

Annette Cumbo

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Warrington  
[REDACTED]

17 June 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

**LP – PSV (Local Plan – Proposed Submission Version)**

I am writing in connection with the Warrington LP – PSV. Overall, I have serious doubts that many parts of the outlined plan are sound and deliverable.

In particular, I object to the LP-PSV for the following important reasons:

**Economic Growth**

- The LP-PSV includes a planned number of homes (18,900 homes by 2037) which is much higher than the government's housing targets.
- The land set aside for employment is not supported by a meaningful economic strategy for Warrington.
- It would appear that the economic growth targets have been set by people and organisations which have a vested interest in overstating the growth predictions for Warrington for their own financial gain. An example of this is Warrington & Co. and the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). The economic growth prediction figures used in the LP-PSV have come from the LEP without any major proposal to back up such predictions. The government growth figures predict much slower growth and therefore there appears to be no justification to use the LEP forecasts in predicting Warrington's housing needs. The LP-PSV basically uses old data and over-ambitious assumptions to support it.
- The LP-PSV calls for a massive release of green belt land for housing and employment purposes. There are no special or exceptional circumstances which would warrant the release of large swathes of green belt land. No reasonable case can be made for this.
- Warrington has a very poor track record for the delivery of housing. The maximum supply rate is less than 550 per annum in recent history, however in the plan the build rate peaks at circa 1600 houses per annum. This does not seem to be deliverable at all.
- The scale of the LP-PSV calls for mass development across South Warrington (7,400 hours), an area filled with small village areas. The LP-PSV would destroy

the character and distinctiveness of these areas by creating an urban sprawl of housing. The entire landscape and distinctiveness would be completely decimated.

- The LP-PSV does not include sufficient building on “brown” sites and these have not been prioritized over the green belt releases. It has recently been announced that Fiddlers Ferry powerplant will close in 2020 and this significant piece of land could be used for housing and employment building rather than using green belt land.

### **Infrastructure**

- The LP-PSV is shockingly lacking in detail. For example, only a vague road network is suggested in the plans for South Warrington. The insufficient detail means that it is hard to see how the plan can be delivered.
- The crossings over the Bridgewater Canal and the Manchester Ship Canal are also vague – only suggestions of possible routes.
- None of the proposed infrastructure in the LP-PSV uses public money. However, there are very limited details in the plan as to where the money to build all of the infrastructure (roads, hospitals, doctors, health centres, schools, community centres etc) is coming from. It therefore doesn't sound deliverable.
- The plan includes an estimate of £50m to develop the Cantilever Bridge. This is completely unrealistic as it would not even cover the cost of the housing / land that would need to be purchased for this development.
- I can see that some of the infrastructure is ‘considered’ in the LPT4 (Local Transport Plan 4). However, it's just a wish list rather than a matter or substance which is funded.
- In terms of health care infrastructure, there is no detail about how these will be funded, when they will be built or where they will be built.
- In terms of education infrastructure, there is no detail about how these will be funded, when they will be built or where they will be built.
- There is no coherent plan about how to solve the current transportation difficulties in Warrington. There will be total reliance on the road network for Warrington residents.
- The WWL (Warrington Western Link) will not help the plan at all. It merely brings traffic to existing bottlenecks whilst adding more traffic from those avoiding Tolls on the Mersey Gateway crossings

### **Air Quality & Environment**

- Warrington already has the worst record in the country for dangerous small 2.5-micron particulate emissions. There is a proven link between exposure to small particles and premature death.
- The removal of green space will make air quality much worse in Warrington and the plans over reliance on the car usage will worsen the situation.
- Realistic traffic assessments do not appear to have been undertaken.
- The loss of habitat for many species is not considered in any detail in the plan.
- The Plan does not guide people back to the town centre, in fact the opposite would result. Warrington would become a network of mini-centres. I cannot imagine why anyone in South Warrington would head for the town centre as the traffic and air quality already put people off going there. Plenty of people in South Warrington already opt to shop in Northwich, Altrincham or Cheshire Oaks because it's quicker and easier to get to.

## Greenbelt

The plan doesn't meet the 5 criteria for release from Green Belt which are...

- to check the unrestricted 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
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

All of the above demonstrate that the plan is **NOT SOUND or DELIVERABLE.**

Kind regards

Annette Cumbo

Annette Cumbo

Warrington

17 June 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

### **Transport Plan LTP4**

I am writing in connection with the Warrington Transport Plan LTP4. Overall, I have serious doubts that many parts of the outlined plan are sound and deliverable for the following important reasons:

- The Transport Plan LTP4 is shockingly lacking in detail. For example, only a vague road network is suggested in the plans for South Warrington. The insufficient detail means that it is hard to see how the plan can be delivered.
- The crossings over the Bridgewater Canal and the Manchester Ship Canal are also vague – only suggestions of possible routes.
- Non of the proposed infrastructure in the LP-PSV uses public money. However, there are very limited details in the plan as to where the money to build all of the infrastructure (roads, hospitals, doctors, health centres, schools, community centres etc) is coming from. It therefore doesn't sound deliverable.
- The plan includes an estimate of £50m to develop the Cantilever Bridge. This is completely unrealistic as it would not even cover the cost of the housing / land that would need to be purchased for this development.
- I can see that some of the infrastructure is 'considered' in the LPT4 (Local Transport Plan 4). However, it's just a wish list rather than a matter or substance which is funded.

**OVERALL BOTH THE LP-PSV and LTP4 are UNSOUND AND UNDELIVERABLE.**

Kind regards

Annette Cumbo