

[REDACTED]

Please consider this e-mail as my objection to the 'Warrington Local Plan Review - Preferred Development Option'

My Personal details are:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I can confirm that I am a resident of Warrington.

Firstly I wish to state that I believe that the consultation that has been provided by Warrington Council is not valid. There was no consultation venues provided in the areas most affected which discriminated against the old, vulnerable and disabled and yet again their voices are unheard. Secondly not enough time or resources were provided by WBC, which produced large queues at the events and prevented people from being seen and questions heard and responded to. Thirdly the events nor the proposal has been at all communicated by WBC. I would like to see a detailed list of the publications which were placed rather than generic statements of information was provided in libraries.

In terms of the preferred option I wish to raise the following points:

1. Significant changes have occurred in local, national & European government since the forecasted housing need for Warrington was calculated including changes to legislation. Therefore for period and investment proposed within this option I think that it is the Councils duty to recalculate and publish the forecasted housing need for the borough.
2. The brownfield sites across Warrington have not been explored or taken into consideration with the proposed option. In recent months the central government have provided access to a fund for local councils to access to establish a 'brown site' register, I was disappointed and frustrated that Warrington BC have not utilised this funding when considering a development of this size. Also the amount of Brown field sites within the borough could facilitate the housing need, let alone the amount further brown field sites that will be generated over the 20 years which will be developed. Therefore I feel that even using the numbers provided over the 20 year period Warrington will over deliver thus exploiting greenbelt which cannot be returned.
3. Within a presentation to the Built Environment at the Village Hotel in Warrington recently, Steve Parks of Warrington & Co stated that Warrington's main 3 aims were to develop the city centre and utilise the 'water systems' (Mersey & MSC) as Manchester and Liverpool successfully have in the last decades and upgrade infrastructure. This option does not represent these aims with only 1,000 homes planned for city centre living. The proposal needs to re- proportion the development on greenbelt land vs city centre waterfront living, which would be good for the town.
4. In regards to Warrington town centre, it urgently needs regenerating, have you asked yourselves why we have no hotels in the centre? The hotel chains are based at the service stations, does this not explain what is required?

5. The Grappenhall community cannot absorb a development of this size without it having a massive detrimental effect to the lives of the people living there. The amenities are just not present. Not just on a basic human need basis such as doctors, schools, dentists etc, but shops, bars and restaurants.
6. The proposal has identified that further schools are required to facilitate a development this size with 1 high school and 3 junior schools forecasted. Lets consider a high school has a cost of £30m and junior school of £20m, that is £90m on top of infrastructure, who will pay for this, where will the funding come from? Also this will generate a huge further demand on the yearly education spend, with St Wilfrids school (current school in the area) the second worst funded in Cheshire, are you planning to do the same with the new builds? Also where will the schools be built, I have not seen these on the plans, is this further Greenbelt developments?
7. In terms of the employment zone, I would like to see what employment this will be! In a recent presentation by Manchester City Council they stated that industries operate best in zones with specific industries working well by working in close proximity. What is the proposed targeted industry? Is it further logistics and compete with omega? This generates low paid employment, for the size of the proposed zone there will not be enough affordable homes in this proposed development to provide houses for this zone!
8. In terms of the use of the Trans Pennine Trail for a new road I think that this is a preposterous ill thought out idea for the following reasons:
 - a. The cost, the existing bridge is not fit for purpose and would need to be replaced, compulsory purchase of houses, purchase of land, 4 further bridges along the route would need upgrading, junction improvements, the road build, the large gas pipe located on the existing bridge which would need relocating. [REDACTED] I would expect a cost of circa £400m, where would this money come from?
 - b. Within the new proposal woodland walk areas and green strips to break up the development have been planned. Therefore I find it unjust that you plan on using the existing green strip / walk for the existing Grappenhall community as a road!
 - c. By using the TPT you are removing a local natural hub and removing a loved town asset for locals and visitors to the area.
 - d. I am perplexed by the idea of locating a 3rd bridge next to two existing bridges, one of which is a high level bridge. For clarity this would provide 3 bridges within 0.5 miles of each other and 3 min car journey (google maps) the next alternative to the East (M6 direction) is 9 miles away and a 16 min journey with no traffic just to get to it. Surely it makes sense to provide another crossing (if needed) in the 9 mile stretch.
 - e. With Warrington already failing its air pollution targets the bridge at its proposed location would increase pollution further in the concentrated area (0.5 miles), thus we are planning to fail further and effect the health of the existing residents further.

Overall I urge the planning department and WBC to see sense and reduce the scale of development in Grappenhall. This will reduce the infrastructure cost burden to WBC and the impact of lives of so many. I believe by recalculating the requirement and focusing on waterfront, town centre and brown field sites the impact on greenbelt land can be significantly reduced.

I would welcome a response to the questions I have asked in this objection and would

accept an open debate on this subject.

Regards

[REDACTED]