

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 June 2019 13:50
To: Local Plan
Subject: PSV Local Plan 2019

Barbara M Gaskell

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I wish to object to the current Local Development Option Plan.

We have been told many times over the past 12 months that the policy is "Brownfield First" and the plan states that the priority is to protect as much Green Belt as possible and to minimise the impact on the environment but then goes on to say that it is not possible to ensure that all brownfield land is developed before any Green Belt is released, surely this is contradictory. If brownfield sites have been identified, and clearly they have, then it must surely be up to the Council to ensure that these sites are made available and are fully exhausted before Green Belt is even considered. Simply stating that the brownfield sites need to be cleared and have infrastructure in place before they become suitable seems rather flimsy and fails to demonstrate the very exceptional circumstances required in order to release and subsequently build on Green Belt land and does not meet the five purposes of Green Belt, which are.....

To check 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

There is no justification for the predicted growth in housing need and the planned number of homes seems to be a massive overestimation, far in excess of government targets, suggesting quantity over quality and you have greatly underestimated the impact this will have on the environment, with a huge increase in air pollution, light pollution and noise pollution, as well as a vast increase in the number of vehicles that such a project will generate. More houses and industry equals more traffic which will vie for a position during the daily commute, on already poorly maintained and heavily congested roads. There is no coherent plan on how to solve existing traffic problems, so to simply add new roads and link ways will do little to ease this problem, in fact it would seem absurd to suggest that new roads be built to relieve existing traffic flow and then pile more vehicles into the equation, surely one cancels out the other!

As for the suggested new transport links, have these been thought through seriously? How will a bus travel safely over the Cantilever Bridge or along Broad Lane for example and will it be possible to access them after 5pm because at the moment, public transport to Appleton / Grappenhall etc is a joke after this time of night.

There is no detail in the plan of health facilities, how they will be funded or when they will be built. Similarly , no detail of school provision, how they will be funded or when they are likely to be built.

Warrington is already over burdened with poor air quality and tops the WHO report for the worst air in the UK. With concentrations of PM2.5 hitting 14 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, and tops the North West and the UK for worst annual PM2.5 pollution levels. This is above the WHO recommended limits of 10 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, and is well above the UK annual average of 9.6 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. How, therefore, can anyone even consider destroying our green, open spaces, the very spaces that give us clean air.

We need to retain our unique countryside, unique village settings and protect the natural habitats of our wildlife, not blight it with the concrete and tarmac of urban sprawl. No matter what fancy or pretentious name is given to such a project i.e. "Garden Suburbs", they will still be a housing estates and a blot on our once beautiful area, and all character and distinctiveness will be lost. Never has it been so true that you don't know what you've got till it's gone and the very sad fact is, that when it has gone, the effects will be irreversible.

B M Gaskell