

[REDACTED]

Re-Consultation on the local plan

Dear Sir/Madam

In producing the draft plan to enable you to designate both residential and industrial land for future development this requires you to place in consultation your thoughts on the availability and viability of land within your boundaries and the laws set out that govern development.

I take on board your requirements to indicate a number of dwellings going forward to provide the future housing for the youth as they become older and for migration into the town to take up the opportunity of existing and future work that the town may and will produce.

I object most strenuously to section 4.81/2 of your local plan, preferred development option-consultation (July 2017). The tacit approval of an extended Omega westward across the borough boundary into St Helens is completely unacceptable.

The protection of the greenbelt is there, as you are aware, to encourage the use of derelict and other brownfield urban areas therefore safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and for its use as farmland or its enjoyment in many different ways by the public. The proposal to remove the parcel of land GDS-145 in the St Helens local plan, next to Omega on the Warrington boundary does not come with any satisfactory reasons why this should happen. Far from this there is no reasoned argument as to how both the industrial and residential sections planned can be sustainable from a St Helens viewpoint, or for that matter from a Warrington viewpoint also.

We are all aware that the greenbelt is there to not only limit urban sprawl as stated in the national planning policy framework across borough boundaries but to give clear delineated boundaries between boroughs. As the current development of Omega is totally different to that which Miller originally won the competition for the green space and indeed water space is far less than envisaged, The St Helens land is therefore the first green lung after all this development.

In initially looking at the proposal for residential development on a section of this land, it fails all the tests for a sustainable development. The closest linkage is actually with

Warrington some half a mile or more away. The closest connection to St Helens is in the order of a couple of miles away, possibly more, it would be a development totally on its own at the side of a major industrial warehousing estate employing more than 24,000 people when fully built out to Warrington plans. There are no schools close by within the St Helens authority, indeed the closest high school is in the region of 5-7 miles away. There are no doctors or dentists in the area or shops that would prevent the use of the car. There are no roads into the area therefore no public transport exists or is likely to exist to service such an outlying area. The proposal is to service the area via the local distributor roads currently in place that service the Omega industrial estate, which to my mind evidences this as more in keeping with Warrington and no natural connection with St Helens what so ever.

The section of land that is detailed for industrial usage again has no connection with St Helens as it is an effective extension of the already existing Omega industrial estate. All the connections to this development are to be via Warrington, so as in the residential proposal above this has no connectivity to St Helens, in fact I contend this is an add on to try and see if the they can get this through as Omega has some nationally known companies situated on it and they would like to have some of that.

I have previously stated this land has no road connection other than through Warrington, it is in fact worse than this because most of the roads that would be required for access are all small local roads serving existing housing prior to them touching Omega. Traffic counts taken on these roads have shown them to close to their maximum and at certain junctions within the Warrington highway system close to the area of planned change they are in excess of their weightings and in need of alteration. Heavy goods vehicles would be encouraged to use junction 8 on the M62, it is already recognised that this is in excess of its traffic weighting and remedial action is taking place, although it will have no positive effect on the junction as it is minor and the Highways Authority has admitted the junction is not fit for purpose for the Omega development, therefore not fit for the proposed St Helens development in my mind. It is recognised that the current alterations to junction 8 will allow 17% more traffic throughput however, this was prior to the developments of the Amazon and Dominoes warehouses and the remaining plots which are of a considerable size and would overwhelm junction 8. Hence this junction cannot accept any further traffic from an expansion of Omega and housing into St Helens.

If this was to be included in the development plan it would mean the removal of many old and in certain instances ancient woodland containing many native species including oak. The land forms the backdrop to the old estate which has been on the maps for hundreds of years and has an historical significance to the local area. This is the only green parcel of land along the M62 as the section on the south side of the motorway through Warrington is built up or planned to be.

If this were allowed it would add greatly to the amount of pollution in the area and would surely be detrimental to the proposed residential development. The greatest amount of pollution would be that of diesel particulate due to the amount of heavy vehicles that would

be prevalent in the area. As I previously stated there currently are no public transport links to the area so again no linkage to St Helens but the public transport to Warrington is also very poor and recently cutback.

In attending the consultation evening at Penketh high school it was stated by a senior planning officer that the pockets of land by Friends lane and Laburnum lane will not be included in any development but retained within the forward plan. The reason for not developing these pockets, it was recognised that these were important sections of greenbelt forming a barrier between boroughs to stop urban sprawl. I would contend that the same argument applies to the St Helens land that you are agreeing should no longer be greenbelt.

Conclusion

This proposal to support the removal of greenbelt and provide housing (section 4.81/2) should be taken out of the forward plan as

It lacks any compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework

- To check the sprawl of large built up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another
- Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Encouraging the use of derelict and other urban land
- Proper and defined reasons for the change have not been made
- The developments are not sustainable in any format
- There is no connection to St Helens at all
- Defined boundaries are not recognisable if this were allowed
- It is a disproportionate removal of the green belt
- It is a disproportionate removal of the green belt

There is no connection to St Helens in any manner as no dwellings exist in the area. Traffic connections are via Warrington and nothing exists in the St Helens highway network. All traffic will be through already heavily congested local distributor routes. Heavy vehicles will have to use inappropriate local roads or the already over utilised junction 8 on M62.

The extra vehicles on Lingley Green Avenue would put the area into gridlock and pollution will be intolerable.

I would also like to be kept informed by letter of any public meetings or any formal hearings within council or with the planning inspector on this matter.

Yours faithfully

██████████