



Subject:  
Date:



Local Development Plan resident response  
17 June 2019 11:58:20

Dear Planning assessor,

I write as a warrington resident to strongly object to the Warrington local development plan on the following grounds:

The plan is not realistically practical, Environmentally sound or deliverable given the geographical nature of Warrington with its several water ways, surrounding motorway network and positioning.

- The loss of green belt will result in urban sprawl and damage to wildlife and public health.
- The suggested destruction of green belt is not evenly spread around warrington, it is all planned for the south -what is the justification?
- What are the exceptional circumstances for the green belt to be build on?
- Why does warrington need 20,000 extra homes? The plan is too ambitious. I agree that homes may be needed and could be built sympathetically, but not to the extent proposed around the town centre (Latchford) or in the far south. We do not have the infrastructure to sustain any more traffic or medical resources to accommodate the significant increase in population.
- Where are the confirmed plans for a new hospital? The current hospital is already overstretched and serves severs Widnes, Runcorn, Halton and Warrington residents!

**Increased Housing /Loss of Green belt = Increased Traffic on existing roads & motorways = Increased pollution from exhaust fumes and tyre dust = increases significant health issues = Pressure on local Hospital & Doctors surgeries**

Warrington has the worst rate of small particulate pollution in the UK in 2018 (WHO AAQD v11 May 2018). A Reduction of the greenbelt in the south reduces the trees and vegetation currently absorbing some of the harmful gases, naturally filtering the air we breath. The air in Latchford on the major roads is toxic on walking into to walk. I am not social deprived, do not smoke or drink and eat a healthy diet, if I developed lung cancer (Warrington has above average rates of lung cancer) could WBC be culpability in the future?

In WBC's Air Quality Report (AQR) June 2018, it states that in 2016 4.9% (that is nearly 1 in 20) of deaths in warrington could be attributed to particulate pollution. Furthermore, some warrington areas, close to major roads, exceeded the levels of particulate pollution, which is recognised to contribute to the onset of cancer and cardiovascular disease. Traffic exhaust fumes and tier dust pollution is a significant contributing factor. I wonder therefore, how WBC can justify spending over £230 million in land/building purchases to generate income, then state that ' monitoring at the worse locations (of pollution) has been proposed to gain further evidence, although there is a gap in funding at this current time' (AQR).

How is this acceptable? Is public health not important? Meanwhile large dense developments keep being built near major roads. How can councillors say, for example, that traffic & pollution generated from 160 & 189 dwellings passed for planning by Wilderspool Causeway & the Canterliver respectively, will not impact the local area? Why won't WBC invest in the monitoring the worst areas of pollution or actually engage in reducing traffic pollution?

**Environmental impact** of increased traffic, both in noise and air quality. Nitrogen Dioxide, Nitrogen Oxides, course and fine Particle Matter (PM10 & PM2.5) pollution from tyre dust and emissions (Oslo effect) have been found to contribute to increased illnesses and mortality (1, 2).

Warrington, among other large towns/cities in the UK, has already missed the original deadline of 2010 to meet pollution limits. In WBC's Air Quality Report (AQR) June 2018 it states, that in 2016, around 4.9% (almost 1:20) of all mortality in Warrington was attributable to man-made particulate pollution. Areas close to major roads are noted as particularly high in nitrogen dioxide levels and exceed national standards.

**In February 2018, Warrington's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) (3)** report it notes that there are two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) designated in warrington, one is around the major roads that lead into, and around, the town centre, including Knutsford Road, Chester Road, Wilderspool Causeway (all three in Latchford) and the other one monitors the motorways. The It must also be noted that all four of the bridge crossings for the Manchester ship Canal are also in this area of the town. The AQMAs in Warrington linked to the major roads falls primarily in high deprivation areas which includes Latchford West and East. Latchford East had a significantly higher mortality rate **than**

**any other warrington area** (regardless of depravity) for cardiovascular disease (CVD) (3). This is significant, as other illnesses cited as 'high' were consistently higher in less affluent areas of the town, suggesting low social economic status and associated factors, can not be considered accountable for the higher incidence of CVD alone in Latchford East. Research (4,5) shows that increased CVD is strongly associated with air pollution. DEFRA state that 'There is clear evidence that particulate matter (PM) has a significant contributory role in human all-cause mortality and in particular in cardiopulmonary mortality.' (7)

The Air Quality Assessment (AQA) report, commissioned December 2017, notes that at 4 out of the 6 diffuser monitoring sites in Latchford, exceeded the 40ugm levels for Nitrogen Dioxide annualised level [set out by WHO (6)]. However, the report **predicts** that additional traffic would have negligible effect on increasing this, a conclusion that is concerning as every little extra counts, particularly as levels are already high in the area and more local development sites are earmarked

#### **Potential Increase in Traffic & Reduction in Air Quality - from:**

- Extensive new housing on green belt with no detailed Infrastructure provided e.g. roads
- High density dwellings planned in the Town Centre - where will the traffic go?
- Extensive housing developments have already been built across Latchford with no new roads to support increased traffic and no infrastructure e.g. doctors surgeries. This has put additional pressure on three major roads already indicated as exceeding pollutants. In addition due to lack of amenities build with these developments, it has put additional pressures on policing e.g. Edgewater Park.
- Construction of Port Warrington could see an increase in shipping down the Manchester Ship-canal, resulting in the swing Bridges turning more and increased emissions from shipping.
- Additional vehicles travelling over the Cantilever when the bridges swing
- Vehicles travelling down Gainsborough road to access new link road, new homes & avoid swinging bridges
- No new roads in the East planned across the Manchester Ship-canal to alleviate traffic from the town centre or the south.
- Congestion/accidents on the M56 & M6 - cars divert through Latchford towards the town centre
- Mass employment land proposed to be built in the south has the potential to further increase lorries and cars travelling through latchford to and from motorway junctions. Why is Fiddlers Ferry that is due to be decommissioned in March 2020 not been allocated as a prime brown field suite for employment land?
- What is Peel's and Langtree's relationship with WBC in terms of financial reward
- Does the RSBP know that part of Moore Nature reserve is included in the building of the new Peel Port Warrington? This is sacrilege.

The LTP4 does outline plans to provide better public & cycle paths, park and ride systems and light rail trams, but this needs to be implemented now, not after all the planning has been completed. In addition there needs to be incentives to leave your car at home, more green planting, reducing the number of dense housing & keep our green spaces etc etc.

These measurements are urgently needed now before additional house, employment land and consequent traffic are even considered. Infrastructure and measures are required currently to alleviate the congestions problem we have in the east of the town particularly the south. Building in such density in this area will have catastrophic implications. Latchford is the bottleneck to the rest of the town and is already significantly congested at peak times and air quality on my way to work is particularly toxic. I would encourage the assessor to please look at the joint health studies were published in 2018 and the maps in the AQR of the Latchford area and see the notable effects increased housing will have.

Residents can help individually to reduce pollution, but it is very concerning when public elected local councillors, sitting on the transport and planning committees, do not adequately acknowledge or represent constituents' concerns on planning & traffic issues but are happy to take home the extra pay increments. The plan still seems set for 20,000 + extra homes and 381 hectares (approx 381 rugby pitches) for employment land. St. Helens have reduced their housing plan, why hasn't WBC?

The plans to build 20,000 + homes in the coming years are unrealistic and unjustified given the current economical climate in the town. However, to appreciate the enormity and devastation this would cause the area, you need to understand Warrington's geography.

We currently live between Manchester and Liverpool and therefore are in their flight path's. We are served by the Manchester ship canal, which carries daily ships with cargo between the two ports. We also have the

Bridgewater Canal and the river Mersey running through the town. Therefore three swing bridges and one tall bridge must carry the traffic into the town centre and beyond. This creates huge bottlenecks of traffic, increasing congestion and pollution. Warrington also is surrounded by three large motorways: the M56, M62, and M6. When either or all have problems, the traffic is directed through the town. The proposal is to build on all the greenbelt area in the south of the town, which not only provides a green lung, it provides habitation for wildlife, and general well-being for the residents. Other infrastructures also would not cope with such increase including our overstretched hospital and doctors surgeries.

Air quality in Warrington is very poor, and even in Warrington Borough Council's (WBC) own reports it shows the severity of the pollution problem. However the proposal to build vast numbers of homes and employment land by the M56 and M6 junction would significantly increase Lorry flow and pollution from vehicles travelling to and from the site.

There has already been significant building of homes in the town in recent years, with no additional infrastructure added, including roads, doctors and services. WBC are building another bridge in the west of the town, but this will serve additional homes and port Warrington that is to be built. It will have little impact with all the additional houses that is proposed and will support only some of the additional traffic volume.

There is very real concern from residents, particularly in the south of the town regarding the destruction of greenbelt and increase in traffic and subsequent pollution. We are already experience poor air quality, the proposed plans do not hold any promise of this problem abating.

Kind Regards,

Melanie Wood



**References:**

- (1) [https://www.who.int/quantifying\\_ehimpacts/global/source\\_apport/en/](https://www.who.int/quantifying_ehimpacts/global/source_apport/en/)
- (2) [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(13\)62158-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(13)62158-3/fulltext)
- (3) [https://www.warrington.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/16004/air\\_quality\\_and\\_health\\_jsna\\_report\\_2018.pdf](https://www.warrington.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/16004/air_quality_and_health_jsna_report_2018.pdf)
- (4) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4740122/>
- (5) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/m/pubmed/28763730/>
- (6) [https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-\(outdoor\)-air-quality-and-health](https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-(outdoor)-air-quality-and-health)
- (7) Page 23: [https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat11/1212141150\\_AQEG\\_Fine\\_Partuculate\\_Matter\\_in\\_the\\_UK.pdf](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat11/1212141150_AQEG_Fine_Partuculate_Matter_in_the_UK.pdf)





Subject:  
Date:



Response to LTP4 resident  
17 June 2019 12:13:16

Dear Planning assessor,

I write as a warrington resident to ask that the transport plan be integrated realistically with a deliverable development plan and not be a pipe dream of possibilities that current funding would not be able to carry out.

It is imperative that transport networks and assailable public transport routes, cycle ways and public foot paths be brought up to acceptable conditions to cope with the congestion problem Warrington faces on a daily basis and also the air quality crises. Though the LTP4 does make provision for a possible new tram line and cycle paths, it is difficult to see exactly where these would be and how they would be funded and if they would be delivered before the excessive planning developments are approved for local developers to build on.

I object to the Warrington LTP4 on the following grounds:

Though on paper it offers good theoretical suggestions, the plan is not realistically practical, Environmentally sound or deliverable given the geographical nature of Warrington with its several water ways and funding requirement needed.

- Roads in Streeton our proposed on Green belt land - what are the exceptional circumstances for the green belt to be build on?
- Why when Warrington can't cope with current traffic levels, particularly when bridges swing and motorways close, does the plan offer any real solution to cope with traffic created from 20,000 extra homes and employment land I.e. Six56?
- We do not have the infrastructure to sustain any more traffic or medical resources to accommodate the significant increase in population.
- Where are the confirmed plans for a new hospital? The current hospital is already overstretched and serves severs Widnes, Runcorn, Halton and Warrington residents!

**Increased Housing /Loss of Green belt = Increased Traffic on existing roads & motorways = Increased pollution from exhaust fumes and tyre dust = increases significant health issues = Pressure on local Hospital & Doctors surgeries**

Warrington has the worst rate of small particulate pollution in the UK in 2018 (WHO AAQD v11 May 2018). A Reduction of the greenbelt in the south reduces the trees and vegetation currently absorbing some of the harmful gases, naturally filtering the air we breath. The air in Latchford on the major roads is toxic on walking into to walk. I am not social deprived, do not smoke or drink and eat a healthy diet, if I developed lung cancer (Warrington has above average rates of lung cancer) could WBC be culpability in the future?

**In WBC's Air Quality Report (AQR) June 2018, it states that in 2016 4.9% (that is nearly 1 in 20) of deaths in warrington could be attributed to particulate pollution.** Furthermore, some warrington areas, close to major roads, exceeded the levels of particulate pollution, which is recognised to contribute to the onset of cancer and cardiovascular disease. Traffic exhaust fumes and tier dust pollution is a significant contributing factor.

I wonder therefore, how WBC can justify spending over £230 million in land/building purchases to generate income, then state that '**monitoring at the worse locations (of pollution) has been proposed to gain further evidence, although there is a gap in funding at this current time**' (AQR).

How is this acceptable? Is public health not important? Meanwhile large dense developments keep being built near major roads. How can councillors say, for example, that traffic & pollution generated from 160 & 189 dwellings passed for planning by Wilderspool Causeway & the Canterliver respectively, will not impact the local area? Why won't WBC invest in the monitoring the worst areas of pollution or actually engage in reducing traffic pollution?

**Environmental impact** of increased traffic, both in noise and air quality. Nitrogen Dioxide, Nitrogen Oxides, course and fine Particle Matter (PM10 & PM2.5) pollution from tyre dust and emissions (Oslo effect) have been found to contribute to increased illnesses and mortality (1, 2).

Warrington, among other large towns/cities in the UK, has already missed the original deadline of 2010 to meet pollution limits. In WBC's Air Quality Report (AQR) June 2018 it states, that in 2016, around 4.9%

(almost 1:20) of all mortality in Warrington was attributable to man-made particulate pollution. Areas close to major roads are noted as particularly high in nitrogen dioxide levels and exceed national standards.

**In February 2018, Warrington's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) (3)** report it notes that there are two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) designated in Warrington, one is around the major roads that lead into, and around, the town centre, including Knutsford Road, Chester Road, Wilderspool Causeway (all three in Latchford) and the other one monitors the motorways. It must also be noted that all four of the bridge crossings for the Manchester Ship Canal are also in this area of the town. The AQMAs in Warrington linked to the major roads falls primarily in high deprivation areas which includes Latchford West and East. Latchford East had a significantly higher mortality rate **than any other Warrington area** (regardless of deprivation) for cardiovascular disease (CVD) (3). This is significant, as other illnesses cited as 'high' were consistently higher in less affluent areas of the town, suggesting low social economic status and associated factors, can not be considered accountable for the higher incidence of CVD alone in Latchford East. Research (4,5) shows that increased CVD is strongly associated with air pollution. DEFRA state that 'There is clear evidence that particulate matter (PM) has a significant contributory role in human all-cause mortality and in particular in cardiopulmonary mortality.' (7)

The Air Quality Assessment (AQA) report, commissioned December 2017, notes that at 4 out of the 6 diffuser monitoring sites in Latchford, exceeded the 40ugm levels for Nitrogen Dioxide annualised level [set out by WHO (6)]. However, the report **predicts** that additional traffic would have negligible effect on increasing this, a conclusion that is concerning as every little extra counts, particularly as levels are already high in the area and more local development sites are earmarked

#### **Potential Increase in Traffic & Reduction in Air Quality - from:**

- Extensive new housing on green belt with no detailed Infrastructure provided e.g. roads
- High density dwellings planned in the Town Centre - where will the traffic go?
- Extensive housing developments have already been built across Latchford with no new roads to support increased traffic and no infrastructure e.g. doctors surgeries. This has put additional pressure on three major roads already indicated as exceeding pollutants. In addition due to lack of amenities built with these developments, it has put additional pressures on policing e.g. Edgewater Park.
- Construction of Port Warrington could see an increase in shipping down the Manchester Ship-canal, resulting in the swing Bridges turning more and increased emissions from shipping.
- Additional vehicles travelling over the Cantilever when the bridges swing
- Vehicles travelling down Gainsborough road to access new link road, new homes & avoid swinging bridges
- No new roads in the East planned across the Manchester Ship-canal to alleviate traffic from the town centre or the south.
- Congestion/accidents on the M56 & M6 - cars divert through Latchford towards the town centre
- Mass employment land proposed to be built in the south has the potential to further increase lorries and cars travelling through Latchford to and from motorway junctions. Why is Fiddlers Ferry that is due to be decommissioned in March 2020 not been allocated as a prime brown field site for employment land?
- What is Peel's and Langtree's relationship with WBC in terms of financial reward
- Does the RSBP know that part of Moore Nature reserve is included in the building of the new Peel Port Warrington? This is sacrilege.

The LTP4 does outline plans to provide better public & cycle paths, park and ride systems and light rail trams, but this needs to be implemented now, not after all the planning has been completed. In addition there needs to be incentives to leave your car at home, more green planting, reducing the number of dense housing & keep our green spaces etc etc.

These measurements are urgently needed now before additional house, employment land and consequent traffic are even considered. Infrastructure and measures are required currently to alleviate the congestions problem we have in the east of the town particularly the south. Building in such density in this area will have catastrophic implications. Latchford is the bottleneck to the rest of the town and is already significantly congested at peak times and air quality on my way to work is particularly toxic. I would encourage the assessor to please look at the joint health studies were published in 2018 and the maps in the AQR of the Latchford area and see the notable effects increased housing will have.

Residents can help individually to reduce pollution, but it is very concerning when public elected local councillors, sitting on the transport and planning committees, do not adequately acknowledge or represent constituents' concerns on planning & traffic issues but are happy to take home the extra pay increments. The plan still seems set for 20,000 + extra homes and 381 hectares (approx 381 rugby pitches) for employment



land. St. Helens have reduced their housing plan, why hasn't WBC?

The plans to build 20,000 + homes in the coming years are unrealistic and unjustified given the current economical climate in the town. However, to appreciate the enormity and devastation this would cause the area, you need to understand Warrington's geography.

We currently live between Manchester and Liverpool and therefore are in their flight path's. We are served by the Manchester ship canal, which carries daily ships with cargo between the two ports. We also have the Bridgewater Canal and the river Mersey running through the town. Therefore three swing bridges and one tall bridge must carry the traffic into the town centre and beyond. This creates huge bottlenecks of traffic, increasing congestion and pollution. Warrington also is surrounded by three large motorways: the M56, M62, and M6. When either or all have problems, the traffic is directed through the town. The proposal is to build on all the greenbelt area in the south of the town, which not only provides a green lung, it provides habitation for wildlife, and general well-being for the residents. Other infrastructures also would not cope with such increase including our overstretched hospital and doctors surgeries.

Air quality in Warrington is very poor, and even in Warrington Borough Council's (WBC) own reports it shows the severity of the pollution problem. However the proposal to build vast numbers of homes and employment land by the M56 and M6 junction would significantly increase Lorry flow and pollution from vehicles travelling to and from the site.

There has already been significant building of homes in the town in recent years, with no additional infrastructure added, including roads, doctors and services. WBC are building another bridge in the west of the town, but this will serve additional homes and port Warrington that is to be built. It will have little impact with all the additional houses that is proposed and will support only some of the additional traffic volume.

There is very real concern from residents, particularly in the south of the town regarding the lack of realistic solutions and affordable options offered to alleviate the current traffic problems in the south (including latchford) of the town.

**I demand that the council be made to measure, all pollution particulates across the town for a clearer assume that to be made of the time bomb residents are living with.**

Kind Regards,

Melanie Wood



**References:**

- (1) [https://www.who.int/quantifying\\_ehimpacts/global/source\\_apport/en/](https://www.who.int/quantifying_ehimpacts/global/source_apport/en/)
- (2) [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(13\)62158-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(13)62158-3/fulltext)
- (3) [https://www.warrington.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/16004/air\\_quality\\_and\\_health\\_jsna\\_report\\_2018.pdf](https://www.warrington.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/16004/air_quality_and_health_jsna_report_2018.pdf)
- (4) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4740122/>
- (5) <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/m/pubmed/28763730/>
- (6) [https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-\(outdoor\)-air-quality-and-health](https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ambient-(outdoor)-air-quality-and-health)
- (7) Page 23: [https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat11/1212141150\\_AQEG\\_Fine Partuculate Matter in the UK.pdf](https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/assets/documents/reports/cat11/1212141150_AQEG_Fine_Partuculate_Matter_in_the_UK.pdf)

