

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Objection to Warrington Local Plan
Date: 16 June 2019 13:43:09

Mark Browne

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I would like to express my objection to the proposed Local Plan for Warrington put out by the Local Authority of Warrington for public consultation on the following grounds.

Warrington Borough Council issued a proposed Preferred Development Option in 2017 which attracted over 4500 objections. In the light of those objections a revised Local Plan was issued and having considered the detail of that Local Plan it appears little has changed and the Local Plan in no way takes into account real concerns raised by many thousands of local residents. I make the following observations in support of the contention that the plan is unrealistic in its deliverability, is based on out of date and unsound data, and is immensely damaging to the environment.

- 1.No justification for the loss of green belt. The proposed loss of 600 acres of green belt almost exclusively in the south Warrington area will hit the character and environment presently enjoyed by many of the historic villages in the area .It may have been more equitable to spread any release of green belt across the whole of Warrington. The greenbelt boundary was only confirmed 5 years ago in Warrington in a plan that was supposed to be good for 20 years. It seems somewhat inequitable that those plans are abandoned so early into the plan. The Council should look to brown field alternatives first , which they clearly have not done which renders the proposals unsound in principle.
2. The brown field site at Fiddlers Ferry will be available for redevelopment from March 2020 .This is a huge expanse of land that could accommodate the Borough Council's proposed development in its entirety. It has much of the necessary infrastructure already in place, and should be the preferred location. This is a 20 year plan and would provide sufficient time to clean the site and make it suitable for both residential and commercial development.
3. The environmental and ecological impact of the loss of green belt has not properly been assessed, particularly in the light of the proposed Garden Suburb in Grappenhall which will result in the building of 4200 new homes. This is in addition to new giant warehousing facilities, all to be built on green belt land.
4. Around 5000 new homes would be built in the Garden Suburb with the potential for 2300 more. An urban extension in the south west will provide a further 1600 new homes at Walton which would triple in the size the development of the immediate area and remove part of the Moore nature reserve.
5. This will lead to unrelenting traffic growth. 2000 HGVs per hour from the Langtree Six/56 commercial warehousing site along with all the additional traffic created from the proposed housing development into a traffic infrastructure that can barely cope with the pre-existing traffic levels. Quite simply unsound and not deliverable.
6. Warrington already has one of the worst records in the country for the dangerous small 2.5-micron particulate emissions. There is a proven link between exposure to small particulates and premature death. This will worsen the problem considerably.
7. The Council is being too ambitious about growth predictions based on unrealistic levels of

economic activity leading to economic development at rates which have never been achieved before. No account appears to have been taken of what is happening in Manchester and Liverpool. Growth seems to be driven by new housing creating economic benefit and not the other way round.

8. In summary the plan is simply not sound. There is no justification for the predicted growth. There is no need for the volume of housing and mass of employment land. No need for the scale of Green Belt release or justification for the release of Green Belt land. No need for the harm to air quality and local ecology. No need to destroy the character and distinctiveness of our villages. No clarity on the means of delivery.

For the reasons stated above I object to the Local Plan.

████████████████████

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: LTP4
Date: 17 June 2019 11:05:15

Mark Browne

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

16.06.2019

I object to the aforementioned local traffic plan for the Warrington area for the following reasons.

1. The LTP4 lacks the necessary details in many key areas in that it frequently describes options and ideas as illustrative and conceptual.
2. It does not address the existing south Warrington highway infrastructure, which is at saturation point at key times and suffers from significant traffic congestion when the swing bridges are turned.
3. The Local Plan refers to increased ship movements on the Manchester Ship Canal (MSC). This will increase the number of swing bridge movements causing chaos to an already difficult congestion problem.
4. Details of the road plans are very vague. The only firm proposal is for a new wide dual carriageway strategic road running parallel to the M56 linking Barley Castle industrial estate to junction 10 of the M56. This is likely to be a feeder road for HGVS and other wagons doing nothing to service residential properties in the area, whether those properties are in existence or proposed. This road will be built on high grade green belt and merely facilitate commercial access to an industrial estate and nothing more .It will also add to the noise and air pollution in the area, which are already amongst the worst in the UK.
5. Warrington's record on air pollution is poor and Warrington is in the top 5 worst towns in the UK for raised levels of PM2.5 BEING ABOVE the recognized limit of 10microg/m3. This is particularly problematic close to roads that suffer from queues of stationary traffic with engines running. The local plan will result in large increases in traffic volumes, increased turns of the MSC swing bridges, exacerbating the aforementioned problems causing significant problems to the duration and frequency of traffic queues on nearby roads, having a significant adverse impact on air quality. The LTP4 offers nothing to address this problem.
6. The LTP4 provides no details of how new public transport systems would cross the MSC or Bridgewater canal.
7. The LTP4 assumes that there will be changes in travel and commuting habits resulting in more people walking, using bicycles and greater bus and train patronage. However, walking and cycling are not facilitated by extremely busy roads at times when most people commute to and from work/school, and are also discouraged by the poor air quality. Most households in south Warrington are multi car households and are car dependent. There are no proposals as to how these issues and cultures will be addressed.

I object to the proposals in the LTP4.

Mark Browne

[REDACTED]