

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** local plan objection  
**Date:** 16 June 2019 22:00:57

---

I wish to object to the local plan as I believe it to be unsound and also because it contains inaccurate information relating to flooding. I have listed my reasons below

Changes are being made to this plan during the consultation period and it's my belief that this is being done to the detriment of local residents. Many will have placed an objection based on the wording when the consultation was commenced and will be unaware that the text has change and the implications of those changes are considerable. E.g. the proposed development of houses in Burtonwood now reads as "1. Land to the north of Burtonwood (inset settlement) will be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development for a minimum of 160 homes." Only a couple of weeks earlier this read as being up to 160 houses and has seemingly been changed at the request of the land owners. The implications of the change are considerable and surely the content of the draft plan should not be change on a rolling basis solely for the benefit of developers. I request that this means the plan should be subject to a government planner's scrutiny as there's clearly questionable activity taking place at a local level. I also believe that the consultation period should be extended and the council should be mandated to fully explain the changes made. No further changes should be made during the consultation period.

With specific regard to the aforementioned housing development in Burtonwood I have significant concerns on a number of levels which I have bulleted below

- The proposed access (as per Northern Trust landowners illustrations/plans) there are two likely access points to the development. One being from Green Lane, immediately across from the primary school. There have been long term issues with traffic and safety along the road past the school, which given that there'll potentially be hundreds of additional car journeys [passing the school, poses a considerable risk to the safety of all pedestrians, particularly school children as well as increased risk to motorists. The other proposed access via Winsford Drive is along a narrow Road with a surface that's often akin to an off-road driving course and regularly needs running repairs. This also provides access to Rushton Close to which access has sometimes been problematic due to previous poor planning decisions such as no footpath for much of the road, narrow roads and houses with insufficient driveway parking for modern households. There are no other viable access points is only half of the proposed development field is to be used (as local councillors claim only part of the field is in scope)
- Flooding – there has been regular surface water flooding on Phipps Lane and Broad Lane with the existing drainage unable to cope with any remotely heavy rainfall. Just in the last few days this has occurred again. The attached surface water flooding risk (from Environment Agency website) shows several high-risk points on the aforementioned roads and also in the middle of the proposed development site. Building on the proposed site will remove considerable natural drainage, including culverts that are on the proposed site and merely move flooding problems elsewhere, be that Rushton Close, Phipps Lane or Broad Lane.
- Inaccurate historical surface water flooding information is including in the plan. It shows not historical surface water flooding in the surrounding areas, despite the fact that it occurs several times per year. Perhaps someone should get the former leader of Warrington council to explain how such a manipulation of fact could occur on his watch, particularly when he lives a few hundred yards from said surface water flooding.
- Health provision in Burtonwood village is, at best, poor. We have two small satellites of surgeries that comes under a different health authority, with one of those due to close in the coming months. Given that making a GP appointment is already problematic and that provision sf being halved, I'd ask that the assurances around adequate health care that are referenced in the plan should be published.
- Transport – the public transport to and from the village is highly limited, with services frequently not turning up and is no existent into the evening. This negates the ability of residents who wish to travel to and from work via public transport, thus the use of cars is then necessary. The plan references accessibility of public transport but doesn't not

address the availability of it. The building of at least 160 properties will mean marked increase in car use. The plan doesn't detail projected increase emissions and predictions around air quality that this will bring. Given the ongoing expansion of Omega, the proposed development around Gorsey Lane by St Helens and Warrington councils plus the potential development of Parkside by St Helens, surely the plan should incorporate a collaborative effort to assess the impact of massively increased emission across the wider area. I'd also query whether putting hundreds of extra car journeys and hundreds of extra home delivery journey a day, adjacent to a primary school, is a way to treat our infants?

- Site traffic – Burtonwood has limited access and has been plagued by HGV problems. What limitation will be provided around the control of HGV and all other site traffic, given the poor levels of access to site. Vehicles will either be accessing site outside the primary school or on a very narrow road, used by dozens of young children to get to and from school. From a safety perspective, surely controls should be put in place to make sure that any site workers are not parking on local roads and only park on the actual development site.
- Water and power failures are frequent in Burtonwood. How will this be mitigated in the plan?

#### General objections/concerns

Full disclosure should be provided, in conjunction with the local plan, of all meetings/discussion between representatives of the council (employees, councillors, consultants etc.) with developers and owners of the proposed development plan, as not all relationships are fully transparent, and in some instances, there appears to be a conflict of interest as the council is approving developments relating to it's own development company.

This plan does not factor in the likely availability of a large brownfield site on the soon to be de-commissioned Fiddlers Ferry power station site. Surely a wholesale audit and review of potential brownfield development sites should be undertaken and the plan suspended until that point.

The draft plan should be fully dovetailed with modern and robust transport, employment and environmental plans. The existing proposals around transport do not address the needs to the borough. Trans Pennine services have been lost from Warrington, HS2 is likely to remove Warrington from rail access to London, major employers such as DWP have recently moved out of Warrington to Manchester, thus increasing the numbers of people needing to commute. The plan should be cohesive and integrated.

The plan is based on inaccurate figures in terms of the figures used to support it being out of date.

The plan cannot be deemed sound until the means and timing of the UK exit from the EU are determined. Housing needs were assessed taking into account migrant labour and that will clearly be subject to change.

The consultation has largely been focussed online, thus to some extent actively excluding many residents. The process has involved face to face events, yet one was switched to an alternate venue with little to no notice. Those face to face events also don't sufficiently cater for full time employees who work long hours with a significant commute to work.

There is a lack of innovative thought around making properties carbon neutral and limiting environmental impact.

There's no assurance that the choice of housing stock built will actually meet the housing needs. E.g. so called affordable housing will simply be subsidised by inflated costs for the remainder of the development to enable high profit margins for developers. Why has no consideration been given to development of properties with a cap on profit margin, so as not to punish existing home owners who would want to move up the housing ladder.

Stuart Williams

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

