

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Local Plan objection
Date: 17 June 2019 12:13:21

Good morning

Please accept this email as my objection to the local plan.

I strenuously object the proposed plan on the grounds that it is not sound for a multitude of reasons, many of which I list below:

The plan and associated documentation clearly admit that building on greenbelt will be allowed before assessment of brownfield sites has been completed. Brownfield site assessment in the town centre and surrounding areas absolutely **MUST** come first. This plan is clearly based around facilitating building by developers who have been land banking for years to make life easier for the council and this **CANNOT** be accepted as a sustainable reason for this proposed plan.

On the above note, Fiddlers Ferry has announced its closure which will free up a massive brownfield site. This must now be considered as part of the plan and mean the plan has to be re-visited to take this into account.

National policy revisions have strengthened protection of the greenbelt. The very special circumstances to release it have not been demonstrated, in fact as mentioned above, the supporting documents concede this. Fiddlers Ferry just reinforces the fact that greenbelt release is not necessary!

The Government has said housing targets are not set in London but decided locally. Forecast numbers in the peak building years greatly exceed historical figures and are unrealistic. The latest 2016 population growth figures should be the starting point for forecast, not 2014's. This is a clear attempt by the council to manipulate the numbers to support the plan rather than basing a plan on the latest approved growth figures.

The plan need only be for 15 years. 20 years is too long. A shorter period would mean fewer houses need to be in the greenbelt, and overall. Again, this is suspicious in supporting WBC's proposal rather than the plan being guided by the most sustainable timeline.

Growth forecasts are ridiculously optimistic! Current uncertainty that the economy around Brexit and the Government's ongoing instability means forecasts should be representative and much lower than WBC are presenting in this plan. Warrington is successful but not growing at the suggested levels and cannot support a higher level of new jobs. The proposed jobs, particularly around the Garden Suburb, are low level jobs which have already been proven to be easily automated and it would be foolish to believe that employers such as Stobart's will be looking to employ thousands when their business models are around automation and lower people costs.

The Council is placing too much emphasis on logistics and distribution which are becoming increasingly automated generating fewer jobs. These are 24-hour businesses requiring huge numbers of vehicle movements and considerable space.

The high-value housing planned in the south will not be affordable for employees working at the proposed nearby logistic sites. This housing will be similar to Grappenhall Heys and

of such a value that it is being marketed at of town commuters working in Manchester and Liverpool. More genuinely affordable houses are needed and it is ridiculous to believe that the proposed Garden Suburb will provide much, if any of this. The land proposed here is privately owned and the owner/developers will hardly want to sacrifice maximum profit to satisfy WBC's proposed narrative, while providing all the physical infrastructure required to support the building.

The Council's alleged vision is for a vibrant town centre surrounded by attractive countryside and distinct settlements. This proposed plan would destroy Walton, Grappenhall, Appleton Thorn and Stretton, the very green spaces and distinct settlements that WBC propose to create... The green farmland around these areas creates a welcome and necessary noise & pollution barrier between the M56/M6 motorways and the aforementioned settlements. The proposed plan completely destroys this imperative pollution barrier, and adds up to 14,000 additional vehicles into this area. Hardly fitting with the WBC narrative...

Congestion is already a major problem on roads in the south of the town and at Junction 20 on the M6. Infrastructure must be built before houses, not afterwards. The cost has been underestimated and should be challenged. Why one earth would developers buy into WBC's plan that requires them to not only deplete their potential profits by building low value 'affordable' housing, as well as providing the full road network to support this? It's simply laughable to suppose that land banking prospectors would just agree to half their profits just to fit into WBC's fantasy proposal and just will not happen!

What guarantees are there that developers will contribute/provide these facilities when they are needed? History shows that developers sign up to provide the earth, then summarily fail to do so, knowing that the fines they may receive for breaking any agreement will be much smaller than the loss in profits they would feel if they conformed. This leaves the developer laughing all the way to the bank, and WBC left to deal with the consequences. Any plan **MUST** contain contractual obligation from **ALL** parties that all road infrastructure **MUST** be provided in advance of any housing being built to guarantee that all elements of a plan are delivered, and the financial penalties for failure to comply need to be such as to discourage non-conformance.

Air pollution is increasingly recognised as a serious health problem. Warrington has the worst record in the UK for air quality and the proposed plan and the vehicles it will add will make matters worse. Simple figures suggest that 7000 houses in the Garden Suburb will easily add a minimum of 2 cars per house so a conservative estimate will be 14,000 additional cars, not to mention the hundreds if not thousands of additional HGV journeys for the proposed Stobart and Six56 developments. This hardly fits with the WBC narrative of healthy outdoor spaces for these new developments.

Green spaces are good for wellbeing and mental health. Part of Moore Nature Reserve would be lost for a huge road that is clearly, and being proven more on a daily basis, a mere vehicle for the proposed logistics developments and pandering to Peel Holdings who, from their own proposal documents have shown that they are instrumental in guiding the WBC plan for their own Port Warrington plans. Any and all Local Plans absolutely **MUST** be in the best interests of the Warrington people who already live here and not simply to pander to billionaire land owners who have their own plans, and WBC **MUST** be the protectors of Warrington's best interests.

Yours Sincerely
Mark Trimble

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]