

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject :- An Objection to preferred Development Option regulation 18 consultation July 2017

Sirs

Having read and considered the following documents

- 1) Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessment
- 2) Area Profiles and options assessment technical note 2017
- 3) Preferred Development Option regulation 18 consultation (July 2017)

I feel I could write a treatise upon what's wrong with the above process and its findings, given time.

One wonders if any consideration has been given whatsoever to your existing residents in affected areas at all ?

From, the call to sites, an inherently flawed process using obsolete data, yielding pre determined out comes not necessarily beneficial to the existing population nor, addressing pretty much any of the real challenges Warrington actually faces

(For example Take the town centre (please) – a disjointed and semi derelict, successively poorly planned shambles right now –with looming and increasingly over ambitious and rather desperate 11th hour plans to rescue it before it dies completely – hastily being enacted) (far too late ?)

And aspiring to city status ? - to what end ? – who benefits ? and why ?

To, (in this case) , a demonstrably and appallingly poor, lack of consultation originally leading to only 78 responses to earlier articulations (how embarrassing is that ?) and more recently, no specific consultation meetings at all, with wards likely to be most greatly affected (notably Grappenhall and Thelwall) .

(coincidence ? –somehow I dont think so)

To, The predictable outcome of the ' call to site' process wholly biased toward green belt green field development and developer induced proposals that follow, to the detriment of existing amenity afforded to existing ratepayers (your employers actually – please do not forget)

To, The 'constraining' and discounting of much of the brown field sites in the territory (ruling them out because they require a bit more effort to develop)(and some loss of profit no doubt, to the developers who seem to have you in their back pockets it would seem).

To, the determination of Green belt in south Warrington as grade 2

To, the assertion, Warrington needs up to 24,000 new homes using incorrect and / or flawed methods based upon data now almost certainly obsolete / out of date

To, new housing densities plainly biased towards certain types of more profitable 'rate lucrative' easier builds on green belt land in Grappenhall and Thelwall adjoining Lymm – (a juicy prize no doubt)

To the use of consultants like ARUP with their connections to local construction companies and most notably, Peel holdings

To 4/5 of the resultant options containing massive construction of new housing and infrastructure to the south East of Warrington (between 4000 –to 8000 home no less), to the destruction of swathes of green belt , wildlife habitat too (some quite rare I may add) to create a 'garden suburb' nobody wants or needs .

Onward, to green corridors which are shown for proposed new built areas whilst, there are none left for existing areas – the new housing coming right up to the borders with existing suburbia – particularly in Grappenhall and Thelwall with associated loss of critical access and amenity to existing communities.

(the land between Stockport road and Weaste lane as far east as the M6 in particular, must always remain sacrosanct no matter what).

i.e. what is proposed therefore (PDO Option 2) is Hopelessly ill thought out, outmoded, ill considered and does not meet the needs of your existing residents never mind the future ones you somehow think you will attract by this process

To the final insult (if, indeed, you live where I live)

The proposal that the Trans Pennine Trail – OF NOW NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION (not a disused railway line as you call it)

Is perhaps to become a new proposed high level road route direct into Warrington town centre

From the new Garden Suburb – boringly predictable and totally lacking in imagination is this

Notwith standing the pretty obvious alternatives located elsewhere either

i.e. taking the easy option –failing to even recognise what's already there in terms of amenity . nor properly considering other more modern alternatives to simply building more roads

or put more bluntly:-

20th century town planning for 21st Century challenges

Here, I offer another example of why this is so ill considered :- Fiddlers Ferry Power Station whose remnant life, having been shut in 2016 (I understand now extended again to 2019) but falls foul of IED nox emissions Directive in 2020 – and furthermore, no coal fired power stations are to remain in operation whatsoever post 2025 –

(and who says so ? UK Government policy no less!!!!)

i.e. well inside your planning period – a brownfield piece of land approximating to 3 to 4 square miles of prime real estate , located land (at 258 hectares per square mile).

A increasingly redundant Brown field eyesore, right on your doorstep. Land ripe for demolition and reuse right in your plans timeframe ? --- Not even considered ????? – whilst you are happy to have a preferred option that in stages, prefers to ‘raze to the ground’ , a similar area of Green belt ?

And , what about land to the east of Woolston A57 m6 junction too -sites called for - identified ? But seemingly not considered ?

And so much Brownfield land north of the Manchester Ship canal as yet untouched –any idiot can drive around greater Warrington and identify it - not considered either?

And so,

Looking at the above shambles –and to be frank, crazy conclusions, plainly born of ulterior motives, if you happen to live in Grappenhall or Thelwall, you can surely see what is proposed is completely unacceptable – ridiculous even .

And will be opposed in the strongest terms by a now galvanised and highly intelligent & resourceful residency. (The wheels are already turning so beware!)

If fact I think it Is pretty outrageous all in all – littered with flaws and contradictions and, if put forward further in the process, it will surely be rigorously tested in law.

So, I'll draw stumps and leave it here for now

This is just you register my total and heartfelt opposition and objection

More to come

Yours 

(A caring and lifelong resident of the parish of Grappenhall)