

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 June 2019 22:13
To: Local Plan
Subject: LP-PSV (Local Plan- Proposed Submission Version)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to the Warrington plan and consider it unsound based on the following points –

There is no justification for the predicted growth in housing needs and these exceed the government requirements. There is no need for development into green belt land when these figures are not justifiable. Brownfield sites should be identified as a first option before green belt. Once green belt is gone, it is gone forever. Considering our future environmental challenges, agricultural land should be a priority. It seems that the potential for development of the brownfield land released by the decommissioning of the Fiddlers Ferry Power station has not been considered.

There is no economic plan to justify the scale of development and release of greenbelt. The proposed Six 56 logistics hub cites employment numbers which are unrealistic and most will be massive automated warehouses with minimal staffing but maximum transport implications. In addition, any staffing requirements are likely to be met by people commuting to these sites from outside the area further exacerbating the congestion and pollution issues.

It is unsound as there is no clear strategy to address the radial transport across Warrington – (see comments on transport separately submitted) and the impact of HGV's and transport across the south of Warrington. It assumes no disruption on the motorways and residents are familiar with the impact of regular disruption and gridlock on side roads whenever there is any disruption on any of the local motorways. Alternative methods of travel such as cycling are proposed to alleviate congestion but this disregards that the length of the commuting journeys undertaken by most local residents make this impractical. Similarly, the distances that have to be travelled to access services such as medical centres, shops, Leisure centres, etc make the use of bicycles or walking for these journeys impractical..

There are no proposals for infrastructure to replace ancient Victorian bridges across the Manchester ship canal. These bridges are also currently suffering from neglect and a lack of maintenance which will lead to a need to significant expenditure on the refurbishment or repair unless the current owner is encouraged to maintain these installations.

How realistic is this plan, given the lack of money locally and nationally to build schools, GP surgeries libraries and where is the money to staff them? How are the associated social care, policing and health care and youth services going to be funded given we already pay an additional amount on Council tax for social care. The likelihood is the housing will be built without the infrastructure and supporting services /community facilities needed to support them which will put further pressure on existing roads and services as more residents travel further to access these services.

Where is the plan to develop /update the creaking Warrington General Hospital? Shouldn't this be prioritised over more unjustifiable housing?

Where is the plan to improve rail links – it is not possible to get a direct train to Leeds/York or Newcastle and trains to Liverpool and Manchester have been halved -surely that should be part of the development ? Northern Powerhouse links? If Warrington is to keep up with development, isn't that crucial? It is easier to drive to Manchester than get a train. Tram links to train stations? - the car is currently the only feasible option.

There is lack of detail to the plan –where is the money coming from? How realistic is it to build 1000-1500 houses per year, which aren't necessary anyway. What plans are there to regenerate the centre of Warrington which WBC say they aim to do –shops have relocated out of town/ bridge street is derelict (potential for city living ?)

What congestion and pollution assessments have been made – there are already 2 critical level points in Warrington –where is the strategy to reduce rather than increase this? As outlined above, the developments proposed will lead to a major increase in road traffic and the consequent effect on air quality as alternative means of transport are not being provided and in many cases , reduced.

The environmental and ecological impacts have not been properly assessed.

4 out of 5 of the Green belt release criteria listed below are not met:

- To check the unrealistic sprawl of large built up areas
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Please do not turn the countryside into an urban sprawl when little justification for taking this unorthodox step or releasing green belt land for development has been provided.

Best regards,

Dewi Williams

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Warrington

[REDACTED]