


**From:**   
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to plan  
**Date:** 08 June 2019 16:34:55

---

Dear Sir/madam,

Having read the Local plan I would like to lodge my objection to the document on the following grounds.

### **Economic Growth;**

It is our opinion that the economic growth targets have been set by those who have a vested interest in overstating growth predictions for their own purposes. Examples are Warrington & Co. and the LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership). Indeed the economic growth prediction figures used have come from the LEP without ANY major proposal to back up such a prediction. Official figures predict much slower growth than that detailed in the plan and hence there is no Justification to use such forecasts in predicting the Towns housing need.

- 
- The planned number of homes is well beyond government housing targets.
- The employment land is not backed by any meaningful economic strategy for the town.
- No need for development which destroys character and distinctiveness (unchecked housing sprawl destroying unique character of each village).
- No Town centre development plan to ease pressure on the development sites be they be brown or green.
- No case made for release of green belt.
- No case can be made for the immediate release of land from Greenbelt (ie before brownbelt has been developed.
- Warrington has a very poor delivery of housing. Previously the maximum supply rate is less than 550 per annum. Yet in the plan the

build rate peaks at circa 1600 houses per annum!

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

### **Infrastructure;**

This is not just roads. Its everything needed for the plan to succeed. Hospitals, Doctors, Heath Centres, Schools, roads etc etc.

Non of the infrastructure proposed uses public money and it is not detailed in the plan where the money is coming from?

- Vague crossings across the canals. No detail, only suggestions all of which are unfunded.
- Estimates of £50m for the Cantilever Bridge to be developed. This is not only unrealistic it would not cover the cost of the housing/land that would need to be purchased.
- Vague road network in the South. Again, no detail, only suggestions all of which are unfunded.
- Some of the infrastructure is 'considered' in LPT4 (Local Transport Plan 4). However this is just a 'wish list' of considerations and has no substance.
- No detail of heath and well-being facilities required, how they will be funded or when they will be built.
- No detail of schools provision, how they will be funded or when in the plan they will be built.
- The WWL (Warrington Western Link) will not help the plan at all. It mere brings traffic to existing bottlenecks whilst adding more traffic from those avoiding Tolls on the Mersey Gateway crossings.
- Total reliance on the road network for residents and the local economy. No coherent plan on how to solve traffic problems.

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

### **Air Quality & Environment**

Warrington is already over burdened with poor air quality.

- Removal of green space will make air quality much worse, yet the plan even argues the opposite
- The plan's over reliance on the car and ensuing traffic will exacerbate the situation.
- No realistic traffic assessments undertaken.
- Loss of habitat for many species not considered in any detail
- Loss of landscape, setting for the villages is lost. Character and distinctiveness is lost.
- The Plan does not guide people back to the town centre, in fact the opposite.
- Click on our information guide on Air Quality here . . . .

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

### **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!**

Brian Potter, 

**Subject:**  
**Date:**

Public consultation on Proposed South Warrington Urban Extension  
06 May 2019 09:50:22

---

To The Planning Officers,

I would like to object to this plan in the strongest terms and on the following basis.

- It is not justified because the projected growth is too ambitious
- the roads are already overstretched and at capacity, nothing in the plan will ease this. Any problems on the Motorway network significantly increases traffic through the town.
- We have the Manchester Ship Canal and the ageing Victorian swing bridges + a weak high level bridge - this affects all routes north /south
- Warrington is one of the worst places in the Uk for air pollution, this can only get worse, especially in Walton and Stockton Heath
- Developers should concentrate on Brownfield sites for regeneration and only when they have been used, should Green Belt land be used.
- The character of the villages south of Warrington will be lost forever
- Already there is significant noise from the road network, this will increase if the proposed new dual carriageway linking Barley Castle industrial estate to Junction 10 is built.
- The plan is not detailed enough
- Much of the proposed housing will not be in the 'affordable' range and the number of vehicles each house could generate is unsustain
- Warrington General Hospital is already overstretched coping with the existing population.

I hope you will take these views into consideration and reject this plan,

Yours faithfully,

Brian Potter, [REDACTED]