

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Local Plan  
**Date:** 10 June 2019 16:46:28

---

I object to the local plan on the following grounds:

#### JUSTIFICATION

There is no justification for the predicted growth in the need for housing. WBC has gone beyond the government's estimates for growth at a time when the outcome from Brexit could significantly affect the levels of immigration and population growth.

Also why has WBC not challenged the reason for the number of houses being so large as we are a small authority so perhaps our number of houses needed should be less than other places and should certainly not be more than the government asked for.

There is also no infrastructure to support the growth. Even if the "community" buildings do get built (and when would this happen this is not clear from the plan), there is no funding for extra doctors, teachers etc. It currently takes me half an hour to get through to the doctors surgery by which time all appointments are often gone.

There is no justification for the large use of green belt land especially where this includes industrial use. There is also no guarantee that brownfield sites will be used for growth first and this needs to happen to protect the green belt. Fiddler's Ferry will be decommissioned soon but has been completely left out of consideration. This is unacceptable. When the green belt land is gone we cannot get it back. We should wait for the brownfield sites to become available.

The plan talks about affordable housing which will just not happen when expensive green belt land has been used for the building of homes. One of the major blocks to people purchasing their own home (except for cost) is that there is no suitable inexpensive properties for the elderly to move into so releasing family homes. Bungalows are as expensive or more expensive than houses so why would anyone downsize where they cannot release some capital at the same time? How many of the houses built will be affordable for people looking to downsize into retirement?

The local plan talks about protecting 90% of the remaining green belt until 2047. It was only 5 years ago that the green belt boundary was confirmed and was supposed to be kept for 20 years. I have no confidence that this 90% remaining will be protected.

Warrington is one of the worst polluted areas in the UK currently. This is only going to get worse by building all these homes with the associated cars and traffic. Warrington cannot currently cope with the level of traffic it has. Any issues on any of the 3 nearby motorways (M6, M56, M62) and all the traffic comes off and goes through Warrington town centre via Grappenhall. There have already been times when I have pulled out onto Knutsford Road

to [REDACTED] Warrington (a journey that should take 20 minutes), to simply turn around because I will not get there in time despite having left in plenty of time.

Recently when I have been looking for a job around Warrington I have had to discount jobs in other parts of Warrington eg Golbourne because it will take too long to get there in rush hour traffic. There is a complete lack of public transport which is seriously overpriced. [REDACTED]

There will be an increase in noise pollution with the new trunk roads and HGVs.

There is no economic plan to justify such large scale expansion. People will not be going into Warrington for the shopping as there is very little left there to look around. Marks and Spencer has gone, BHS has gone, Debenhams is going and Boots is under threat. Surely the empty properties which are increasing in number could be better used as housing.

There is also no money to pay for the proposed transport plan except charging a workplace parking levy. So we could well be left with the situation where all the houses are built and none of the improvements to transport transpire and businesses get charged for providing a few car parking spaces.

Loss of green spaces will undoubtedly destroy habitats for plant and animal life. I don't think we will see the breeding pairs of pheasants [REDACTED] down Stockton Lane. How much longer will the bats stay around their feeding grounds in Parr Wood when building starts?

#### SOUNDNESS

The plan lacks soundness. There are vague plans to address the crossings over the Manchester Ship Canal which are due to bear hundreds of thousands of extra crossings every year. This will have the effect of stopping people who live in South Warrington from accessing the town centre. People will travel to Altrincham or other parts of South Manchester to access work and leisure pursuits.

There has been no serious analysis of air quality impact. There is only one quality monitor in South Warrington and it only measures NO2 and doesn't measure particulates.

The transport system as it currently stands is not fit for purpose. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Any incident as trivial as someone breaking down causes major issues.

The transport plan is full of ideas but there is no attempt to cost the work needed or explain how it will be paid for. The current level of bus fares is already too expensive which

is why a lot of people drive. If you push up parking costs all you are doing is penalising the working population and reducing disposable income. If you put a parking levy in place, employers will freeze wages to cover this cost.

Incidentally making the people in South Warrington pay for their children to get to school has not helped the transport problem. At a cost of over £400 a year per child the introduction of this has produced a significant effect on the traffic going to and from Lymm.

The growth strategy is based on an automated industry which will generate few jobs in reality. The expected jobs will be mainly minimum wages, zero hours contracts which will not attract people in the immediate vicinity of the site due to high living costs. You are only further increasing traffic as workers move across Warrington to get to those jobs.

#### LACK OF DETAIL ON INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

There is a lack of detail about several key logistical issues.

The plan for the crossing to replace the Victorian bridges over the Manchester Ship Canal is just a box on the map. There are no details of what form such a crossing would take, how much it would cost, when it would be built and who would be paying for it. This suggest to me that there are no real plans in place to deal with the issue we currently have with traffic caused by the Manchester Ship Canal swing bridges which will undoubtedly get worse.

There has been no honest assessment of how the Warrington Wester Link will impact the Walton/Chester Road and the new link road through Stretton, Pewterspear, Appleton Cross and Grappenhall Heys looks suspiciously like an HGV link road. Does this road need to be a dual carriageway?

How is all the building work of houses and infrastructure going to be done in such a short space of time where there is already a high density of people without causing serious delay for residents?

#### DELIVERABILITY

Can this full scheme of development be delivered?

There is a lack of clarity about where the money is coming from to fund the dual carriageway, High School, GP surgery, Supermarkets etc. Is there money in the WBC budget to run an extra High School when funds are already stretched? Are there sufficient doctors and teachers to take up the posts and is there money to pay them?

The plans for the new high-level bridge over the ship canal (the box) can not be realistic estimates since the actual plans are not in place but are just an idea shown by a box.

Can this level of house building of 945 - 1,500 houses a year be competently overseen by

WBC when the most that's ever been overseen previously is 500 per year?

Is it fair to leave people living in the middle of a gigantic housing development without the infrastructure in place? What guarantees are in place to make sure the infrastructure is built? Is there not a risk of the developer building the houses then going out of business before any infrastructure is built?

CRITERIA FOR RELEASE OF GREEN BELT NOT MET

There has been no case made for the release of the green belt land. Is there a case for this? How does it meet the objectives?

It doesn't meet 4 out of the 5 objectives set

The greenbelt is there to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas to help safeguard the countryside from urban encroachment, to assist in urban regeneration by ensuring derelict land and other urban land is used first. Finally the greenbelt is there to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. This development will ruin Grappenhall village, Appleton, Stretton, Walton and Moore.

Please consider my views when looking at the local plan.

Regards

Sylvia Hulse