

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Representations - Mark Baker, [REDACTED]
Date: 17 June 2019 14:49:09

Firstly, I note that the census of 2011 has been used as a reference point in the formulation of the local plan.

I feel that this is not sufficiently recent and that accordingly there should be built in regular reviews of 3 yearly intervals measuring actual developments against those envisaged in the draft local plan. This would cover housing, business development /growth, transport developments.

Specifically, I feel that housing growth since the census should be assessed and form a base point. I also feel that the targets in the local plan are set too high and a mechanism for reducing them to take account of actual developments should be included.

I object to development on the green belt. Except in exceptional circumstances use of the green belt for housing or business should not be allowed in the first ten years and then only after 80% of the target has been reached via brownfield sources. Green belt development if allowed at all should have a 50% affordable housing target.

Also, no building on flood plains or within 1 mile of any nature reserve (official or unofficial) or similar.

New developments - roads associated with housing.. These should be wider with a minimum level stated to allow for cyclists and motor cycles. Currently developments have been allowed with roads which are narrower than should prevail.

Transport developments - the achievement of provision of transport developments should be a requirement/ condition/ prerequisite before approval for housing and/or business development takes place not as an afterthought widening junctions etc. Traffic assumptions should be based on current figures with soundly based reviewable projections. Not like the traffic assumptions for Asda Westbrook which were based initially on out of date figures leading to traffic flow issues. When there are problems on motorways Warrington becomes gridlocked and it can take over an hour to get from Sankey to Bridgefoot to go to North Wales which is longer than it takes to walk.

I object to the Western Link road proposal. Representations made at the time did not produce a satisfactory outcome and the proposal is in my opinion flawed and designed more to open up land for development rather than solve a transport issue. As someone who travelled regularly for a 3 year period to Priestly College and occasionally to Appleton I do not see the scheme solving the issues it references to justify it. The fact that additional crossings have been mentioned through the Warrington Guardian online suggests that proposals thus far are not sufficiently robust. I do not consider transport development have priority over development in the proposals. Equally, action to reduce car usage is generally flawed since many live out of the area and restrictions/lack of parking and a presumption that local links are adequate may inhibit recruitment of key workers

Environmentally, a base level needs to be set for air quality and pollution after measurement of current levels. Detailed proposals to mitigate or prevent any increase needs to be set out. Closing the road for a period if levels are exceeded should be included. The worry is that the western link and other developments create a corridor of poor or hazardous air quality through pollution, vehicle fumes or other sources. The Council should it proceed should have in place Legal Indemnity insurance to meet claims of impaired health resulting from the creation of areas with hazardous air quality.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Regards

Mark Baker