

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: RE: consultation response
Date: 13 June 2019 16:04:17

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to offer some comments on your latest proposed submission version of the Local Plan.

My principal concerns relate to the proposed Garden Suburb and adjacent large employment site. While the plan generally makes the right noises about sustainability and making Warrington a less car dominated place, I fear that concentrating so much low density greenfield development in one part of the borough will achieve precisely the opposite. Past research shows that such locations encourage private car trips rather than other modes of transport. To disperse the impact of additional development, would it not be wiser to release sites around the urban fringes rather in one place? It seems that the proposals are dictated mainly by where land is held in public ownership rather than logic.

The brief presentation of the summary plan (which I watched on Youtube) acknowledges that the Green Belt will only be used as a last resort. However, the plan recommends release of such land on an unprecedented scale which cannot be justified on the basis of historic take-up rates of either housing or employment land.

While Warrington is undoubtedly thriving, there is a lack of detail in the plan specifying where the new economic impetus is going to come from and why so many homes are necessary. The plan places a lot of emphasis on distribution and logistics which though justifiable in terms of the nature of the town's economy is not likely to generate large numbers of jobs and therefore the need for large numbers of new homes. Given the lack of evidence concerning additional economic activity locally, there is a danger that the proposed garden suburb will boost long-distance commuting and primarily benefit outsiders rather than local residents.

LTP4 Transport Plan refers to producing options for a new rapid transit system but there is scant mention of how this would serve the town and particularly the garden suburb, to offset increases in vehicular movements and congestion. Is it just a pipe dream?

The plan does not indicate whether neighbouring authorities support the plan and are developing complementary infrastructure schemes.

The wording of the transport section does not inspire confidence. Paragraph 10.2.13 is vague as it suggests that there may potentially be a need for a second Manchester Ship Canal crossing which tends to suggest that traffic projections have not been calculated in much detail. It would help to specify the timing and nature of transport improvements to show how they serve the new garden suburb etc. and for more plans showing this (para

10.2.12).

More detailed comments:

The plan is not very user friendly for members of the public like myself as it lacks an executive summary.

The map on the local plan website does not feature major proposals and how they relate to one another.

The Appendix contains a housing trajectory chart but the employment chart showing historic and projected take up appears to be missing. There is no convincing evidence to suggest why a sharp increase in land for either use is required.

██████████ I noted that the sites will be developed in such a way as to respect the Neighbourhood Plan. I find this somewhat ironic as to my knowledge the Neighbourhood Plan Group was not involved in the selection of these sites.

I hope that these comments will be given close consideration at the forthcoming Examination in Public.

Many thanks,

Richard Evans