space Review (2006), which informed the SPD are currently under review and will feed into the LDF process.</p> <p>The capacity to monitor Access to Nature is held and this will be considered further when we are looking at targets and indicators.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/141	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>"Green Infrastructure. How and where can it help the NW Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change". MerseyForest & others. (June 2010).</p> <p>Vision - Support this policy as it is for Green Infrastructure, but object to non natural environment status a legal requirement and something that the plan will need.</p>	<p>It is agreed that Green Infrastructure does not only relate to the natural environment but many elements of the non-natural environment also. The wording makes reference to examples of this in terms of playing fields, canals, gardens, and allotments.</p>
CSOO/84	Paul Daly Sport England	<p>Objective G11</p> <p>Sport England is concerned that the objectives of conserving and diversifying multi functional green infrastructure could have adverse effects upon playing fields. For example, provision of a play area, pond and wetland habitat area on a playing field would diversify the range of functions, and indeed, conserve green infrastructure. However, such action could reduce the useable area of the playing field and thereby represent the irretrievable loss of an opportunity for participation in pitch sports.</p> <p>It should be emphasised here that PPG17 considers playing fields separately from other types of open space, sport and recreation facilities and states that planning permission for development should not be allowed unless specific exceptions apply. The general Government approach to playing fields also treats playing fields differently to other forms of green infrastructure and open space typologies. For example, Sport England was made a statutory consultee in relation to developments affecting playing fields, and referral mechanisms put in place, due to specific concerns about their loss. No similar arrangements have been put in place for other open space typologies.</p> <p>The consultation paper on a new Planning Policy Statement: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment (Department for Communities and Local Government 2010) continues this approach of giving specific consideration to playing fields.</p> <p>In terms of options, therefore, Sport England would not support the integration of all aspects of Green Infrastructure into a single policy unless playing fields were given separate consideration within the policy. Similarly, site listings should identify playing fields as a separate grouping.</p>	<p>G11 - Playing fields are identified as a separate grouping along with sites of international, national, regional and local significance for bio-diversity, trees and woodland areas etc.</p> <p>G11 and G12 - Whilst the general approach to GI will be for it to perform as many functions as possible any decisions with regard to playing fields will be based on an audit of current provision and an assessment of projected needs that is currently being undertaken. The findings of which will inform a revised Playing Pitch Strategy that will have specific regard to playing pitch provision.</p> <p>G13 - Comments noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>G12</p> <p>Sport England welcomes in principle the objective of seeking to secure provision for new Green Infrastructure as an integral part of new development. In terms of options, whilst an integrated approach might be desirable it is not clear how this could work in practice as some types of Green Infrastructure have recognised, and differing, methodologies for assessing need and existing provision whereas other forms of Green Infrastructure do not. Incorporating open space, sport and recreation within Green Infrastructure could result in simplified analysis of demand and supply, especially in relation to sports facilities. The risk associated with simplified analysis is that the provision being sought would not relate to need.</p> <p>A note to explain the Council's Greenways and Healthy Lifestyles Strategy and the roles of the various strategic locations would be beneficial. Objective G13 again emphasises that whilst there are clear synergies between Green Infrastructure and open space, sport and recreation the various components are disparate. For example, OrfordPark includes major built facilities for sport and health (swimming pool, sports hall, synthetic turf pitches, health facilities) whereas SankeyValleyPark is a 15 mile green corridor which follows a canal. Both these locations appear to be regarded as Green Infrastructure. Producing subsequent policies that are appropriate to such differing forms of Green Infrastructure will be challenging.</p>	
CS00/94	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Green Infrastructure Objective G11 Some of the space and habitat for wildlife should not be accessible to people. Options: The CWT would support Option ii) which is to integrate all aspects of GI into a single policy Objective G14 Add its provision of Ecosystem Services to this list.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Public access will be a matter for site management at a very specific local level, and need not be referenced in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is not clear that the reference to 'Ecosystem Services' would add anything significant to the text.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
MINERALS AND WASTE			
CS00/6	Miss Rachael Bust Coal Authority	<p>The Coal Authority is a Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues and provide information on coal mining.</p> <p>The Coal Authority set up a new Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department in 2008 to re-engage with the three planning systems across England, Scotland and Wales. The main areas of planning interest to The Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the safeguarding of coal as a mineral in accordance with the advice contained in MPS1 and MPG3 in England; and • ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduce the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in PPG14 and MPG3 in England. <p><i>Please Note: The Coal Authority is a specific named consultee under the 2008 amendment to the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations. As such we should have been notified about this consultation, but it appears that we were not. Could you please check your consultation database and, if necessary, add the above contact details to ensure that this does not occur again during future Development Plan consultations.</i></p> <p><u>Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction</u></p> <p>As you will be aware, the Warrington area contains very limited coal resources in the north-west of the Borough which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. This information is available to Mineral Planning Authorities free of charge from The Coal Authority following signing a data sharing licence and was given to Warrington Borough Council on the 8 December 2009.</p> <p>The current Energy White Paper, published in May 2007, estimated that " by 2020 fossil fuels are expected to supply the great majority of UK energy needs and 14% of primary energy demand will be met by coal."</p>	<p>The overall comments on the role of the Coal Authority are noted along with the support for objectives MW5 and MW6. In particular the main areas of planning interest to the Coal Authority are the safeguarding of coal as a mineral resource and ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduce the future liability for subsidence and other mining related hazards. The safeguarding issue will be addressed within the Core Strategy along with the development management considerations associated with potential land stability.</p> <p>It is noted that the Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development and this issue will be taken into account within the development management considerations within the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy will address the issue of coal bed methane extraction within the Borough.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>In March 2008, the Rt Hon. John Hutton MP, Secretary of State for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform stated that "...Fossil fuels will continue to play an important role in ensuring that flexibility of the electricity generation system as well. Electricity demand fluctuates continually, but the fluctuations can be very pronounced during winter, requiring rapid short term increases in production. Neither wind nor nuclear can fulfil that role. We therefore will continue to need this back up from fossil fuels, with coal a key source of that flexibility...."</p> <p>The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan White Paper builds on the 2007 White Paper, was published in July 2009 to set out the national strategy for climate and energy suggests that by 2020, clean coal will contribute 22% to the overall energy mix (this is actually an increase on that predicted in 2007 Energy White Paper). The 2009 White Paper re-confirms that "coal and gas will remain important to ensure our electricity supply is reliable and secure as we move towards greater dependence on intermittent sources like wind...The UK needs to main security of supplies of fossil fuels, which will remain an essential input to our electricity supplies for many years to come. Around a third of this is supplied by the UK coal industry."</p> <p>The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In instances where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. Contact details for individual operators that may be able to assist with coal extraction in advance of development can be obtained from the Confederation of Coal Producers' website at www.coalpro.co.uk/members.shtml.</p> <p><u>Coal Mining Legacy</u></p> <p>As you will be aware, the north of the Warrington area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.</p> <p>Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. The new Planning Department at The Coal Authority was created in 2008 to lead the work on defining areas where these legacy issues may occur.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. Even in areas where coal mining was deep, in some geological conditions cracks or fissures can appear at the surface. It is estimated that as many as 2 million properties of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas needs to take account of the coal mining legacy issues. The principal source of guidance is PPG14, which despite its age still contains the science and best practice on how to safely treat unstable ground.</p> <p>Within the Warrington area there are 5 recorded mine entries in the north of the Borough. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by the Local Planning Authority to ensure site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards.</p> <p>Although mining legacy is as a result of mineral workings it is important that new development delivered through the Local Development Framework, recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. Land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on the new development, rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.</p> <p>As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of the Coal Authority may be required.</p> <p>Further to our comments submitted on the Core Strategy Refined Vision in early 2010 The Coal Authority is pleased to note that the Core Strategy Objectives and Options consultation document considers the issue of mineral resources within Warrington.</p> <p>We also consider however that the Core Strategy should identify that past coal mining activity has taken place in collieries to the north of Warrington. This has left a limited environmental legacy, as mining activity took place at depth, but one that should nevertheless be acknowledged within the Core Strategy as a potential issue for developers to be aware of, should any new development be</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>proposed in this area. We have recently spoken to your Development Control team about providing the Council with our coal mining legacy information, in order that this can be added as a layer to your GIS DC constraints system.</p> <p>The Coal Authority fully supports objectives MW5 and MW6 which state that the Council intends to protect viable mineral resources from sterilisation by other non-mineral forms of development and to promote the sustainable extraction of mineral resources by operators. The Coal Authority considers therefore that in order to achieve these two objectives the Council's preferred option for minerals should be (iii) - a combination of both mineral safeguarding (which should include the small area of surface coal resource in the north west corner of the borough) and criteria based policy to ensure sustainable practices for mineral extraction.</p> <p>One further issue that we consider should be addressed in the Core Strategy is Coal Bed Methane extraction from deep coal seams that are present in Warrington. As required by Annex 4 of MPS1, CBM licensed areas should be identified within the LDF. The Coal Authority can provide you with this information upon request.</p> <p>Reason - In order to acknowledge the coal mining legacy in Warrington, and set out a strategy for the future of mineral planning within the Core Strategy, in line with MPS1.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these comments, we are of course willing to discuss the comments made above in further detail if desired and would be happy to negotiate alternative suitable wording to address any of its concerns.</p>	
CS00/4	<p>Alethea Faulkner GMGU (Urban Vision Partnership Limited)</p>	<p>Waste and Minerals are covered under the same heading on pages 35 and 36 of the consultation paper. For waste the vision for 2026 includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meeting all waste management needs (inc landfill) through provision of facilities • significant reduction of imports of waste into Warrington, whilst still having regard for sub regional/ regional/national need; • Landfilling residual wastes only. 	<p>The detailed comments are noted and welcomed.</p> <p>In terms of waste management facilities the respondent raises a number of significant relevant issues which will need to be addressed in the emerging Core Strategy. The particular</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>The Greater Manchester Waste Plan Publication Report is in alignment with the Warrington vision for waste in 2026. Recognition of the need for Warrington to provide certain regionally important waste facilities is welcomed and this should be incorporated into the emerging policy approach within the Core Strategy. It is recommended that the vision be amended to reflect the fact that landfilling of residual wastes should only include non-biodegradable wastes.</p> <p>Once the preferred options for waste issues are known (stated as autumn 2010), further work on the identification of strategic sites and preferred policies will be required.</p> <p>The options presented for achieving the vision include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify specific sites for a range of waste management facilities in the Core Strategy; 2. Set out a clear criteria based policy for the assessment of planning applications in the Core Strategy and identify specific sites for a range of waste management facilities in a separate Development Plan Document; 3. A mixture of the above. <p>The options are simplistic at this stage and therefore it is hoped that once a final option is chosen from the above, further consultation on the detailed arrangements, policies to be included and potential site allocations will be carried out.</p> <p>In addition to the issue of Council Collected Waste arisings, which from the Needs Assessment 2009 are likely to make up less than 25% of total waste arisings in Warrington, it will be necessary to address all waste issues within any emerging Core Strategy. This must include policies on wastes outside the control of Warrington Borough Council, such as Commercial & Industrial wastes, Construction & Demolition wastes, hazardous wastes, Low Level Radioactive wastes, Agricultural wastes, and also Sewage sludge wastes. It may also be necessary to include site allocations for the treatment and disposal of such wastes over the Plan period. In terms of the options for achieving the objectives Warrington Borough Council should recognise the significant nature of waste policies contained within the Core Strategy to neighboring and other regional authorities. Production of comprehensive policies and site allocations will constitute a significant level of work and may require the production of a separate DPD covering Waste.</p>	<p>references to Warrington providing certain regional important waste facilities to assist neighbouring authorities will be given detailed consideration. The suitability of bringing forward waste management facilities to serve sub regional strategic needs will be assessed with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The comments on minerals are noted and will be given due consideration.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>With the removal of the NW RSS, detailed direction from the regional planning team on waste issues will disappear. Therefore coverage of all waste planning issues, including the comprehensive evidence base, all policies and completing intensive work on site allocations for inclusion within emerging Core Strategies in the North West will become more important and subsequently more challenging. The current vision is simple but the detailed work required to implement the vision, in accordance with national planning policy will be challenging and it is considered that the options set out for achieving this vision are unlikely to achieve the vision.</p> <p>In summary, the emerging Greater Manchester Waste Plan is clear that some reliance on facilities outside Greater Manchester will continue throughout the Plan period and therefore robust and supportive waste policies and allocations within the Warrington Core Strategy will be essential. It is considered that option 3; (a combination of both options) are taken forward by Warrington Borough Council.</p> <p>Minerals</p> <p>MPS 1 requires Mineral Planning Authorities to encourage the efficient use of all minerals and alternatives to them. An objective promoting the use of alternatives to primary minerals would ensure this requirement is met.</p> <p>The objectives in the Core Strategy set out a commitment to protect mineral resources from sterilization but for the purposes of clarity it would be helpful for the term 'mineral safeguarding area' to be set out in full.</p> <p>One of the Government's national objectives for minerals planning is to promote the sustainable transport of minerals by rail, sea or inland waterways. The Manchester Ship Canal has the potential to be used for the transportation of aggregates (recycled and virgin). Therefore, the Core Strategy could refer to the potential of the Manchester Ship Canal in the sustainable transportation of minerals.</p> <p>The consultation document sets out three options for minerals. GMGU prefer Option iii. 'Both of the above' ('identify and safeguard important mineral resources' and 'set out a clear criteria based policy for the assessment of planning applications and control of mineral workings').</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/16	Mr Paul Knott Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	<p>As a Minerals Planning Authority, Warrington BC is required to define mineral safeguarding areas and given the limited scope for minerals development in the Borough, setting out criteria based policy for the assessment of planning applications will ensure that any proposals that do come forward for minerals extraction can be properly assessed.</p> <p>On behalf of Merseyside and Halton local authorities we support the approach proposed in the Core Strategy with regard to the Council's waste management priorities, and specifically with respect to landfill diversion and recycling.</p> <p>Merseyside and Halton continue to use landfill sites in the Borough for the disposal of wastes from homes and businesses. The approach taken in Core Strategy statement MW4, which acknowledges that the Borough's landfill sites are a resource to assist waste management within the North West region, is both pragmatic and welcomed. Notwithstanding, the emerging Joint Merseyside Waste Development Plan Document aims to implement policies which will help to reduce the quantities of waste which will export to Warrington in the future, thereby reducing the contribution of our waste management activities to local impacts.</p> <p>The proposed "Vision for 2026" identifies the need for a waste management facility to deal with the Borough's residual wastes and which will make it self-sufficient. The adopted Municipal Waste Management Strategy proposes that this would be an Energy from Waste (EfW) plant operating on a modest scale compared to some of the facilities of this type which have already received planning consent in neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>One approach to the Borough's future waste management needs which the Council might contemplate is to invest instead in a facility to pre-treat the residual waste into a secondary product (Solid Recovered Fuel). This product could then be sent to a facility elsewhere, such as one of those in Merseyside and Halton. We recognise that treating waste locally is more sustainable than transporting it over even modest distances. However the Council will be aware that EfW plants are usually controversial, making it difficult to identify locations that are both sustainable and acceptable to the local community. This issue may hinder delivery of such a site or prevent it from being built at all.</p> <p>Although the Regional Spatial Strategy is in the process of being revoked, Merseyside and Halton consider that it appropriately encourages the region's waste planning authorities to make best use of consented capacity in order to contain the number of new waste facilities that need to be built,</p>	<p>The comments in support of the approach proposed in the Core Strategy are appreciated and welcomed.</p> <p>The suitability of landfill sites within the Borough to assist waste management in the north west will be assessed within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Comments on the possible options for the development of the Borough's final preferred MWMS are appreciated and useful. .</p> <p>Comments on mineral resources are noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/42	Alan Hubbard National Trust	<p>limited land needs and their collective impact. As the Vision only defines a need for waste management facility of undefined type, may we suggest that the Council considers the above suggestion as one potential solution to meeting its future residual waste management needs.</p> <p>We also support the positions taken by points MW5 to MW7 (inclusive) regarding the safeguarding of the Borough's mineral resources. These statements are consistent with the joint position adopted in the Mersey Belt (ie. Merseyside, Halton, Warrington and Manchester) in the regional coordination of the protection and supply of minerals and aggregates to local, regional and national markets.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste Vision - having regard to the Waste Hierarchy it is unfortunate that the first sentence refers to landfill; it is suggested that the second paragraph is moved to the start of the Vision, with the current first paragraph following it and with the order of the first and second sentences reversed.</p> <p>MW1/MW2/MW3 - the objectives are appropriate and welcomed. In terms of the options it is considered that the approach needs to encompass both the overarching issues and more detailed criteria, accordingly option iii) is supported.</p> <p>MW5/MW6/MW7 - the objectives are appropriate and welcomed. In terms of the options it is considered that the approach needs to encompass both the safeguarding of mineral resources and set out detailed criteria for the assessment and control of mineral developments, accordingly option iii) is supported.</p>	<p>The suggested re format of the Vision will be given consideration during subsequent stages of the Core Strategy. The comments that the objectives are appropriate and welcome are acknowledged.</p>
CSOO/77	Janet Belfield Natural England	<p>Objectives MW1 - MW7</p> <p>We would welcome policy directions that secure effective conservation of soils, recognising their importance as a natural resource; and conservation and enhancement of biodiversity.</p> <p>We would welcome references being made to specific soils, and sites of geodiversity interest with clear measures for their conservation and enhancement described. The local Wildlife Trusts have useful information on local designations and any Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Sites (RIGS), which should also be taken into account.</p>	<p>The comments are noted and will be taken into account during the development of the Core Strategy. A decision will be taken on whether or not to include these issues within a separate Natural Environment section or to incorporate them into another relevant topic area within the Core Strategy</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/142	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>This reference to Defra's Soil Strategy may be helpful. "Safeguarding our Soils: A Strategy for England" (Defra, 2009), provides a vision that by 2030, all soils in England will be managed sustainably and degradation threats tackled successfully.</p> <p>We believe that references to soils and geodiversity should be included in a separate 'Natural Environment' section.</p>	<p>General support appreciated and welcomed. The Core Strategy will consider if a specific minerals and waste policy is necessary to protect sensitive wildlife sites or whether this can be accommodated within other development management policies.</p>
CSOO/85	Paul Daly Sport England	<p>Support generally but object to no objective re: application / extension to minerals site within sensitive wildlife areas. Flintshire County Council can give you their exact policy etc.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Core Strategy must recognise that former mineral and waste sites should be restored to beneficial afteruses with appropriate long term aftercare provisions. The preferred afteruse will be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage when an agreed suitable afteruse should be determined which itself would depend on the particular circumstances appertaining to the site.</p>
CSOO/70	Mr Matthew Hayes Regional Estates Manager Waste Recycling Group	<p>The vision and objectives are silent on the after use and / or restoration of former waste and mineral extraction sites. Such sites can represent opportunities for sport and recreation. For example, mineral extraction sites have potential to become sites for water sports depending upon the nature and extent of the mineral extraction: Smaller sites may be suitable for windsurfing and canoeing while appropriate extraction methods and subsequent engineering operations could lead to major multi-purpose water facilities, such as the National Water Sports Centre at Holme Pierrepont. Likewise, inert landfill operations can be used to create golf courses. This section of the document would benefit by the scope being widened to include consideration of the after use / restoration of minerals and waste sites.</p>	<p>The comments are noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The respondent raises a number of significant issues involving the Arpley landfill site which must be addressed within the Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that the site has</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>Detailed comments are presented on the relevant sections of the report below, where appropriate extracts from the consultation have been repeated in italics for ease of reference.</p> <p>Strategic Options</p> <p>WRG support the promotion of the Arpley Meadows area for future development. This area borders the existing consented landfill boundary and future development of should be planned mindful of the landfill development; that can in time provide a complimentary adjacent development.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste - Vision in 2026</p> <p>There will be a reduction in the amount of waste sent to landfill as waste is moved up the waste hierarchy, however there will always be some waste (that cannot be economically reused, recycled or recovered) sent to landfill and we are pleased to see that this has been acknowledged within Warrington's vision.</p> <p>WRG agrees with the Warrington vision to ensure sufficient landfill capacity remains within the Borough throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The vision states <i>"The only wastes sent to landfill constitute waste with no further potential for recycling or re-use"</i>. WRG suggests that the proposed statement is too restrictive and may lead to significant financial burdens for the Council and businesses within the Warrington area as although many wastes can be recycled, and are, some that technically could be are not as the cost is simply too high or the facilities not locally available (or in some cases nationally). A revised wording of <i>"The only wastes sent to landfill shall constitute waste with no further economic potential for recycling or re-use"</i>.</p> <p>Minerals and Waste - Objectives and Options</p> <p>WRG broadly supports the objectives MW1 through to MW3. Regarding the proposed options, WRG considers Option iii appropriate; specific sites should be allocated for strategic large scale waste management facilities supported by criteria based policies.</p> <p>We also consider that policy MW3 should be broadened to support the extension of existing facilities before the development of new. This will ensure the use of existing sites are maximised and reduce the need to develop new sites. This point is especially important as Policy EM13 within the North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) required, wherever possible, that existing sites <i>"should be used in preference to other sites where waste management activates have not previously been</i></p>	<p>historically provided landfill capacity which has been used to meet the sub regional/regional needs for landfill. It is also known that a substantial void will remain when the current planning permission expires in October 2013. The suitability of the Arpley landfill site to continue to provide capacity to meet sub regional landfill needs will be assessed within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>There are a number of documents which supported the production of RSS which are acknowledged as material considerations for emerging Core Strategies. The Council will have regard to the role these documents will have in developing Core Strategy policies.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
INEQUALITIES			
CSOO/43	Alan Hubbard National Trust	Generally supported - no specific comments to make (other than the probable need to amend or explain the term 'vertical drinking').	Comment noted. A reference will be added to the Glossary.
CSOO/119	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	<p>I2 -Reducing inequalities by ensuring all areas have an accessible local centre with access to fresh food and appropriate services - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to achieve this objective by providing the opportunity for a new neighbourhood centre, with a modern convenience store offer for the existing and future residents.</p> <p>I3. -Ensure access from areas of income deprivation to employment and areas of business growth -A strategic allocation at Peel Hall will bring massive investment and urban regeneration into the central core of Warrington's Regeneration Area. The scheme will be in close proximity to the proposals for the A49 business area and synergies and complementary development will occur to the advantage and benefit of the local communities.</p> <p>I4 - To encourage environmental improvements in areas of deprivation -A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to provide for major environmental improvements throughout the site and its locality within the Regeneration Area.</p>	<p>All comments noted. The appropriateness of a strategic allocation at Peel Hall will be assessed as the core strategy process continues. The need in housing terms for such an allocation must be established prior to any consideration of additional benefits an allocation may bring, and all options need to be explored.</p>
<p><i>located</i>". Now that the RSS has been revoked that Policy is no longer afforded any weight. The principle of this approach within the region has however clearly been accepted. It is now be the role of the Local Development Documents to carry this forward. For this reason, Policy MW3 should be amended to specifically reference extensions to existing sites.</p> <p>Policy MW4 states <i>"To reduce the amount of waste imported into the Borough...having regard to sub regional and regional needs..."</i>. WRG considers this is likely to be met by the natural completion of a number of landfills in the Warrington area combined with a reduction in tonnage to landfills as waste is moved up the waste hierarchy. This same reduction in landfills, repeated across the North West, will likely result in the remaining landfills acting as sub regionally and regionally important facilities and this should be acknowledged within the policy.</p>			

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/143	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>I5 - To increase housing choices in areas of deprivation - A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to provide for a variety of housing types and styles, both for the market and those with specific housing needs. Housing provision on the Peel Hall site is able to compliment existing public sector housing provision within the area so as to achieve a more flexible local housing market creating opportunities for a throughput within the existing stock of special needs and affordable housing.</p> <p>I6 - Affordable Housing -A strategic allocation at Peel Hall is able to bring forward a significant amount of Affordable Housing for those in general housing need and those with more specialist requirements, such as the elderly and the disabled.</p>	Support welcomed
CS00/86	Paul Daly Sport England	<p>I4</p> <p>Objective I4 seeks to improve the number and quality of parks and green spaces. This objective would benefit by being amended to also include seeking to improve accessibility. Furthermore, the current UDP policy protects many of the "elements of environmental improvements". However, objective I4 does not appear to include a safeguarding role. This is an important omission, as without protection it could prove very difficult to achieve the objective of increasing quantity.</p> <p>In terms of options, it is difficult to form a view about continuing to improve the environment through planning obligations / tariffs without information on how the current approach is performing.</p>	Comment noted and amendments made to Objective IP4.
CS00/82	Jonathon Burns DPP	<p>Objective I3 Inequalities</p> <p>Whilst DHL generally support the principles of the objective, it is important that new employment generating uses are not solely focused within the inner areas of Warrington (option i). If option i was progressed it could hamper or prevent development within key regeneration areas outside the inner areas of Warrington. Instead the focus should be on the regeneration areas identified in this document (page 49 onwards) which also suffer from high levels of deprivation and are not necessarily located within the inner areas of Warrington (e.g. A49 Gateway), as defined within by existing UDP policy EMP5.</p>	Comments noted and will be given due consideration when considering preferred option.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		Objective I4 - Inequalities DHL generally support this objective but feel that any future policy should be linked to the regeneration areas identified in this consultation document.	
HEALTH, PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIME			
CSOO/22	Mr Tom Ferguson Planning Policy manager Mersey Forest	The reference to the role of green infrastructure in Objective HP5 is supported	Support noted
CSOO/44	Alan Hubbard National Trust	Health, Public Safety and Crime Generally supported but no detailed comments to make.	Comment noted
CSOO/102	Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes	HP3 – there is no statutory basis to provide 'Building for Life' (BfL) so any policy is aspirational and needs to take account of development viability. In our experience of delivering BfL (it is a requirement in certain HMRI areas not as part of planning policy but via Development Agreements) it impacts upon land-take (BfL units tend to have a larger footprint) and build-costs, both of which are not returned through higher sales values. We therefore advocate caution in policy terms on this matter, especially in this climate;	Comment noted. It is appreciated that there is no statutory basis on which to specify 'building for life', hence the reference within the objective to just promoting it.
CSOO/121	Mr Collin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	HP4 – To provide sport, recreational and cultural facilities in locations accessible for all As the Authority are aware, Winwick Football Club wish to have a permanent home for their Youth Football Team and Peel Hall, as part of a strategic allocation, could provide an opportunity to create such a facility.	Comment noted
CSOO/78	Janet Belfield	Objectives HP1 – HP5	Comment noted

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
	Natural England	We welcome references in this topic to GI. Natural England fully supports the links and evidence that exist between positive benefits for health and access to a healthy and natural environment. We welcome inclusion of this with the main GI policy.	
CS00/87	Paul Daly Sport England	<p>Vision for Health, Public Safety & Crime</p> <p>The recognition of the link between healthy lifestyles and access to sport, recreation, and green infrastructure facilities in the vision is welcomed.</p> <p>HP1</p> <p>There is opportunity here to amend the objective such that it seeks new healthcare facilities to incorporate other community facilities, including sport and recreation facilities. Some primary care facilities now include fitness suites, swimming pools etc. alongside libraries and offices. Such facilities can help contribute to more active lifestyles, and also be used directly for physical activity referrals by healthcare professionals. There are opportunities to use the findings of a PPG17 audit and needs assessment to help shape the nature and location of such facilities. Likewise, there are opportunities for more efficient use of land and potential for reducing journeys by combining facilities on accessible sites.</p> <p>HP4</p> <p>Sport England broadly supports the objective of providing sport and recreational facilities in accessible locations. However, provision of sport facilities should be based on assessments of need / audits of existing provision, and the results might identify the appropriate location for new facilities as being those with the highest level of unmet demand. These locations might not be those typically regarded as the most accessible, eg town centres. Indeed, some facilities by their very nature rely on natural resources or open land (such as golf courses, playing pitches, equestrian facilities) which will be found more frequently in the wider urban area, on the urban fringe, or in the countryside as opposed to in town or district centres.</p> <p>HP5</p>	<p>Comments noted. To some extent the policies for locating community and health facilities in established centres support the HP1 comment; however it is difficult to see how the specific objective suggested could be delivered.</p> <p>In relation to Objective HP4, the need for open space will indeed be underpinned by the Council's Open Space Audit evidence base. Objective HP5, comment noted and amendments made.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/92	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Mr M Waheed	<p>There would appear to be considerable overlap between this objective and G11. As a result, my comments made in relation to G11 are also applicable here. I would also add that if the decision is made to continue with objective HP5 then bullet point 1 should be amended to include places for sport. The current policy column makes reference to playing fields, which by definition are primarily used for pitch based sport as opposed to play or relaxation.</p> <p>Tourism and Leisure</p> <p>We support HP4 which is to provide sport, recreational and cultural facilities in locations which are accessible for all. The consultation document states that the Council aim to continue the current policy approach aims to ensure an appropriate level of provision of open space and recreation facilities in each area and these are directed towards the most accessible places i.e. existing centres in accordance with current policy. We support this approach however it is imperative that each settlement has the necessary facilities to aximize its self containment.</p>	Comment noted

3 Schedule of Responses - Building Blocks

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
THE BUILDING BLOCKS			
CS00/28	GVA Grimley Ltd	<p>The West Warrington 'building block' includes reference to Omega. Our general response to the matters identified can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regard should be had to the fact that Omega Phases 1 and 2 has the benefit of an extant permission for B1 uses. This should be reflected within policy WW2; reference to the need to potentially restrict development whilst having regard to sequentially preferable locations is not relevant in this respect. • With regard to the options there is clear scope to review the masterplan in the context of the changing circumstances outlined. The review would include both the non strategic area and the strategic site so as to allow for maximum flexibility. • The commitment at WW3 to introducing other land use elements on the land at Omega is strongly supported. The four criteria listed provide an appropriate framework against which to review alternative uses; we would however question whether the specific criteria need to be made binding in every respect. There may be classes of development or particular uses which may not meet any of the criteria but would be otherwise acceptable and contribute to the wider aims. <p>The JV are committed to bringing the site forward as a true mixed use, sustainable urban extension, and are committed to working with the Council in terms of formulating policy, developing the masterplan and engaging in the development management process to bring this about.</p>	<p>Comments noted, including the need to reflect the extant permission and the suggestion that the review of appropriate uses should include both the non strategic and the strategic site to allow for flexibility.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to the criteria set out in the objective WW3 prior to their inclusion in any Core Strategy policy.</p>
CS00/88	Paul Daly Sport England	<p>This section of the consultation document identifies various locations and sites, and also makes reference to studies which have assessed individual sites, such as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p> <p>It is likely that some locations and / or sites include playing fields or other land and buildings used for sport and recreation (eg there is reference to Wilderspool Stadium, Fordton Leisure Centre, Warrington RUFC, school sites etc.). Sport England would like to emphasise here that Planning Policy Guidance</p>	<p>Comment noted. Some of the locations identified in the building blocks section would be subject to more detailed assessment to justify any development. The need for justification and the possibility that</p>

Schedule of Responses - Building Blocks

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/5	Mr Michael Hancock	<p>Note 17 (PPG17) states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which has shown the land or buildings to be surplus to requirements, or replacement open space, sport or recreational facilities are provided. With regards to playing fields, PPG 17 and Sport England's Playing Field Policy oppose development of playing fields in the absence of a PPG17 compliant robust assessment of need unless the requirements of specific exceptions are met.</p> <p>The exact impact of the protection offered by PPG17 to locations and sites identified in the consultation document is unclear without reviewing each individual site. Unfortunately, we do not have the resource to undertake such a task. In light of this, Sport England would make the point that some locations and sites which have been identified for development, might themselves need replacement provision, and that requirements for such replacement provision should be made explicit.</p>	<p>replacement provision may be required will also be reflected in any resultant policies.</p>
CSOO/144	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	<p>It seems to me specifically with regard the Town Centre the whole tone of the document is way too self congratulatory and upbeat.</p> <p>e.g. p44 "complemented by a wider mix of uses in newly regenerated areas around Bridge Street, Market gate" etc!.</p> <p>The reality is very much at odds with this document.</p> <p>Virtually no progress has been made to the core of the Town in the last 5 years which has not been driven and paid for by Lend Lease.</p> <p>The input from the Council in my opinion has been minimal and with the funding squeeze currently taking place I can see little hope of progress in the short to medium term.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The vision statements set out look 15 years ahead and are not intended to reflect the current situation.</p> <p>The Council is proactively engaged in bringing forward development in the Bridge Street area which will look to introduce a mix of new uses into the area. The regeneration of this area is a priority for the Council and development is expected within the 15 year Core Strategy timescale.</p>
CSOO/144	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	Support wholly	Support welcomed
REGENERATION AREA			

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/52	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>The regeneration area incorporates a stretch of land bounded by the Manchester Ship Canal to the south and the M62 to the north. The Refined Vision describes how this area is to be the focus for housing provision and development. The proximity of this area to the M6 and M62 (M62 Junctions 9 and 10, M6 Junction 21) means that development here may be of concern to the Agency and consequently, the development aspirations here should be brought forward in close consultation with the Agency.</p> <p>A number of key sites are identified within the document, and these include sites that already have planning permission and those that don't. The scale of these sites is not apparent from the information provided in the document and the Agency will need further information in order to be able to provide appropriate comments on specific sites.</p> <p>The Northern Spine A49 Corridor location contains a number of key sites and it is recognised that the cumulative impact of these will require strategic intervention. Rather than allowing ad hoc development as suggested in option i), the Agency would prefer this site to be allocated as a strategic location with more specific guidance as to appropriate uses, as set out in option ii). This will allow better control of development coming forward at this location close to the M6 and M62. This could be in the form of a DPD or SPD. The Agency also considers that it would be useful for the document to define what is meant by 'strategic intervention', along with a definition of a 'strategic location' in order that these terms are understood correctly.</p>	<p>All potential development sites are being tested through the Borough's Multi Modal Transport Model. Development on each site has been quantified for the purposes of the model and the impacts of potential development will be tested.</p> <p>Comments regarding the A49 corridor and the preference for providing more detailed guidance as to appropriate uses is noted.</p> <p>The need for more detailed definition of terms used is also noted.</p>
CSOO/103	Mr Simon Artiss Bellway Homes	<p>Regeneration Area Section - Greenalls Distillery is referred to and is assumed to include our site and we therefore support its inclusion. RA9 - a policy to support implementation is suggested although nothing further is provided. What would such a policy say? We confirm our intention to submit Reserved Matters on the site as we seek to deliver the residential development and reclaim this PDL site.</p>	<p>There are a number of matters that could be included in such a policy, and it would be in recognition of the difficult market conditions that are likely to pertain for the foreseeable future. Possible matters include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a presumption in favour of the renewal of unimplemented existing permissions where the only impediment is the weak housing market • a willingness to discuss the renegotiation of Planning

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/106	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	<p>The Broad Strategy</p> <p>We note that the Vision in 2026 for the various areas of Warrington sets out very clearly where the focus for development should be within the Core Strategy - within the Regeneration Area which includes Peel Hall. It should be noted that the Vision states</p> <p><i>"The Regeneration Area has been the focus of housing provision and development over the last fifteen years and the area has benefitted as a result. The older parts of the town have been regenerated as popular and attractive places to the live with easy access to local jobs and services. There are good local facilities and open spaces that link to a wider walking and cycling network of green infrastructure which is beneficial for health and recreational purposes. Improvements to the area and its links to other areas have meant that environmental accessibility and quality of life disparities have been reduced. A "building for life" approach to providing new housing in this area has meant there is less need to move out of the area as family needs and aspirations change".</i></p> <p>It is very clear from this Vision that Peel Hall will be an important component of the area as it continues to develop and this is examined in more detail later in these submissions.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Vision refers to the A49 corridor which <i>"has been renewed and improved by new employment opportunities and an improved appearance"</i>.</p> <p>This Vision is able to be contrasted with those for the other, more peripheral areas of Warrington, namely West, East and South Warrington.</p> <p>The Vision at 2026 for West Warrington states:</p>	<p>Agreements where development is no longer viable in present conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nomination and support for schemes eligible for government funding initiatives • A willingness to use CPO powers where ownership difficulties arise <p>Comments noted. It is recognised that the size of the Peel Hall site means that any proposed development would have significant impacts, but these have yet to be assessed.</p> <p>As set out in the Introduction to the Objectives and Options document, Strategic Option 2 is emerging as the preferred option. However, all the options are being assessed further before final conclusions can be drawn.</p> <p>The reference to opportunities presented by larger greenfield sites being examined to ensure that they are released only when needed would also apply to Peel Hall.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p><i>"Employment development has advanced at Omega and is a model of good design and sustainability..... Chapelford has been completed and provides a mix of house sizes and types including Affordable Housing in a safe, high quality environment".</i></p> <p>The Vision at 2026 for East Warrington states:</p> <p><i>"East Warrington has not changed significantly in the last fifteen years Opportunities for the re-use and redevelopment of sites within established employment areas at Risley and Woolston Grange continue to arise and these opportunities to incrementally improve the image, appearance and accessibility of those areas are guided by local Master Plans" ... "The former Bruche Training Centre has been successfully developed and now provides market and Affordable Housing in a high quality, sustainable environment".</i></p> <p>And finally the Vision in 2026 for Stockton Heath and South Warrington states:</p> <p><i>"The area has not experienced significant change over the last fifteen years".Traffic congestion has reduced thanks to effective demand management across the area Opportunities presented by larger Greenfield sites are being examined to ensure they are released only when development is necessary to contribute to the Borough's housing needs".</i></p> <p>It is very clear, therefore, that the Vision set out within the Issues and Options document seeks to concentrate future development within the Regeneration Area. This concentration of new development and investment will act as a catalyst in improving those inner, more deprived parts of Warrington, which includes the Wards surrounding Peel Hall.</p> <p>The document also sets out key issues relating to the Regeneration Area. stating that <i>"Housing provision is important within the Regeneration Area - the area needs to support a more balanced housing offer to encourage people to stay in the area and sustain communities"</i>. This is a theme elaborated upon further in these representations.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/123	Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam	<p>The Core Strategy Objectives and Options Report set out clearly, and in our view correctly, that the focus for the forthcoming Plan period (i.e. up to 2026) should be encouraging development within the Regeneration Area. This area includes Peel Hall which lies immediately adjacent to some of the most deprived areas of Warrington. Such areas require large scale investment so as to achieve life changing investment and improvement within the existing locality. A strategic allocation at Peel Hall will enable such improvements to be made.</p> <p>Peel Hall.</p> <p>We note from para 1.4 of the Report that Option 2 of the previous draft requires revision to include Peel Hall with the "Amber" area, rather than in the "Red" area as originally proposed, on account of the planning status of Peel Hall not being able to be distinguished from that of the HCA land in South Warrington. We agree with this repositioning for the reason set out but also for the following additional reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peel Hall is located within the Regeneration Area; it is the only strategic opportunity for life changing development within the Regeneration Area that will dramatically improve the living conditions of existing communities. 2. Peel Hall provides the opportunity to make a strategic allocation to fulfil numerous policy objectives set out as aspirations within the Core Strategy. 3. As such, the opportunity to bring forward a comprehensive development at Peel Hall, with all the benefits this could bring, should not be missed at this stage. <p>Four options are set out within the Regeneration Area section of the report in respect of the possible treatment of Peel Hall within the Core Strategy; these are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do nothing. 2. Include in the Greenbelt. 3. Strategic allocation for housing and associated uses. 4. Strategic location for future development needs. 	<p>Preferred approach to Peel Hall noted. The chosen approach to Peel Hall within the Core Strategy will be informed by decisions on an appropriate level of housing development in Warrington over the Core Strategy period and evidence on housing demand and supply within the borough.</p> <p>The proposed benefits of development at Peel Hall are theoretical at the moment and would depend on if, when and how the site is brought forward for development.</p> <p>It should be noted that whilst the site is within the Regeneration Area, it is also a greenfield site. The emerging preferred strategic option suggests that the focus of development should be brownfield sites in inner Warrington with selective release of other sites. The greenfield nature of the site means that it may not automatically be a preferred location for development, despite its location within the Regeneration Area.</p> <p>The comments on the Options are noted. The expressed preference assumes that it is necessary to allocate land for development during the plan period, and that Peel Hall is the preferred location.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>We would respond as follows to each of these options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i "Do nothing" is by its very nature not a planning approach; Peel Hall needs to be fed into the Core Strategy and therefore a pro-active course for this land area needs to be agreed. ii "Include in the Greenbelt" would require a strategic review of the existing boundaries of the Greenbelt around Warrington. There is no policy basis for a strategic review of Green Belt around Warrington as part of this Core Strategy, and the Issues Report sets out very clearly that it is not intended to review the boundaries of the Greenbelt as part of the process. To include Peel Hall Farm within the Greenbelt therefore is not available at this stage. iii "A Strategic allocation for housing and associated uses: would be the most appropriate route forward in our view. Such an allocation is able to be planned and phased so that it provides for the necessary amount of development either in terms of a set timeline or related to the performance of external factors such as progress on major urban sites or other such monitoring factors. iv "A Strategic location for future development needs: appears to be similar to the former "Area of Search" policy that existed in Warrington in the past This could lead to further plan reviews, and so delays, if there are more than one such allocation, and if there is only one such allocation then it becomes iii rather than iv in any event, when the site is required to be brought forward. For this reason we do not feel this approach is appropriate. <p>The preferred approach therefore, would be to positively allocate the site at this stage, with a phasing mechanism so that investment decisions are able to be made by both the landowner and those in proximity to the site, such as infrastructure providers. In this way, the future of this part of the Regeneration Area is able to be properly addressed throughout the period of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Such an allocation will provide the opportunity to create a sustainable extension to the existing communities of North Warrington and to bring massive improvements and benefits to the current locality within which the site sits. There will be major local improvements in terms of employment, recreational, shopping, healthcare, housing and quality of life issues, which are only able to be created and sustained with a development at Peel Hall.</p> <p>We trust the above view will be taken into account and look forward to discussing the many aspects of Peel Hall as raised in this letter with your Officers in due course.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/145	Eng Klaus Armstrong-Braun	- Support wholly	Support welcomed
CSOO/83	Jonathon Burns DPP	Objectives RA1, RA2 & RA3 The Northern Spine A49 Gateway DHL support the identification of the A49 gateway as a regeneration area and the inclusion of improvements to this corridor within the vision. DHL support option ii which seeks to allocate the area as a strategic location with specific guidance as to appropriate uses. It is recommended that the type and scale of appropriate uses required to achieve the objectives need to be carefully considered. It is recommended that the appropriate uses should replicate the wide range of uses existing along the A49 gateway and should include employment uses (B1, B2 & B8), leisure, education and retail. It is imperative that any future policy is predicated on delivering this objective and recognises the need for a critical mass to achieve this.	Support for identifying the A49 corridor as a strategic location is noted. The suggested appropriate uses will be considered against national policy objectives and local circumstances including evidence collected to support the Core Strategy. Specific consideration will be given to the Town Centre uses suggested as being appropriate in this location (leisure and retail) given the town centre first policy approach and the need to support Warrington Town Centre.
WEST WARRINGTON			
CSOO/10	David Percival Strategic Planning Group Leader Salford City Council	Salford City Council considers that the mix of uses on the Omega site should be revisited, so that the emphasis is on B2 and B8 uses. Offices should not be provided on the site and should be directed towards the Regional Centre and town centres, and of course particularly Warrington Town Centre in the context of this Core Strategy.	Part of the site already has outline planning permission for a mix of uses including B1 offices, and this will be unaffected by the Core Strategy. Objectives for the economy clearly state the locational principle of directing office developments to the town centre, but recognises that market demand plays a significant part in locational choices, as also recognised by PPS4.
CSOO/53	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	West Warrington lies to the west of the regeneration area, including the housing areas of Westbrook, Chapelford, Callands, Whittle Brook, Old Hall and	The Multi Modal Transport Model will provide a robust evidence base to ensure impacts of proposed and anticipated development are minimised.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
	<p>Kingswood, as well as employment sites at Lingley Mere and Omega. Further housing and employment development is anticipated for West Warrington in the vision for 2026, with excellent public transport links and traffic impacts on the local and strategic road networks well managed.</p> <p>Development in the area will need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base, including traffic modelling, in order to ensure that the traffic impact at the SRN is minimised, particularly as the area borders the M62.</p> <p>With regards to Chapelford, the objective is to 'achieve the completion of the Chapelford urban village' which will comprise residential development, a railway station, a village centre, a primary school, a health centre and a mixed use area. It is recognised within the document that strategic intervention may be required to help deliver the infrastructure for this and the Agency will look to work in consultation with Warrington to ensure that development is brought forward in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>As with the Regeneration Area, a number of sites are identified in West Warrington, and the scale of these sites is not apparent from the information provided in the document. Therefore, the Agency will need further information in order to be able to provide appropriate comments on specific sites, however the cumulative impact of these sites will be of concern to the Agency given the proximity of West Warrington to the SRN.</p>	<p>The current approach to joint working with the Highways Agency on the evidence base for the Core Strategy, including the Multi Modal Transport Model will ensure that development is brought forward in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The anticipated scale of development on sites is detailed in the Multi Modal Transport Model work, which will also help to assess the cumulative impacts of development.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/31	Paul Knott	<p>My comments relate to the Strategy for development in West Warrington, and specifically to objectives WW2 and WW3 which relate to the Omega site. In the previous version of the Strategy it appeared certain Omega would be taken forward as it is currently proposed and it was assumed that traffic impacts would not materialise or could be solved. I am somewhat re-assured that the current wording of the <i>Vision for 2026</i> suggests the Council is taking a more pragmatic position which recognizes the existence of other land that should be a priority for re-development. However I remain unconvinced that the Council will be able to manage the increased traffic which will be an inevitable consequence of even modest development on the Omega site, and saddened at its visual effect on this part of the town.</p> <p>1. <i>Do we need Omega?</i></p> <p>The wording of the <i>Vision for 2026</i> suggests the Council acknowledges Omega is not necessarily the first priority for development and that other land allocated for non-residential use should be considered first. Since Omega is recognized as a strategic site for the whole of Warrington I would hope the review of land would extend to brownfield plots throughout the town and not just within the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Nevertheless, there is plenty of land nearby which should be exploited first, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the many empty premises (some recent, some older and in need of refurbishment or replacement) on the Europa Business Park; 	<p>A borough-wide employment land review is being carried out as part of Core Strategy work. This will ensure an appropriate and flexible supply of employment land over the Core Strategy period based on previous employment land take up rates. Although the current allocation will be reviewed, the level of employment land required in the borough over the plan period means that Omega will likely form part of this land supply. The flexible supply required means that a range of sites should be provided, and the scale and nature of the Omega site distinguishes it from other sites in the borough, such as those listed, which will also be considered and included in the employment land supply where appropriate. Omega is also 'previously developed land', part of the former Airbase that was specifically reclaimed for development through the New Town programme.</p> <p>The vision for 2026 in West Warrington states that "traffic impacts on the local and strategic road networks are being well managed". This recognises that there may be impacts on the road network resulting from development of Omega, but that these have been mitigated and minimised where possible.</p> <p>Potential uses on Omega are currently being assessed in the borough's Multi Modal Transport Model to predict impacts and effects. Current transport movements have been modeled as part of the model. This will allow any potential impacts and effects of development to be taken into account in the Core Strategy policy framework and in assessing any application for development on the site.</p> <p>Modelling the potential impacts of development will allow them to be managed in the most appropriate way.</p> <p>The Multi Modal Transport Model is borough wide, so potential impacts will be modelled at this geography and will not be confined to the more local road network.</p> <p>The Objectives and Options document sets out that the emerging preferred option is to prioritise development on inner Warrington brownfield (previously developed) sites, and to promote employment development near the town centre. However this may not be sufficient to deliver the varied needs of the local economy over the life of the plan, and Omega is likely to have a role to play.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> several empty serviced offices on the land between Westbrook Crescent and Westbrook Way, as well as other undeveloped land in this area which is presumably allocated for business use; the large empty concrete plot at the southwest corner of Winwick Quay industrial park. <p>All sites have convenient access to junctions 7 and/or 8 on the M62; they could surely house some of the functions that are proposed for the Omega site; and they would not encroach on open space.</p> <p>2. <i>What will happen if Omega is developed?</i></p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, I consider that the <i>Vision for 2026</i> for West Warrington contains an oxymoron. All the evidence leads me to believe that the Council and the Highways Agency will be powerless to deliver any substantial development on either part of the Omega site without creating very significant adverse impacts on the local road network that cannot be mitigated. Moreover the connectivity of the road network in the North of Warrington and the limited number of routes for through traffic mean that any local congestion will have knock-on effects elsewhere in the town. Objective WW3 refers to reducing traffic impacts, whereas the evidence points to an inevitable increase. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The route round from Junction 8 to the A57 near Dawson House is used by local and through traffic as an outer north-west ring-road for the town. It is already badly congested along Whittle Hall 	<p>The detailed policy framework for the site will seek to ensure that the site is developed to a high standard of design. Open land to the north and west of the site is protected by the Green Belt.</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="485 1733 501 1756">• 	<p data-bbox="421 1182 475 1688">Avenue during rush hour with traffic backing towards the Westbrook area at its eastern end.</p> <p data-bbox="485 1182 852 1688">In summer 2009 a traffic accident forced the closure of the lower part of Burtonwood Road during the evening rush hour, resulting in virtual gridlock of the surrounding through roads (notably Winwick Road and Cromwell Avenue) as drivers sought alternative routes. Whether traffic is halted due to a blocked road or due to congestion, the knock-on effects are inevitable regardless, and this event was a foretaste of a regular occurrence if Omega was developed. A further consequence was that traffic was queuing down the slip-road and onto the westbound M62, creating a safety hazard.</p> <p data-bbox="861 1182 1347 1688">The light sequences on the Junction 8 roundabout are already finely balanced and leave no scope for change to accommodate more traffic or a new access onto the roundabout. Several roads leading onto it already get very short green sequences which allow no more than 4-5 vehicles through (and usually only a single HGV). Omega will generate more traffic and the only way to prevent it building up to congest local roads will be to alter the light sequences. I assume the aim of this change would be to provide longer green sequences for Lower Burtonwood Road (possibly serving the main Omega site), for Upper Burtonwood Road (serving Burtonwood village and the northern part of Omega), or the unused Omega entrance onto the roundabout that exists already.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="868 1733 884 1756">• 	<p data-bbox="1356 1182 1442 1688">I fail to see how the light sequence could be changed to accommodate more traffic from any one of these directions, let alone all three, without</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>increasing the queues on the other roads that exist already. Some days traffic on Charon Way is backed up most of the way down to the Warrington Audi garage, suggesting it will be close to 15 minutes before those at the back of the queue will get onto the roundabout. The <i>Vision for 2026</i> expects Gemini to remain a successful trading site, but why would anyone want to visit the stores if it takes an age to get back to the M62 afterwards? Changing the light sequences on Junction 8 will only make things worse for Charon Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same outcome will affect the accesses from Burtonwood village and traffic leaving the eastbound M62. Problems with the latter will result in traffic queuing down onto the motorway, creating a safety hazard. I cannot believe that the Highways Agency would tolerate that outcome. • Moreover the southern part of Gemini and the Scorpio business parks suggest that public transport improvements are unlikely to offer a solution. These sites are already served by (in my opinion) a good high frequency 18/18A bus service which connects to other good services across the rest of the town. Yet few people use it to go shopping at Gemini and the side roads and verges around both areas are littered with the parked cars of people working in the light manufacturing and distribution businesses which occupy units on these sites. Neither of those land uses has the same employment density as the office use which would apparently predominate on Omega. Even if the Omega site offers more generous parking the current evidence suggests it will just generate more traffic from those who 	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>live outside the town or who cannot be bothered to use public transport.</p> <p>I ask that any future traffic assessment will not be confined to the immediate vicinity of Omega but will consider the effect of local congestion on the town's road network. Omega may be a strategic site but is it so important that much of the town has to be brought to a halt? I cannot accept that the Council can permit development of Omega and also moderate and eventually reduce local traffic effects. Therefore <u>the Vision for West Warrington as currently stated cannot be delivered, and therefore I question its soundness.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>Preserving open space in West Warrington</i> <p>Approaching Warrington from Liverpool along the M62, the "edge treatment" is attractive, even if this is by accident rather than design. The openness of the former airfield helps, especially now that the hangars have gone. The houses at the edge of the Kingswood and West Westbrook sectors are surrounded by plenty of trees. Even the curved roof of the Royal Mail distribution centre to the south complements the impression rather than intruding on it.</p> <p>The new town master-plan for the Callands/Westbrook area was enlightened, building in green corridors and retaining open space and plenty of greenery. I recognize that the Council is under pressure, much of it external, to provide land for more houses and jobs, but it is necessary to push further development relentlessly towards the local authority boundary until there is no more open land left?</p>	

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/122	<p>Mr Colin Griffiths Managing Director Satnam</p>	<p>I encourage the Council to prioritise more efficient use of land which is or has been used for non-residential use before gobbling up more open space (even if that means more commercial development that is closer to my house than Omega would be!). However, if the Omega this site has to be developed, then let it be for uses which would not blight this part of Warrington with more anonymous sheds or with fumes from the inevitable increase in congested traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted. An employment land review is being carried out as part of Core Strategy work. This will ensure an appropriate and flexible supply of employment land over the Core Strategy period based on previous employment land take up rates. Although the current allocation will be reviewed, the level of employment land required in the borough over the plan period means that Omega will likely form part of this land supply. The flexible supply required means that a range of sites should be provided, and the scale and nature of the Omega site distinguishes it from other sites in the borough.</p> <p>It is appropriate, however, to consider whether all of Omega is required over the Core Strategy period and whether there are legitimate reasons to consider alternative uses on parts of the site. In view of deliverability issues, the Council has a responsibility to review the continued allocation of the site (PPS4, policy EC2.1.h).</p>
EAST WARRINGTON		<p>Omega -Summary</p> <p>It is our firm view that the Omega site should be retained for strategic employment purposes within the Core Strategy. It is essential that Warrington has a flagship employment site which is able to be readily developed, and which is attractive to national and international markets. Omega is well placed to serve Liverpool, Manchester, the wider region and internationally (via Manchester and Liverpool Airports). Whilst other sites may be available elsewhere in Warrington for uses similar to those proposed for Omega, these sites are not in such a strategic location and are, as a result, not so attractive to would be occupiers. It is in our view essential for the economic wellbeing of the region that Omega is retained as an employment site.</p>	
CSOO/54	<p>Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency</p>	<p>East Warrington lies to the east of the regeneration area and is adjacent to both the M6 and the M62. It incorporates areas such as Woolston Grange, Birchwood Park, Risley and Longbarn. The objectives</p>	<p>The Council will continue to work closely with the Agency as work on the Core Strategy proceeds.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/99	Turley Associates on behalf of MEPC Birchwood Park General Partner Ltd	<p>identified within the document for the key sites in East Warrington are considered by the Agency to be appropriate. Given the proximity of the area to the SRN, the Agency will need to be involved in any development proposals at this location at an early stage.</p> <p>With regard to Warrington's centres, Built Environment, Green infrastructure, Minerals and Waste, Inequalities, Health Public Safety and Crime, the Town Centre, Stockton Heath and South Warrington and The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements the Agency has no comments to make on the objectives and options for these sections.</p>	
	<p>Objective EW2</p> <p>The areas that comprise East Warrington, including Birchwood Park, and their future role are considered within this section. It correctly recognises the quality and importance of this area with objective EW2 specifically seeking to support Birchwood Park as 'as a <i>flagship sustainable and high quality business park of sub-regional importance</i>'. My client wholly supports this approach and, given the evidence base's recognition of the importance of Birchwood Park, supports my view that a more promotional approach should be taken to future development across the site consistent with the amendment to the Strategic Option set out above. This will be instrumental in achieving the 'continued success' envisaged for the borough's economy.</p>		<p>The support for objective EW2 is welcomed, and the preference expressed for Option 2, involving a more promotional policy is noted.</p>
STOCKTON HEATH AND SOUTH WARRINGTON			

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/1	Mr Andrew Cross	<p>The former New Town housing sites I believe need to be designated as green belt to preserve the distinct areas and not create one large mass of housing. The Appleton Cross proposal will extend Appleton up to the edges of Appleton Thorn and destroy the feeling of openness and countryside, defined under Green Belt. Many sites in Warrington need to be developed before areas such as this should even be considered for development, and PPS2 should ensure the Green Belt is protected.</p> <p>Housing in these areas would also put a huge strain on the infrastructure in South Warrington, the narrow roads, the small village schools etc...</p> <p>The Stockton Heath Centre should be limited to ensure it does not become a huge social problem for the surrounding residence.</p>	<p>Preferred option for the former New Town sites noted.</p> <p>The chosen approach to the former New Town sites within the Core Strategy will be informed by decisions on an appropriate level of housing development in Warrington over the Core Strategy period and evidence on housing demand and supply within the borough.</p> <p>To make a strategic change to the extent of the Green Belt would require the demonstration of very special circumstances and none are identified. The Green Belt was established very recently in 2006 following a thorough examination of all the issues.</p> <p>If a preferred option emerges for these sites which proposes potential development within the Core Strategy period, this would have to be supported by appropriate infrastructure planning, including assessment of services and facilities in the surrounding area as well as testing the impact of proposed development on the surrounding road network through the borough's Multi Modal Transport Model.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/8	Mr. Peter Briggs Clerk Stockton Heath Parish Council	<p>Following receipt of your letter dated 19 July regarding the above and referral to the report on the website, may I advise you of the following comments from the members of Stockton Heath Parish Council:</p> <p>Strategic Option 2 It is recommended that, due to the perceived sufficiency of brownfield sites to accommodate residential requirements for the foreseeable future, the HCA sites at Appleton Cross, Grappenhall Heys and Pewterspear should be redesignated from the 'amber' area to the 'red' area - 'Areas where development would be restrained over the plan period.'</p> <p>Stockton Heath and South Warrington - Objectives/Options Vision - in 2026..... Recommended that the paragraph relating to Stockton Heath be amended to the following: Stockton Heath is thriving as the main retail and service centre in south Warrington, and is a popular evening destination where people of all generations feel safe.</p> <p>Stockton Heath Centre - Option iii. is preferable but amended to the following: Apply a criteria based policy to assess changes of use from retail, subject to Stockton Heath Parish Council being involved with the setting of the criteria based policy which should include a restriction in the change of use of any premises to Class A3, A4 or A5.</p> <p>Former New Town Housing sites - Grappenhall Heys, Appleton Cross, Pewterspear. The preferred option is 'ii. Include in the Green Belt' and therefore exclude the plan objective for these areas due to the inadequacy of the roads infrastructure to accommodate any further housing development.</p>	<p>Comments relating to Stockton Heath Centre are also noted. The vitality and viability of Stockton Heath centre is of importance and it is evident that there are concerns over amenity issues due to the evening economy. Any planning issues will be addressed through the Local Development Framework and Core Strategy policies where appropriate.</p> <p>Strategic Option 2 See previous response</p> <p>Stockton Heath and South Warrington – Objectives / Options / Vision – in 2026 See previous response</p> <p>Stockton Heath Centre -Comment noted. A criteria based approach consistent with national policy could not include a presumption against particular changes of use.</p> <p>Former New Town Housing sites - Preferred option for the former New Town sites noted.</p> <p>The chosen approach to the former New Town sites within the Core Strategy will be informed by decisions on an appropriate level of housing development in Warrington over the</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>Warrington Rugby Union Football Club. As a 'green open space', it should remain as such and not be nominated for consideration as a housing site in the SHLAA.</p> <p>Lumb Brook & the Dingle The Bridgewater Canal. Objectives fully supported.</p> <p>The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements - Objectives/Options Manchester Ship Canal - Port Manchester. Option iii. including both bullet points is recommended.</p> <p>Walton Hall and Gardens. Presumably will be updated following recent developments.</p>	<p>Core Strategy period and evidence on housing demand and supply within the borough.</p> <p>Warrington Rugby Union Football Club - sites are included within the SHLAA for a number of different reasons. The methodology used to produce the document is in accordance with national guidance and has been agreed following consultation. Inclusion within the document does not predetermine that the site will come forward for development or receive planning permission. The SHLAA is a tool used to assess the suitability, availability and deliverability of suggested sites for housing development. The site's inclusion in the SHLAA is therefore entirely appropriate.</p> <p>In this instance the SHLAA concludes that whilst the site may be suitable for housing development, there are currently significant constraints to its development - namely its designation as urban green space and playing field.</p> <p>Lumb Brook & the Dingle The Bridgewater Canal - Support noted.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
THE COUNTRYSIDE AND CONSTITUENT SETTLEMENTS			
CS00/11	David Percival Strategic Planning Group Leader Salford City Council	Salford City Council welcomes the references in The Mosses section to working with the adjacent local authorities. The other key partner would be Natural England rather than the Countryside Agency. The city council would welcome a policy approach that places a very strong emphasis on developing the biodiversity potential of the Mosses, focusing particularly on lowland raised bog restoration, as well as protecting the area's role as an important carbon sink. The agricultural and recreation roles of the area will also be important.	Comments noted. The reference to the Countryside Agency will be changed to Natural England.
CS00/45	Alan Hubbard National Trust	this is considered to be appropriate in the context of the characteristics of these areas and the proposals for the remainder of the Borough; accordingly it is supported. Key Issues - no specific comments to make. Key Sites - no specific comments to make.	Support noted.

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/68	<p>Barry Murphy</p> <p>Dalton Warner Davies</p>	<p>Background</p> <p>1. These informal representations are submitted in relation to the Council's Core Strategy Objectives and Options Consultation Paper (CSOOP) (July 2010) and draft Infrastructure Capacity Assessment (ICA) on behalf of Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) in respect of Fiddlers Ferry Power Station and land within SSE's ownership.</p> <p>2. Dalton Warner Davis (DWD), on behalf of SSE, submitted representations to Warrington Borough Council in relation to the Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper (CSIOP) on 23 March 2009, followed by representations in relation to the Core Strategy Refined Vision Paper (CSRVP) on 25 March 2010. The issues raised in those letters remain relevant and copies of these representations are attached.</p> <p>3. DWD's representations of 25 March 2010 referred to DECC's Draft Overarching Energy National Policy Statement (November 2009) (EN1) and the Energy Markets Outlook Report. (December 2009) (EMOR) which confirmed the important role that fossil fuel power stations will continue to play in the provision of flexible and reliable electricity supplies (EN-1 3.6.1 and EMOR 4.3.15).</p> <p>4. On 15 July 2010 Charles Hendry MP, Minister of State for Energy, announced the Government's aspirations to strengthen the current draft EN1 stating that " <i>for large energy projects we need to give industry maximum certainty, so that if sound proposals come forward, they will not fall victim to unnecessary hold-ups</i> ". A revised consultation is due to take place in autumn 2010 ¹ .</p> <p>5. The CSRVP Report of Consultation (May 2010) contains responses to representations on the CSRVP, including those submitted by DWD on behalf of SSE in March 2010. The officer comments in relation to representation ID no. CSVIS/133, with regard to Fiddlers Ferry Power Station, state that:</p> <p>" <i>It is acknowledged that the omission of references to major infrastructure in the Core Strategy should be addressed. The next stage of consultation will see the issue of a further Background Paper setting out a position statement in relation to all aspects of major infrastructure in the borough, including electricity generation and distribution. This will include significant references to Fiddlers Ferry power station and will draw upon the information contained in the representations from Dalton Warner Davis</i> .</p> <p><i>As work progresses to improve our understanding of infrastructure issues, there is likely to be scope for the inclusion of an overarching policy supporting major infrastructure development and investment in the borough, particularly where this is of strategic significance as is the case with Fiddlers Ferry "</i> .</p>	<p>The positive response to the changes made in response to previous consultation is welcomed.</p> <p>In establishing the current Green Belt boundary through the UDP process, the Council was mindful of the need to respect guidance in PPS2 and argued that the exclusion of a wider area in order to accommodate operational development was not necessary, as if the need for additional operational development were to arise in future and require land in the Green Belt, it would clearly be an exceptional circumstance that would justify development. The heightened national importance of securing the nation's future energy needs gives further support for that view. References in the Core Strategy to the strategic importance of the site, as welcomed above, also provide a supporting context.</p> <p>The UDP Inspector concurred with the Council's approach and concluded that:</p> <p><i>I do not consider that the defined policy area should be extended to include the lagoons and sidings and the '10ha' site to the east of the main power station site. In my view, those areas are essentially open in nature</i></p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>6. The Council's draft ICA was published in April 2010. Fiddlers Ferry Power Station is referred to in Section 4 of the ICA where references are made primarily to the Power Station's contribution towards renewable energy provision, the aims of the Borough to support major infrastructure development and the fact that investment at Fiddlers Ferry will need to be brought forward through the Core Strategy as well as other Development Plan Documents.</p> <p>Comments on CSOOP</p> <p>7. Strategic Option 2 is about "Prioritising development on Inner Warrington brownfield sites with selective release of other sites". Our representations to date have emphasised the strategic importance of Fiddler's Ferry, the fact that recent substantial investment has resulted in land being taken for development, notably for co-firing of biomass (built), flue gas desulphurisation (built), ash processing (built) and NOx reduction (planned). The remaining land on the east side of the site is used as construction lay down area and consequently there is very little land within the main site that is available for development; consequently any further large scale projects would require the extension of the built area of the site. Given the strategic importance of Fiddlers Ferry both now and in the future, it is considered that potential future development at the site should be recognised through the Core Strategy.</p> <p>8. Paragraph 1.14 refers to "issues that need to be addressed in refining this option which have arisen from the consultation responses to date". DWD have submitted representations in respect of Fiddlers Ferry for each of the statutory and informal rounds of consultation on the emerging Core Strategy. It is our view that reference should be made as part of the Strategic Option to supporting expansion of Fiddlers Ferry in the future.</p> <p>Reference to the Green Belt remaining largely unaltered is made in the 'Where is Warrington?' vision in 2026. Whilst it is agreed that local alterations to the Green Belt need to be justified, it is considered that in the case of Fiddlers Ferry, there is already significant justification for a local alteration to the Green Belt at the Power Station. Policy provisions need to be in place as part of the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) in order to guarantee that additional land is readily available to accommodate expansion of the power station and in turn contribute toward the security of energy supply in the region.</p>	<p>and differ significantly in character from the main area of the power station site with its massive cooling towers, turbine houses and ancillary structures. The objection sites form part of an important area of open land which serves to separate the power station and adjoining industrial areas within Halton Borough from the urban areas of Warrington to the east. I consider that there is ample land within the operational area of the power station site to allow for appropriate development. Should there be a need to develop the sidings area or the lagoons, for example in order to reclaim the ash or to facilitate new development related to the operation of the power station, I believe that it should be possible to demonstrate very special circumstances in the national interest in support of such development.</p> <p>The Council considers that there is no reason to depart from this approach.</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CS00/79	Janet Belfield	<p>10. Reference in " <i>The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements</i>" vision in 2026 to the strategic importance of Fiddlers Ferry Power Station is welcomed, as are Objectives CC6 and CC7, which seek to support continued investment for the purposes of power generation and to provide opportunities for the establishment of related development.</p> <p>11. There is, however, no specific reference in the CSOOP or ICA as to the need for protection of existing and important non-renewable sources of electricity within the Borough. It is essential that regard is had as part of the Core Strategy to the continued importance of Fiddlers Ferry Power Station to the security of electricity supply, given the recommendations contained in Government's draft EN1, the recent announcements in respect of EN1 by central Government and DECC's EMOR.</p> <p>12. Representations with regard to Green Belt policy in the Borough are well documented in previous submissions by DWD. Therefore, in respect of the Options for future development at Fiddlers Ferry Power Station outlined in the CSOOP, it is essential that the Council progresses with Option ii, which seeks to: " <i>Maintain current policy approach and alter Green Belt boundary</i>". A commitment by the Council to support alterations to the Green Belt boundary to allow for potential future expansion of Fiddlers Ferry Power Station would provide a significant policy basis for the protection and potential future expansion of power generation and associated operations at this strategically important site.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>13. The CSOOP has, to some extent, addressed the concerns outlined in previous representations by DWD with regard to Fiddlers Ferry Power Station and Objectives CC6 and CC7 are welcomed.</p> <p>14. Policy provisions, specifically a local alteration to the Green Belt at Fiddlers Ferry, need to be in place as part of the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF) in order to guarantee that additional land is readily available to accommodate expansion of the power station and in turn contribute toward the security of energy supply in the region.</p>	
		The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements - Vision	Comments noted

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
	Natural England	<p>We welcome such a positive Vision for the countryside and its settlements. We welcome aspirations for greater public, yet quiet, enjoyment of the countryside. We want to see positive policies for the retaining and enhancing land within the Green Belt for a wide range of recreational, environmental and climate change uses and measures, whilst aiming to preserve its open character.</p> <p>We welcome links to built environment and GI in this section and the relationship between them and the countryside in ensuring that landscape character, biodiversity (and geodiversity) amenity and visual amenity of the countryside are safeguarded and enhanced. The role that the green belt can play in adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change has not been realised in the Vision.</p>	
CS00/91	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of Mr M Waheed	<p>The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements</p> <p>Key Service Centres should include those centres that act as service centres for surrounding areas, providing a range of services and with good public transport links. They have the potential to accommodate all types of development including a range of housing, employment and other services. Paragraph 3 of PPS7 identifies that away from larger urban areas, planning authorities should focus most new development in or near to local service centres where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together. They should be designated a proportion of development in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Whilst the regeneration of Warrington town centre and intensification of brownfield sites is sequentially preferable, the Core Strategy must accept the need to develop greenfield sites adjacent to existing settlements. Employment land and housing needs, particularly in the rural areas, cannot be met solely through the continued focus on brownfield sites in central Warrington. As we have seen from the SHMA it also contradicts those studies.</p> <p>We also have concerns in respect of the proposed approach to retail. Whilst making the town centre the focus for major retail development is accepted and is in accordance with PPS4, the retail needs of key settlements need to be carefully considered. Increasing retail opportunities within and adjacent to settlements in the countryside can support the long term sustainability of the settlements and assist in reducing the need to travel.</p> <p>Meeting the needs of the countryside and its constituent settlements as set out above may involve local detailed boundary changes to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Responses at earlier stages of consultation have made the Council's view of 'Key Service Centres' clear. It is not a concept relevant to a highly urbanised borough such as Warrington. As the letter acknowledges, paragraph 3 of PPS7 applies 'away from larger urban areas'.</p> <p>Significant greenfield sites are situated on the edge of Warrington without the need to alter the Green Belt boundary at Lymm or anywhere else, should it prove necessary to make additional land available for development.</p> <p>Reducing the need for travel is a prime purpose of policies that identify a retail hierarchy within the borough and protect these centres from harmful development elsewhere. Lymm village centre is within the currently identified</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CSOO/95	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	<p>The Countryside and its Constituent Settlements Vision in 2026... add 'biodiversity' to the end of the first paragraph</p> <p>Locations: The Mosses Option ii) should probably refer to 'Natural England' rather than the Countryside Agency (which was broken up in 2006)</p>	<p>hierarchy and proposals for additional development will be considered in the context of local and national policies.</p> <p>These amendments are agreed and will be made.</p>
CSOO/151	Emery Planning Partnership on behalf of client	<p>Key Service Centres should include those centres that act as service centres for surrounding areas, providing a range of services and with good public transport links. They have the potential to accommodate all types of development including a range of housing, employment and other services. Paragraph 3 of PPS7 identifies that away from larger urban areas, planning authorities should focus most new development in or near to local service centres where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together. They should be designated a proportion of development in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Whilst the regeneration of Warrington town centre and intensification of brownfield sites is sequentially preferable, the Core Strategy must accept the need to develop greenfield sites adjacent to existing settlements. Employment land and housing needs, particularly in the rural areas, cannot be met solely through the continued focus on brownfield sites in central Warrington. As we have seen from the SHMA it also contradicts those studies.</p> <p>Meeting the needs of the countryside and its constituent settlements as set out above may involve local detailed boundary changes to the Green Belt.</p> <p>Lymm</p> <p>In addition to the above, we also have a number of comments to make in respect of the settlement of Lymm. It is included within the 'countryside and its constituent settlements' in the consultation document. We object to this categorisation. We consider that it should be considered to be a Key Service Centre.</p>	<p>Responses at earlier stages of consultation have made the Council's view of 'Key Service Centres' clear. It is not a concept relevant to a highly urbanised borough such as Warrington. As the letter acknowledges, paragraph 3 of PPS7 applies 'away from larger urban areas'.</p> <p>Significant greenfield sites are situated on the edge of Warrington without the need to alter the Green Belt boundary at Lymm or anywhere else, should it prove necessary to make additional land available for development.</p> <p>Reducing the need for travel is a prime purpose of policies that identify a retail hierarchy within the borough and protect these centres from harmful development elsewhere. Lymm village centre is within the currently identified</p>

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
		<p>There is a need for development of all types in Lymm. Our comments on the need for housing, in particular family housing, and employment development outside of Warrington itself are set out in our response to the strategic option, housing and economy sections. We consider that as a Key Service Centre, development is needed in Lymm to fulfil the needs of local communities for housing, employment, services and recreation.</p> <p>The consultation document acknowledges at paragraph 1.14 that one of the two issues that needs to be addressed in refining the strategic option is to allow for development within the built footprint of the 'larger villages' of Lymm and Culcheth to enable opportunities to provide affordable homes. We consider that this does not go far enough. Land for housing, employment and leisure facilities is required in Lymm. In our view this need cannot be met through sites within the existing settlement boundaries where there are limited opportunities. In respect of employment, there is a need for further employment opportunities in order to reduce the need to travel and to increase the sustainability of the settlement. Reducing the need to travel in rural areas and Key Service Centres should be a key objective of the Core Strategy. These needs are unlikely to be met by sites within the existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>We consider that once the scale of development required in the Key Service Centres such as Lymm is established, an assessment of the capacity of the existing settlements should determine where development should be located.</p>	<p>hierarchy and proposals for additional development will be considered in the context of local and national policies.</p>

4 Schedule of Responses - Next Steps

ID	Name Details	General Comments	Officer Comments
CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS			
CSOO/55	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>The Agency welcomes the opportunity to respond to the current consultation on the Warrington Local Development Framework Core Strategy Objectives and Options. We have suggested a number of minor amendments to the wording of some of the objectives and have requested the inclusion of a definition of 'sustainable location' within the glossary. We have also identified preferred options for policy objectives in some instances.</p> <p>In general terms, the Agency supports the location of development on brownfield sites, with good access to key services via public transport, and where the use of the private car is minimised, though we would be concerned about development sites and land allocations located close to the SRN, which may impact upon the capacity, operation and safety of the SRN.</p> <p>Where large scale regeneration sites in close proximity to the SRN are to be promoted through the LDF process, these sites should be developed in as sustainable manner as possible and in close consultation with the Agency.</p> <p>The Agency looks forward to continued working with WBC throughout the plan-making process.</p>	<p>Suggested amendments, general support, concerns and comments noted.</p> <p>Work will continue on testing the Core Strategy through the Multi Modal Transport Model, which will involve working with the Highways Agency. This will allow large scale regeneration sites to be promoted through the LDF process in as sustainable manner as possible.</p>
CSOO/96	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Conclusions and Next Steps A small typo in bullet point 6: The Town Centre is vibrant 'and' is etc. Does 'more' in this sentence mean 'additional'?</p>	<p>The typo will be corrected as suggested. The sense of 'more' in this case is 'additional' ie 'more centres' rather than 'more local'.</p>
GLOSSARY			
CSOO/97	Chris Driver Cheshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Glossary Green Infrastructure also includes farmland.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Glossary will be amended to reflect this.</p>

5 Schedule of Responses - Infrastructure

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
463049	Mr Michael Rose Catchment Manager United Utilities	<p>Whilst I support the principles and direction of the document as a whole there are a number of amendments and clarifications that I would like to see to Sec.4 in particular 4.19-4.27.</p> <p>4.19 - You reference expenditure totalling £9 million to maintain the water supply system. This is investment related to the provision of water infrastructure and should be removed from this section of the document.</p> <p>United Utilities have now entered AMP5 (2010 - 2015), rather than the 2005-2010 AMP4 period you are current citing, we will be investing £8m to improve wastewater treatment works in the Warrington area to deliver cleaner rivers, streams and coastal bathing waters. United Utilities will seek to prioritise maintenance investment at a regional level in order to maintain service to customers.</p> <p>During AMP5 United Utilities will invest £12m in the Warrington area to help prevent sewer flooding to customers properties, rather than the £1.5m currently quoted in the text.</p> <p>4.23 - The project to improve the quality of storm discharges to Sankey Brook at Bewsey Bridge Pumping Station was completed in 2009. Further work is to be carried out at the station during AMP5 and represents an investment of £10m of investment, this work is scheduled to be completed in 2012.</p> <p>Joint modelling work was carried out in 2009 between United Utilities, Environment Agency and Warrington Borough Council at Longford Barrage. The findings of this exercise are currently being reviewed to determine the next steps. Rather than the comment current in this section about the Longford project.</p> <p>4.25 - Please remove this comment as it has been superseded by comments in 4.23 for BewseyBridge, the remaining stations will be subject to prioritisation at a regional level during AMP5</p> <p>4.26 - No additional processes were added at Gatewarth in AMP4, as currently suggested. We will make improvements to the works during AMP5, as described in 4.19.</p>	<p>All comments welcomed and noted. As the infrastructure evidence process progresses, further consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken to make them aware of key development sites and question whether there may be any infrastructure issues as a result of these. Capital Programmes and Long Term Development Statements will also be assessed in order to produce an infrastructure schedule.</p>

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
273735	Victoria Ridehaugh Highways Agency	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document, we have limited our comments to the Transport section as we did not feel that we needed to comment on the utilities infrastructure, social infrastructure or environmental infrastructure sections.</p> <p>The Strategic Road Network [SRN] within Warrington is comprised of sections of the M6, M62 and M56. The M6 is the longest motorway in the UK and runs from the M1 at junction 19 to join the A74 south of the Scottish Border at Carlisle. The M62 runs from Liverpool to Hull, apart from the short section around the north of Manchester which is numbered as the M60. The M56 is the primary link from North Wales and the M6 to Manchester and Manchester Airport. These routes are deemed to be of national importance and as such the Agency would be concerned if any proposed development sites or land allocations were to have an adverse impact upon their safety and / or operation.</p> <p>Moreover, the Agency should be concerned if, through land use planning policy, the development of land were to increase levels of traffic on the network to those which could potentially create capacity problems in the future.</p> <p>Public Transport: Rail</p> <p>We note the ICA reports that usage of the 6 rail stations within the borough has grown in 2007/8 but does not state how this level of usage relates to the capacity of the services. The Agency considers that it would be beneficial to include information on the capacity of the services so as to provide an indication of the level of spare capacity on the rail network. This would help to focus priorities for any future improvements.</p> <p>Plans for construction of an additional rail stop at Chapelford Urban Village are welcomed by the Agency, as are aspirations for the Borough to benefit from the electrification of the Great Western Mainline and future High Speed Rail Link, through improvements to the accessibility of the North-West region.</p> <p>Public Transport: Bus</p>	<p>All comments welcomed and noted. As the infrastructure evidence process progresses, further consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken to make them aware of key development sites and question whether there may be any infrastructure issues as a result of these. Capital Programmes and Long Term Development Statements will also be assessed in order to produce an infrastructure schedule.</p>

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>The Agency welcomes the improvements to bus stops in the Borough over the last few years, which has included easy access kerbing and real time passenger information boards and also schemes such as that implemented at Chapelford in partnership with the developers, whereby all householders are offered two 6-monthly or one 12 monthly travel pass providing free travel on the whole WBT network.</p> <p>The Agency would recommend that an assessment to identify gaps in the bus network be undertaken as part of the ICA, and whether these could be filled through future infrastructure improvements, to reduce the trip burden on the SRN. This is particularly important for large sites close to the SRN that are to be promoted for future development through the LDF process.</p> <p>Highways: Strategic Road Network</p> <p>We note the ICA includes the Agency's stress maps from the Regional Network Reports, however we would recommend that the daily stress is defined within the report in terms of the time period it covers (i.e. is it peak hours, 18 hours, 24 hours etc).</p> <p>Taking into account the current and projected network (stress) condition of the M6, M62 and M56, the Agency will not be able to support unsustainable land allocations located close to the SRN. Sites being promoted through the emerging LDF will need to be supported by the appropriate sustainable infrastructure and be accessible by public transport, cycling and walking to reduce the need to travel by private car.</p> <p>Moreover, the Agency would recommend that when looking at the impact at the SRN, focus should be placed upon the current operation of the network and the impacts resulting from land allocations contained within the emerging LDF. In addition to stress, 'level of service' performance indicators should form part of the evidence such as journey time analysis and average peak hour speed etc.</p> <p>Highways: Local Road Network</p> <p>The ICA reports that all other roads apart from the SRN are managed by the Local Authority, however there is no assessment of capacity of these local roads or the current and projected levels of service on the local network. The Agency would recommend that such an assessment is provided</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>in order to give some level of assessment of capacity on the local road network. This is especially important where the SRN forms part of a route in conjunction with the local road network or where the SRN provides an alternative to a local route.</p> <p>Private Car</p> <p>It is stated within the ICA that highway network in Warrington has to deal with considerable traffic movements on a daily basis, particularly in the morning and evening peaks. These traffic movements are growing with development and redevelopment pressures both within and outside the Borough. In terms of personal transport, car ownership is higher in Warrington than the rest of the North West with 36% of households having 2 or more cars or vans.</p> <p>Continued and sustained traffic growth is of concern to the Agency as it may place increased pressure on the SRN in the Borough. The Agency would therefore emphasise the importance of ensuring new development is served by sustainable transport infrastructure to help reduce the number of private car trips. This can also be achieved by wider travel planning measures.</p> <p>Parking Provision</p> <p>WBC controls a total of 19 car parks throughout the Borough serving the Town Centre, District and Local communities. The main public parking provision is concentrated within the Town Centre, though there are major provisions at Birchwood and Westbrook Centres. The Council owns and manages a number of car parks in and around the town centre. There are a total of 5,616 spaces for public use, of which the Council controls approximately 17%. The ICA would benefit from an assessment of the car parking capacity, in order to consider whether the existing provision is sufficient.</p> <p>Car parking can play a key role in defining the modal choice when making a trip. Whilst it is unlikely that a car parking strategy within the Borough will impact upon the SRN, it should complement the wider sustainable travel initiatives which will be required to support the emerging LDF.</p> <p>Cycle Routes</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>The ICA describes Warrington's Cycle Map Guide which has been distributed to every household in the Borough and provides a map which categorizes the entire highway network according to the degree of skill and experience needed for cycling. We note however, that no mention is made of the adequacy of the cycle network, how it relates to cycling demand, or where there may be significant gaps in the network.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>The Agency welcomes Warrington's Rights of Way Improvement Plan which is being implemented as this should help to encourage pedestrian and cycle travel.</p> <p>Conclusion and Summary of Key Considerations</p> <p>The Agency welcomes the opportunity to respond to this current consultation, especially as we are already working alongside WBC in the process of developing a traffic model for the Borough, which will help to inform the future highway infrastructure requirements within the Borough.</p> <p>The next step is to identify the infrastructure (transport) shortfalls which need to be addressed to support and deliver the site allocations being promoted by the emerging LDF. If the LIP is to achieve this, and fulfil its purpose of providing a sound and robust evidence base to support the LDF, infrastructure provision and transport intervention need to be guided by outputs from the traffic model. This would enable co-ordination of development and infrastructure phasing which is requisite to deliver sustainable development and growth.</p> <p>Overall, the Agency are encouraged by the work undertaken by WBC at this stage, and would seek to continue to work in partnership to ensure that the transport evidence base and supporting Local Infrastructure Plan is sound and robust, and that any transport infrastructure identified to support the spatial planning of land allocations is evidence based.</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
400405	<p>Alethea Faulkner GMGU (Urban Vision Partnership Limited)</p>	<p>The current consultation on the Core Strategy is accompanied by an assessment of infrastructure capacity. The three paragraphs included on minerals and waste describe the current available infrastructure in relation to these two areas and do not include detail relating to future requirements of the Borough. It is recommended the information on waste infrastructure should be expanded to include consideration of future capacity requirements, especially in relation to economic and residential growth planned through the Core Strategy, this should highlight the specific facility types required for all waste streams and the delivery partners. Greater Manchester Planning Authorities will be particularly interested in information relating to the contribution to waste infrastructure which Warrington will provide for the NW region in future and conversely the infrastructure capacity which Warrington will rely on which is located outside the Borough.</p> <p>Similarly, the information on Minerals infrastructure should be expanded to include consideration of the future requirements of the industry, especially in light of the possible changes in aggregate apportionment. Future developments proposed through the Core Strategy will rely on adequate minerals infrastructure provision in Warrington. From a regional perspective, Greater Manchester will be interested to note where provision for minerals infrastructure in Warrington will impact on the flow of minerals into and out of the sub region.</p>	<p>The comments made are welcomed. The suggestions to expand the information on waste and minerals will be incorporated into the next infrastructure assessment.</p>
402116	<p>Paul Daly Sport England</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the Infrastructure Capacity Assessment document. The comments of Sport England are presented in this letter. The letter is divided into two sections. The first provides some background information on Sport England which sets the comments we make into context. Comments that apply to the consultation document are then provided in the second section.</p> <p>1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION</p> <p>Sport England is the government agency responsible for building the foundations of sporting success by creating a world-leading community sport system of clubs, coaches, facilities and volunteers.</p> <p>Sport England has a particular interest in the operation of the statutory planning system in terms of the protection, enhancement and provision of opportunities for sport and active recreation, both facility and non-facility based. Added to the statutory duty to protect playing fields through the planning system, there is a wider objective of using spatial planning to help create a more active</p>	<p>All comments welcomed and noted. As the infrastructure evidence process progresses, further consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken to make them aware of key development sites and question whether there may be any infrastructure issues as a result of these. It is our intention to produce an infrastructure schedule to identify future infrastructure requirements.</p>

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>and healthy population. Putting sustainable communities and quality of life at the heart of policy making ensures that a wide range of issues are addressed in parallel. Sport England argues that creating a more active and healthy population through the protection, enhancement and provision of opportunities for sport is a key ingredient of achieving this aspiration and should be commensurately reflected in planning policy.</p> <p>2. COMMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT</p> <p>Scope of Work</p> <p>The scope of the assessment includes social, physical and green infrastructure. However, the document is structured around the categories of transport, utilities, social and environmental infrastructure (as shown in Table 1). As the Core Strategy Objectives and Options consultation specifically identifies objectives relating to Green Infrastructure, it would be beneficial if Table 1 could also identify which of the types of infrastructure listed are regarded as Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Social Infrastructure</p> <p>It is important to note that much of the social infrastructure could be multi-functional and any assessment of capacity needs to take account of this. For example, education facilities such as secondary schools and colleges are often important providers of sport and recreation facilities to students and the wider community (often secured through community use agreements).</p> <p>Sport and Leisure provision</p> <p>Firstly, Sport England supports the inclusion of sport and leisure facilities within the scope of the assessment as development can create additional demand for sport and recreation facilities which requires new and / or enhanced provision. This impact of development is recognised by national planning policy (PPG17).</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>The document refers to a Playing Pitch Strategy which is currently under review. This would be regarded by Sport England as a key component of the evidence base underpinning the core strategy. Assuming that the Towards A Level Playing Field methodology has been followed, then this strategy should test the adequacy of existing pitch provision and also the future requirement for pitch provision taking account of future population changes and changes in participation.</p> <p>However, the Playing Pitch Strategy will only help identify infrastructure required by team sports which use grass pitches. Other types of sport and recreation facilities such as athletics tracks, sports halls, swimming pools, golf courses, Multi Use Games Areas etc. would not be captured.</p> <p>Here, however, a PPG17 compliant audit and assessment of needs would be able to provide appropriate information. For the purposes of assessments of need and audits of existing built facilities for sport and recreation, PPG 17 states that local authorities should use a typology which includes swimming pools, indoor sports halls and leisure centres, indoor bowls centres, indoor tennis centres, ice rinks, community centres, and village halls. In terms of outdoor sports, a PPG17 compliant assessment would include outdoor sports facilities such as tennis courts, bowling greens, sports pitches, golf courses, athletics tracks, school and other institutional playing fields, and other outdoor sports areas.</p> <p>Sport England believes the most effective way to plan strategically for sport is for local authorities to develop a sport and recreation strategy which addresses the need for indoor and outdoor provision. Such strategies should be prepared in conjunction with the leisure department and be clearly linked to the corporate strategy, providing both opportunities for the public and private sectors, and should set out clear priorities for investment.</p> <p>For information, Sport England has developed a suite of strategic planning tools which could be used to help assess demand and provision including:</p> <p>Active Places Power: An online database of sports facilities available to local authorities which allows provision to be mapped and benchmarked. The following core facility types are covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sport Halls. Swimming Pools. 	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>Synthetic Turf Pitches·</p> <p>Indoor Bowls·Indoor</p> <p>Tennis·Athletics</p> <p>Tracks·Playing Fields (including Natural Turf Pitches)·</p> <p>Health and Fitness·</p> <p>Golf Courses</p> <p>Facilities planning model: A strategic modelling tool used to estimate the level of demand for sports facilities within the local population, comparing this with the supply of facilities within a given local area. Taking account of the size and location of the facilities, the model highlights any inadequacies in facility provision. The model can also be used to model 'what if' scenarios including the impact of increases in population, the closure of individual facilities, and the opening of new facilities.</p> <p>National Benchmarking Service:The aim of the National Benchmarking Service for sports halls and pools is to provide local authorities with rigorous and robust information on the performance of their sports halls and swimming pools, compared with that of equivalent 'family' facilities in similar locations elsewhere in the country.</p> <p>Sports Facility Calculator. An interactive tool which estimates the demand for major community sports facilities and allows the impact of major new residential developments to be assessed.</p> <p>Further information on the tools can be found on the web.</p> <p>I trust that the above comments are clear and prove useful. If you require any further information in relation to these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments																																																		
462894	Duncan Richardson Neighbourhood and Community Services	<p>I would make the following observations on the core strategy.</p> <p>At 5.16 I am sure others will point out that the Government has now withdrawn the BSF programme. Strategy now needs to reflect aspiration to improve secondary and primary infrastructure, Children's Services should advise.</p> <p>At the section for community centres, there is no reflection of the present Council's community centres and community houses infrastructure at the following venues :</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="598 741 1295 1780"> <thead> <tr> <th>CENTRE</th> <th>ADDRESS 1</th> <th>ADDRESS 2</th> <th>TOWN</th> <th>POSTCODE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bewsey Gym</td> <td>Lockton Lane</td> <td>Bewsey</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA2 8AG</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BewseyPark Pavillion</td> <td>Troutbeck Avenue</td> <td>Bewsey</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA5 0AY</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Burtonwood Community Centre</td> <td>Green Jones Brow</td> <td>Burtonwood</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA5 4LH</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capesthorpe Community Centre</td> <td>Orange grove</td> <td>Orford</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA2 0BJ</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Croft youth & Activity Centre</td> <td>Smithy Lane</td> <td>Croft</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA3 7HQ</td> </tr> <tr> <td>College Close Community House</td> <td>1 College Close</td> <td></td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA2 7SD</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Culcheth Age Concern Centre</td> <td>Jackson Avenue</td> <td>Culcheth</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA3 4EJ</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dallam Community House</td> <td>7 Harrison Square</td> <td>Dallam</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA5 0HQ</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fearnhead Cross YAC</td> <td>Insall Road</td> <td>Padgate</td> <td>Warrington</td> <td>WA2 0HB</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	CENTRE	ADDRESS 1	ADDRESS 2	TOWN	POSTCODE	Bewsey Gym	Lockton Lane	Bewsey	Warrington	WA2 8AG	BewseyPark Pavillion	Troutbeck Avenue	Bewsey	Warrington	WA5 0AY	Burtonwood Community Centre	Green Jones Brow	Burtonwood	Warrington	WA5 4LH	Capesthorpe Community Centre	Orange grove	Orford	Warrington	WA2 0BJ	Croft youth & Activity Centre	Smithy Lane	Croft	Warrington	WA3 7HQ	College Close Community House	1 College Close		Warrington	WA2 7SD	Culcheth Age Concern Centre	Jackson Avenue	Culcheth	Warrington	WA3 4EJ	Dallam Community House	7 Harrison Square	Dallam	Warrington	WA5 0HQ	Fearnhead Cross YAC	Insall Road	Padgate	Warrington	WA2 0HB	<p>The comments made are welcomed. The information on the Council's Community Centres will be incorporated into the next stage of the infrastructure requirements schedule.</p>
CENTRE	ADDRESS 1	ADDRESS 2	TOWN	POSTCODE																																																	
Bewsey Gym	Lockton Lane	Bewsey	Warrington	WA2 8AG																																																	
BewseyPark Pavillion	Troutbeck Avenue	Bewsey	Warrington	WA5 0AY																																																	
Burtonwood Community Centre	Green Jones Brow	Burtonwood	Warrington	WA5 4LH																																																	
Capesthorpe Community Centre	Orange grove	Orford	Warrington	WA2 0BJ																																																	
Croft youth & Activity Centre	Smithy Lane	Croft	Warrington	WA3 7HQ																																																	
College Close Community House	1 College Close		Warrington	WA2 7SD																																																	
Culcheth Age Concern Centre	Jackson Avenue	Culcheth	Warrington	WA3 4EJ																																																	
Dallam Community House	7 Harrison Square	Dallam	Warrington	WA5 0HQ																																																	
Fearnhead Cross YAC	Insall Road	Padgate	Warrington	WA2 0HB																																																	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above						Officer Comments
	Greenwood Community Centre	Greenwood Crescent	Orford	Warrington	WA2 0DU			
	Longshaw Street Community House	Longshaw Street	Bewsey	Warrington	WA5 0DW			
	Meeting Lane Community Centre	Helston Close	Penketh	Warrington	WA5 2HB			
	Nora Street Community House	15-17 Nora Street	Howley	Warrington	WA1 2JG			
	Oakwood Neighbourhood Centre	62-64 Whitethroat Walk	Oakwood	Warrington	WA3 6PQ			
	Padgate Community Centre	Station Road	Padgate	Warrington	WA2 0QS			
	Radley Common Community Centre	Grasmere Avenue	Orford	Warrington	WA4 0NA			
	Sandy Lane Community Centre	Sandy Lane	Stockton Heath	Warrington	WA4 2AY			
	Sankey Bridges Community Centre	Old Liverpool Road	Sankey Bridges	Warrington	WA5 1EB			
	Westy Community Centre	Bridgewater Avenue	Latchford	Warrington	WA4 1TA			
	Whitecross Community Centre	Lexden Street	Bewsey	Warrington	WA5 1PT			
Table 2								

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
457024	Scottish and Southern Energy plc	<p>The Council is currently reviewing this provision and a new strategy to reflect present needs will be produced in early 2011.</p> <p>The Council is also looking to deliver a number of Community Hubs across each of the 5 neighbourhood areas linked to the core Neighbourhood Hubs.</p> <p>The vision for these Community Hubs will be to deliver sustainable community buildings linked to facilities for statutory agencies which reflect the needs and interests of the local community they serve.</p> <p>Section 6 around sport and leisure needs to reflect sports facility strategy and neighbourhood hub development. Target of one neighbourhood hub per neighbourhood area as per development at OrfordPark.</p>	<p>All comments welcomed and noted. As the infrastructure evidence process progresses, further consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken to make them aware of key development sites and question whether there may be any infrastructure issues as a result of these. Capital programmes and Long Term Development Statements will also be assessed in order to produce an infrastructure schedule.</p>

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>In referring to the LTDS, I would also refer you to Appendix A5 which lists proposals in Cheshire, in particular, C14 which refers to work at Fiddlers Ferry. This is the project which I have recently spoken to your colleagues about and enclose the draft Project Briefing Note. The purpose of this proposal is to improve supplies on the west Warrington circuits which are currently short of the required Ofgem regulatory standard of electricity supplies (referred to as 'P2/6'). SP Manweb has recently committed investment for building a new 132kV grid substation which would resolve this problem. I would suggest that this project should be included in your capacity assessment. Maybe we could meet over next few weeks to discuss?</p> <p>In respect of other aspects of the network, and assuming the implementation of the Carrington - Lostock circuit on which work is due to start in 2011, these are operating as per required operational standards. This however is not to say that there is adequate capacity for future development. Such increases in supply would need to be in the first instance the subject of connection applications which would be made by developers promoting development schemes. These connections may require work at varying voltage levels and would be assessed at the time the applications are made.</p> <p>As discussed, and from my experience of dealing with similar infrastructure plans, it would be a good idea to list the key development sites and list against these the anticipated developer partner if known. For most, I imagine SP Manweb is likely to be a delivery partner rather than lead partner. For the Carrington - Lostock and Warrington West projects we would of course be lead partners.</p>	
462894	Duncan Richardson Neighbourhood and Community Services	<p>The Neighbourhood Approach</p> <p>Whilst our Leisure Centres, Libraries, Community Centres and Cultural facilities all operate independently in terms of management, there is a commitment and focus on a joined up approach to service delivery as part of a wider neighbourhood approach.</p> <p>The neighbourhood approach promotes and facilitates the relationship of local communities working with local organisations to join up services at a neighbourhood level and make them responsive to local needs.</p> <p>Neighbourhoods in Warrington</p>	All comments welcomed and noted. As the infrastructure evidence process progresses, further consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken to make them aware of key development sites and question whether there may be any infrastructure issues as a result of these. It is our intention to produce an infrastructure schedule to identify future infrastructure requirements.

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>Neighbourhood working is the active involvement of residents in local decision making as equal partners on neighbourhood boards; by joint problem solving on thematic working groups or through attendance at community engagement meetings. Having achieved very positive results and impacts during the pilot phase neighbourhood working was adopted across Warrington with two neighbourhood management areas and 4 lighter touch neighbourhood coordination areas. Now across the borough Stronger Together Neighbourhood Area Boards facilitate neighbourhood working on different levels to meet area priorities identified in neighbourhood plans. Working with partners and the third sector delivering initiatives that contribute to closing the gap for health and wellbeing issues whilst building safer and stronger communities.</p> <p>In the six neighbourhoods area bases accommodate core teams and co-located workers from a variety of disciplines. These work to engage residents, target groups and appropriate partners in developing accessible service delivery at grass roots. For example working with the leisure service to improve access and take up of wellbeing programmes in their centres and focusing programmes delivered in community centres to meet local needs.</p> <p>Area bases are:</p> <p>East - Oakwood Family Centre, Whitethroat Walk.</p> <p>West moving to Whitecross Community Centre in September</p> <p>South - Westy Community Centre, Bridgewater Ave.</p> <p>Central - Orford Day Centre, Capesthorne Road, working with Orford Park Project team to develop this building into a community hub that will compliment and serve the larger project once it is completed</p> <p>Area Co-ordinators also develop hot desks with partners in order to give better coverage across these larger areas. Bases agreed to date include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Woolston Leisure Centre ● Howley Community Hub ● BewseyCommunityPark Centre 	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grappenhall and Thelwall Youth and Community Centre ● Fearnhead Youth and Community Base <p>Leisure Centres</p> <p>There are 7 Leisure Centres across the borough. Under the brand name of 'Leisure Warrington' the centres focus on engaging local people, supporting those with the greatest need and delivering opportunities for all to improve both physical and mental wellbeing. 5 of our centres are nationally accredited as highly commended within the Quest framework. They are located geographically across Warrington and deliver to all our communities in a truly inclusive way. In 2009-2010 the Leisure Centres attracted over 1.9 million visitors.</p> <p>In line with a neighbourhood approach, recent developments have been focused on the co-location of community facilities under one roof. Woolston Leisure Centre has recently undergone a major refurbishment programme and is now the first 'Neighbourhood Hub', comprising leisure and wellbeing facilities, library service, a childrens Sure Start centre and a doctors surgery. All these services function in the one building and offer real synergy and a partnership approach.</p> <p>A similar service delivery model exists in the newly opened Culcheth Community Campus building and a facility that will make a further significant impact to neighbourhood and community delivery is the 'Orford Park' building due to open in January 2012 early in 2012. Co-located facilities and services will deliver a range of activities and opportunities and focus on improving the quality of life in an area where health inequalities are amongst the greatest in the town.</p> <p>Our remaining Leisure Centres, whilst still delivering a range of opportunities within their communities, are older stock and predominately 1970's buildings. As such they require increasing maintenance to remain operational. Investment in the core structures and facilities is required to reflect the increasing expectation of centre users and increase the opportunities for the local communities.</p> <p>Broomfields Leisure Centre - Broomfields Rd, Appleton, Warrington WA4 3AE</p> <p>Birchwood Leisure and Tennis Complex -Benson Rd, Birchwood, Warrington WA3 7PQ</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>Fordton Leisure Centre - Chilitem Rd, Orford, Warrington WA2 9SX</p> <p>Great Sankey Leisure Centre - Barrowhall Lane, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 3AA</p> <p>Woolston Community Hub - Hall Rd' Woolston, Warrington WA1 4PN</p> <p>Soccer Warrington - Long Lane, Orford, Warrington</p> <p>CulchethHigh School Community Campus - Warrington Rd, Culcheth, Warrington WA3 5HH</p> <p>Culture in Warrington</p> <p>Following the creation of the Neighbourhoods and Culture Service in 2009 the vision of establishing Warrington as 'the most strong, healthy and active town in the North West' was adopted.</p> <p>The new service is focused on delivering against the key priorities of narrowing the gap on health inequalities, building safer and stronger communities and contributing to the regeneration of the town. At the time of writing a Cultural Strategy for the Town is being developed which will reflect these key drivers.</p> <p>The service comprises 13 public libraries and a mobile library, WarringtonMuseum and ArtGallery, Pyramid Arts Centre and Parr Hall.</p> <p>It is evident that satisfaction with library and museum provision is good, however, satisfaction with theatre and concert provision has been less so. This is being addressed through both significant investment in the physical condition of Parr Hall and also a continuing commitment to offer a wide variety of activities and events at Pyramid and Parr Hall which has seen a steady increase in usage over recent times.</p> <p>Library Services.</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>A Library Review is underway and will report later in October 2010. Co-location of services will be a key theme. There is a history of community library provision on school sites, both Birchwood and Lysander house community libraries. Woolston and Lymm libraries have been redeveloped as part of hub developments with Children's Centres and the OrfordPark development will house a library moved from its current location.</p> <p>WarringtonCentral Library - 3 Museum Street, Cultural Quarter, Warrington WA1 1JB</p> <p>Birchwood Library - Brock Road, Birchwood, Warrington, WA3 7PT</p> <p>Burtonwood Library - Chapel Lane, Burtonwood, WA5 4PS</p> <p>Culcheth Library - Warrington Road, Culcheth, Warrington, WA3 5SL</p> <p>Grappenhall Library - Victoria Avenue, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 2PE</p> <p>Great Sankey Library - Marina Avenue, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 1JH</p> <p>Lymm Library - Davies Way(off Brookfield Rd), Lymm, WA13 0QW</p> <p>Orford Library - Poplars Avenue, Orford, Warrington, WA2 9LW</p> <p>Padgate Library - Insall Road, Padgate, Warrington, WA2 0HD</p> <p>Penketh Library - Honiton Way, Penketh, Warrington, WA5 2EY</p> <p>StocktonHeath Library - Alexandra Park, Stockton Heath, Warrington, WA4 2AN</p> <p>Westbrook Library - Westbrook Crescent, Westbrook, Warrington, WA5 8UG</p> <p>Woolston Library - Holes Lane, Woolston, Warrington, WA1 3UJ</p> <p>Museum and ArtGallery</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>The museum service is focused around the collection at Warrington Museum and making the provision more accessible to children and families. A WREN funded £250,000 refurbishment is currently being completed and funds are actively being sought to further restore and develop the Central Library and Museum a key heritage asset for the town.</p> <p>Warrington Museum & Art Gallery - Bold Street, Cultural Quarter, Warrington, WA1 1JG</p> <p>Cultural Services</p> <p>The major cultural provision in Warrington is provided through the facilities at Parr Hall and Pyramid in the town centre. These venues are fully equipped to provide activities for educational, rehearsal and performance. The Pyramid facility was delivered following a successful Arts Council Lottery application in 2002. Attached to this application was the development of the external performance space in Queens Gardens at the front of the Parr Hall venue.</p> <p>Parr Hall is the subject of a significant refurbishment programme, with £1.2 million being spent by October 2010.</p> <p>Pyramid & Parr Hall- Palmyra Square South, Warrington, WA1 1BL</p>	
464424	Ivan Baracska Leisure Warrington Warrington Borough Council	<p>The Neighbourhood Approach</p> <p>Whilst our Leisure Centres, Libraries, Community Centres and Cultural facilities all operate independently in terms of management, there is a commitment and focus on a joined up approach to service delivery as part of a wider neighbourhood approach.</p> <p>The neighbourhood approach promotes and facilitates the relationship of local communities working with local organisations to join up services at a neighbourhood level and make them responsive to local needs.</p> <p>Neighbourhoods in Warrington</p>	All comments welcomed and noted. As the infrastructure evidence process progresses, further consultation with stakeholders will be undertaken to make them aware of key development sites and question whether there may be any infrastructure issues as a result of these. It is our intention to produce an infrastructure schedule to identify future infrastructure requirements.

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>Neighbourhood working is the active involvement of residents in local decision making as equal partners on neighbourhood boards; by joint problem solving on thematic working groups or through attendance at community engagement meetings. Having achieved very positive results and impacts during the pilot phase neighbourhood working was adopted across Warrington with two neighbourhood management areas and 4 lighter touch neighbourhood coordination areas. Now across the borough Stronger Together Neighbourhood Area Boards facilitate neighbourhood working on different levels to meet area priorities identified in neighbourhood plans. Working with partners and the third sector delivering initiatives that contribute to closing the gap for health and wellbeing issues whilst building safer and stronger communities.</p> <p>In the six neighbourhoods area bases accommodate core teams and co-located workers from a variety of disciplines. These work to engage residents, target groups and appropriate partners in developing accessible service delivery at grass roots. For example working with the leisure service to improve access and take up of wellbeing programmes in their centres and focusing programmes delivered in community centres to meet local needs.</p> <p>Area bases are:</p> <p>East - Oakwood Family Centre, Whitethroat Walk.</p> <p>West moving to Whitecross Community Centre in September</p> <p>South - Westy Community Centre, Bridgewater Ave.</p> <p>Central - Orford Day Centre, Capesthorpe Road, working with Orford Park Project team to develop this building into a community hub that will compliment and serve the larger project once it is completed</p> <p>Area Co-ordinators also develop hot desks with partners in order to give better coverage across these larger areas. Bases agreed to date include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Woolston Leisure Centre ● Howley Community Hub ● BewseyCommunityPark Centre 	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grappenhall and Thelwall Youth and Community Centre ● Fearnhead Youth and Community Base <p>Leisure Centres</p> <p>There are 7 Leisure Centres across the borough. Under the brand name of 'Leisure Warrington' the centres focus on engaging local people, supporting those with the greatest need and delivering opportunities for all to improve both physical and mental wellbeing. 5 of our centres are nationally accredited as highly commended within the Quest framework. They are located geographically across Warrington and deliver to all our communities in a truly inclusive way. In 2009-2010 the Leisure Centres attracted over 1.9 million visitors.</p> <p>In line with a neighbourhood approach, recent developments have been focused on the co-location of community facilities under one roof. Woolston Leisure Centre has recently undergone a major refurbishment programme and is now the first 'Neighbourhood Hub', comprising leisure and wellbeing facilities, library service, a childrens Sure Start centre and a doctors surgery. All these services function in the one building and offer real synergy and a partnership approach.</p> <p>A similar service delivery model exists in the newly opened Culcheth Community Campus building and a facility that will make a further significant impact to neighbourhood and community delivery is the 'Orford Park' building due to open in January 2012 early in 2012. Co-located facilities and services will deliver a range of activities and opportunities and focus on improving the quality of life in an area where health inequalities are amongst the greatest in the town.</p> <p>Our remaining Leisure Centres, whilst still delivering a range of opportunities within their communities, are older stock and predominately 1970's buildings. As such they require increasing maintenance to remain operational. Investment in the core structures and facilities is required to reflect the increasing expectation of centre users and increase the opportunities for the local communities.</p> <p>Broomfields Leisure Centre - Broomfields Rd, Appleton, Warrington WA4 3AE</p> <p>Birchwood Leisure and Tennis Complex -Benson Rd, Birchwood, Warrington</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
	<p>WA3 7PQ</p> <p>Fordton Leisure Centre - Chiltem Rd, Orford, Warrington WA2 9SX</p> <p>Great Sankey Leisure Centre - Barrowhall Lane, Great Sankey, Warrington WA5 3AA</p> <p>Woolston Community Hub - Hall Rd' Woolston, Warrington WA1 4PN</p> <p>Soccer Warrington - Long Lane, Orford, Warrington</p> <p>CulchethHigh School Community Campus - Warrington Rd, Culcheth, Warrington WA3 5HH</p> <p>Culture in Warrington</p>	<p>Following the creation of the Neighbourhoods and Culture Service in 2009 the vision of establishing Warrington as 'the most strong, healthy and active town in the North West' was adopted.</p> <p>The new service is focused on delivering against the key priorities of narrowing the gap on health inequalities, building safer and stronger communities and contributing to the regeneration of the town. At the time of writing a Cultural Strategy for the Town is being developed which will reflect these key drivers.</p> <p>The service comprises 13 public libraries and a mobile library, WarringtonMuseum and ArtGallery, Pyramid Arts Centre and Parr Hall.</p> <p>It is evident that satisfaction with library and museum provision is good, however, satisfaction with theatre and concert provision has been less so. This is being addressed through both significant investment in the physical condition of Parr Hall and also a continuing commitment to offer a wide variety of activities and events at Pyramid and Parr Hall which has seen a steady increase in usage over recent times.</p> <p>Library Services.</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>A Library Review is underway and will report later in October 2010. Co-location of services will be a key theme. There is a history of community library provision on school sites, both Birchwood and Lysander house community libraries. Woolston and Lymm libraries have been redeveloped as part of hub developments with Children's Centres and the OrfordPark development will house a library moved from its current location.</p> <p>WarringtonCentral Library - 3 Museum Street, Cultural Quarter, Warrington WA1 1JB</p> <p>Birchwood Library - Brock Road, Birchwood, Warrington, WA3 7PT</p> <p>Burtonwood Library - Chapel Lane, Burtonwood, WA5 4PS</p> <p>Culcheth Library - Warrington Road, Culcheth, Warrington, WA3 5SL</p> <p>Grappenhall Library - Victoria Avenue, Grappenhall, Warrington, WA4 2PE</p> <p>Great Sankey Library - Marina Avenue, Great Sankey, Warrington, WA5 1JH</p> <p>Lymm Library - Davies Way(off Brookfield Rd), Lymm, WA13 0QW</p> <p>Orford Library - Poplars Avenue, Orford, Warrington, WA2 9LW</p> <p>Padgate Library - Insaill Road, Padgate, Warrington, WA2 0HD</p> <p>Penketh Library - Honiton Way, Penketh, Warrington, WA5 2EY</p> <p>StocktonHeath Library - Alexandra Park, Stockton Heath, Warrington, WA4 2AN</p> <p>Westbrook Library - Westbrook Crescent, Westbrook, Warrington, WA5 8UG</p> <p>Woolston Library - Holes Lane, Woolston, Warrington, WA1 3UJ</p> <p>Museum and ArtGallery</p>	

Person ID	Name & Organisation Details	General Comments - Comments to support your choice above	Officer Comments
		<p>The museum service is focused around the collection at Warrington Museum and making the provision more accessible to children and families. A WREN funded £250,000 refurbishment is currently being completed and funds are actively being sought to further restore and develop the Central Library and Museum a key heritage asset for the town.</p> <p>Warrington Museum & Art Gallery - Bold Street, Cultural Quarter, Warrington, WA1 1JG</p> <p>Cultural Services</p> <p>The major cultural provision in Warrington is provided through the facilities at Parr Hall and Pyramid in the town centre. These venues are fully equipped to provide activities for educational, rehearsal and performance. The Pyramid facility was delivered following a successful Arts Council Lottery application in 2002. Attached to this application was the development of the external performance space in Queens Gardens at the front of the Parr Hall venue. Parr Hall is the subject of a significant refurbishment programme, with £1.2 million being spent by October 2010.</p> <p>Pyramid & Parr Hall - Palmyra Square South, Warrington, WA1 1BL</p>	

6 Next Steps

6.1 Work has continued on the Core Strategy since the Objectives and Options consultation was undertaken. Given the Coalition Government's stated intention to abolish the Regional Spatial Strategy, this has focused on the quantity of land for housing and employment development to be provided in the borough over the period to 2026.

6.2 Two consultation documents have now been published which look at options for housing and employment land provision over the 15 year period. The documents are intended to facilitate a debate with stakeholders about which option appears the most appropriate way forward for the Borough.

6.3 Following this consultation, the representations will be considered alongside evidence and other considerations (such as Sustainability Appraisal or the Multi Modal Transport Model) to help identify a preferred option for inclusion within a draft publication of the Core Strategy.

6.4 A draft Core Strategy should be published in the Spring of 2011. At this time the Council will undertake a six week period of statutory consultation. Prior to this however there may be consultation on the emerging work on an informal basis through a process of continuous engagement with key stakeholders.

