

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Local Plan LP-PSV and Transport LTP4 plan
Date: 13 June 2019 15:11:54

Dear Sirs ,

Please find attached my comments regarding the local plan and the transport plan

Warrington draft plan

I wish to object to the Warrington plan and consider it unsound based on the following points -

There is no robust justification for the predicted growth in housing needs and these exceed the government requirements. There is no need for development into green belt land when these figures are not justifiable. Brownfield sites should be identified as a first point over green belt. Once green belt is gone, it is gone forever. Considering our future environmental challenges then agricultural land should be a priority. There is potential for the brownfield land at Fiddlers Ferry Power station to be redeveloped after decommissioning, should there be a further housing need and this has not been considered.

There is no economic plan to justify the scale of development and release of greenbelt. The proposed Six 56 logistics hub cites employment numbers which are unrealistic and most will be massive automated warehouses with minimal staffing but maximum transport implications.

It is unsound as there is no clear strategy to address the radial transport across Warrington - (see comments on transport separately submitted) and the impact of HGV's and transport across the south of Warrington. It assumes no disruption on the motorways, which is unrealistic and assumes alternative methods of travel eg cycling with no reality checks.

There are no proposals for infrastructure to replace ancient Victorian bridges across the Manchester ship canal.

How realistic is this plan, given the lack of money locally and nationally to build schools, GP surgeries libraries and where is the money to staff them? How are the associated social care, policing and healthcare and youth services going to be funded given we already pay an additional amount on Council tax for social care. The likelihood is the housing will be built without the needed infrastructure and supporting services /community facilities, which will put further pressure on existing roads and services.

Where is the plan to develop /update the creaking Warrington General Hospital? Shouldn't this be prioritized over more unjustifiable housing?

Where is the plan to improve rail links - it is not possible to get a direct train to Leeds/York Newcastle and trains to Liverpool and Manchester have been halved -- surely that should be part of the development? Northern Powerhouse links? If Warrington is to keep up with development isn't that crucial? It is easier to drive to Manchester than get a train. Tram links to train stations? - the car is currently the only feasible option.

There is lack of detail to the plan -where is the money coming from? How realistic is it to build 1000-1500 houses per year, which aren't necessary anyway. What plans are there to regenerate the centre of Warrington? which WBC say they aim to do -shops have relocated out of town/ bridge street is derelict (potential for

city living ?)

What congestion and pollution assessments have been made - there are already 2 critical level points in Warrington -where is the strategy to reduce rather than increase this?

The environmental and ecological impacts have not been properly assessed.

4 out of 5 of the Green belt release criteria are not met so please do not let this green belt become urban sprawl—

To check the unrealistic 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

Warrington Borough Councils Fourth Local Transport Plan (LPT4)

I wish to object to the transport plan and consider it to be unsound for the following reasons -

It is a concept aspirational document and difficult to envisage the actual impact on local residents. Where will the funding come from given government national and local cuts?

The risk is that the residential and warehousing developments will be built without the necessary transport links to support the development. The town is already at breaking point transport wise.

The strategy does not address the radial route connections in Warrington which already have significant pinch points .The overall plan says it aims to encourage redevelopment of the town centre but the radial routes are not improved and there will be major gridlock points i.e. Lumb Brook underpass road, Cantilever Bridge ,Stockton Heath swing bridge ,Latchford swing bridge . The strategy is unsound as it is reliant on old narrow bridges crossing the Manchester Ship Canal. There is also no strategy for the anticipated increase in Manchester Ship Canal usage and the resulting road blockages.

The effects of the increased domestic and commercial traffic on the existing highway infrastructure will be huge - ie. A49, A50, A56, bringing increased pollution, noise, and congestion.

The Western bypass is a welcomed development and will alleviate traffic on the western side of Warrington, much of which comes from commuters avoiding the new Runcorn Bridge toll. It does not address the estimated increase in traffic from the southern Warrington developments

There is no clear strategy that ensures traffic generated by the Garden Suburb (Housing and Neighbourhood Centre) will not have an adverse impact

on the local community. The effects on the current highway infrastructure will be enormous i.e. A49, A56, A50 in particular Stockton Heath High Street, Stretton Village, Grappenhall Road, London Road, Lumb Brook under bridge, Wilderspool Causeway and Latchford Village. There is also no evidence to support the assumption that the proposed Garden Suburb Southern Strategic Link Road will reduce traffic travelling from Stockton Heath via the A49 to the M56-J10.

It will also road- lock the village of Appleton Thorn on all sides, which will be under siege when there are motorway incidents. The proposed link from J10 M56 to Lymm interchange will simply become a huge rat run- why is this a dual carriageway? -it will be used by HGV's when there. The village of Appleton Thorn needs protecting from this.

In addition it encourages residents to exit Warrington by these routes to commute to the Trafford Centre of Cheshire Oaks rather than go into Warrington or Gemini/A49 for shopping/cinema etc.

There is no strategy to deal with the impact of disruption, accidents etc on both the M6 and M56, which currently happen on a regular basis and bring Warrington to a standstill. There needs to be a clear strategy for dealing with this.

There is no clear strategy for dealing with the increase in HGV's lorries etc. from the proposed industrial development at Cartridge Lane- there is already queuing at peak times at the Lymm interchange -this needs a clear plan for investment and development should this warehouse development proceed. In conclusion, I believe this transport plan does not best serve Warrington's future development and is therefore unsound. It doesn't address the major issues and creates further concerns regarding the protection of green belt and outlying settlements such as Appleton Thorn.

Thank you
Kind regards

Elizabeth Williams

[REDACTED]

Warrington

[REDACTED]