

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Local Plan Objection  
**Date:** 08 June 2019 12:30:29

---

Pete and Helen Wellock

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

22/05/2019

**Objection and Concerns Re: Warrington Local Plan Option (South Warrington)**

We wish to take this opportunity to set out our concerns and objections to some of the Warrington Local Plan. From the outset we must state we feel unable to respond to the pro forma which is inappropriate and specialist for all but professional planners, our comments are based on our experience [REDACTED]

We, along with 4500 south Warrington people, set out our initial objections in the summer of 2017. Since then we have attended presentations by Stobarts, the local Liberal councillors, WBC on the 8<sup>th</sup> May and 2 by Langtree in relation to Six56. In general we feel all the issues raised in the consultation to date have been ignored by WBC.

**Grappenhall Garden Suburb**

We were advised by WBC to make specific points rather than general points this however is not possible. The proposed Garden Suburb has no detail other than some variable numbers, 5000 homes plus maybe a further 2300. The plan says the proposal is "illustrative" only therefore making detailed comment impossible. The maps are very poor and technical, local people know landmarks like the Walled Garden, Cricket club etc and road names, all missing as if to make life harder. Therefore our comments cannot be a detailed critique.

Grappenhall Village is a conservation area and therefore not allowable for further development, the Village dates back many years and is recorded in the Domesday Book of 1086, the village contains many listed historical building. The Village is service by a narrow bendy lane (Broad Lane) with access from Chester Road restricted to two narrow weight hump back bridges.

Currently the Village suffers from disruptive traffic from the Barley Castle estate.

So is South Warrington being a NIMBY? Possibly but in its time as a New Town Dudlows Green and Pewterspear were built, in more recent years Grappenhall Heys. Significant properties were built between Bellhouse Lane and the Bridgewater Canal, the estate on the Old Dairy on Thelwall New Road. So to be fair it has had a reasonable amount of growth. Again we accept that the existing Homes England around Grappenhall Heys will probably go ahead and some roads etc are already in place. We acknowledge the need for housing but it's all about the scale. The proposed development of 5000 or 7300 is grossly excessive. Grappenhall Village, and Appleton Thorn, represent strong distinctive local communities, yet the Leader of the Council says it will strengthen local communities but provides no evidence. The potential influx of 12000+ would effectively submerge all the local communities

Appleton Thorn village is the only village in England where the 'Bawming of the Thorn' ceremony takes place on the third Saturday of June each year. The thorn tree, which stands beside the church, is believed to be an offshoot of the Glastonbury thorn, which grew from the staff of

Joseph of Arimathea.

These are long standing historic villages and must not be overwhelmed by excessive development.

The area around much of Grappenhall Heys and Walled Garden has we accept been designated for development for 30 years and is clearly signed by the Homes England who we believe own 42% of the land in the plan. Residents there, we are sure, will be concerned but must have bought their homes there in that knowledge. The density and infrastructure however should be subject to consideration.

The large field on Stockton Lane opposite the Grappenhall Sports Club and up unto the ridge of trees at Grappenhall Heys is key greenbelt and should remain so. Stockton Lane has limited access since its closure but does provide safe access for young people using the facility on foot or bicycle.

### **Proposed Industrial Development**

Infrastructure is obviously key, anyone who travels the A50 in the morning knows it often backs up almost to the traffic lights at the cross roads with Chester Road. Adding more homes plus extending Barley Castle will make this is a disaster waiting to happen. Access to the junction 20 of the M6 is regularly problematic. We have seen the Langtree proposal for the redevelopment of the Cliff Lane roundabout and whilst looking impressive show no understanding of the M6 Thelwal Viaduct issues not only at rush hour but on the many closures due to high wind or accidents which effectively closes Warrington through grid lock. Alternatively there is the A49 which is almost in permanent gridlock in Stockton Heath. It has been argued that this will create many local jobs, but this is ill-defined and most wages will be minimum wages or zero hours contracts rendering it necessary for more traffic to access the site. The only other access is via narrow restricted roads on Broad Lane and Lumb Brook Road. Additionally this will generate more traffic in the Clarence Road, Euclid Avenue area with commuters accessing via Knutsford Road. In a time when traffic pollution is a major concern this seems crazy. The SIX56 group argue many will live locally, no amount of so called "low cost housing" will realistically be available with most homes starting at £500K plus.

WBC seems to have an ambition of being a city, with Manchester and Salford to the east and Liverpool to the west we find that highly unlikely. But maybe WBC should put it to the test, a simple vote; do you want your town to work towards being a city?

What cities do work, in the last 30 years Manchester has transformed itself, key to that has been the growth of people living in the city centre, and developers like Urban Splash have rejuvenated old obsolete factories and units. Bringing mainly young people initially into the city brought the centre alive. So yes to the waterfront at Mr Smiths old site, to the vast empty land on Slutchers Lane but let's make the developers' work, use up the small brown field sites. Let's use the sites along the ship canal and turn it into an asset. Let's bring people back into the town centre instead of commuters to Liverpool and Manchester

Recent reports suggest the projected growth for new housing in the north has been exaggerated by some 25% and that all local authorities will have to revise their plans accordingly.

Finally the plan makes little reference to the effect on the environment, air quality, nature etc.

We should be proud of our trees and green spaces in Warrington, not seeking to destroy this irreplaceable asset, an asset which is used by the whole population of Warrington, not just those who live in the south of the town.

Yours faithfully  
Pete and Helen Wellock

Best regards

