

---

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Local Plan  
Planning Policy & Programmes  
Warrington Borough Council  
New Town House  
Buttermarket Street  
Warrington  
WA1 2NH

Dear Sirs

**Warrington Proposed Submission Version Local Plan 2017- 2037**

I object to the above plan as the proposals are not sound for the following reasons:

There is disproportionate loss of Green Belt in South Warrington. There would be no need to lose Green Belt at all to build houses if Warrington looked at the actual need for housing. The calculation of figures using 2014 data is a guide only and it is then up to Warrington to determine how many houses are needed. There is no need for a 10% flexibility to be added as the plan can be reviewed. If the 2016 figures were used and the plan was set for 15 years not 20 there would be no loss of Green Belt, as only 345 houses a year would be needed. The distinctive character of the villages will be lost as it has in Lymm already, which has, over the last 20 years, become a sprawl of housing estates for commuters. The data and reasoning is unsound.

The actual housing needed in Warrington is social housing, not even more developer led 'commuter' houses. Another 370 houses are already planned in Appleton Cross and 64 in Lymm. The site in Lymm provided a variety of amenities - food outlets, dog training, gyms etc for residents which have been lost meaning residents have to travel further increasing their carbon footprint. Warrington even state in the plan that housing is needed for the elderly, disabled and young families - not commuters!

The use of Green Belt for economic purposes is unwarranted when the Fiddlers Ferry site will soon become available. Not including the Fiddlers Ferry site is unsound.

The proposed economic growth in logistics and distribution is over estimated and unrealistic given the vast amount of empty warehouses in Warrington. It is also wrong to invest in such a heavily polluting industry when there is a Climate and Environmental Emergency. The data and reasoning are unsound.

The Green Belt site proposed for economic use contains 10 pond, 2 woods and protected species and plans for Port Warrington involve the loss of part of a Nature Reserve. In a state of Climate and Environmental Emergency the Green Belt and ecologically rich areas should be preserved not concreted over for profit. The reasoning is unsound.

The road infrastructure cannot support the current population. The swing bridges frequently cause chaos when they malfunction and the M6/M56/A50 are at a standstill on a daily basis - any incident in the area results in gridlock. It is completely unsound to bring more HGVs to a distribution centre and cars to the 5000 houses proposed. There are no plans for crossing the Manchester Ship Canal in South East Warrington so

WBC are relying on the existing Victorian swing bridges despite the projected major increase in shipping traffic necessitating the bridges being closed much more often in future. The Transport Plan does NOT provide any details of how the new public transport systems would cross the Manchester Ship Canal or the Bridgewater Canal. The plan for traffic is unsound.

The air quality in Warrington is one of the worst in the UK for PM2.5 because Warrington use the monitor at Selby Street and computer models to give inaccurate predictions of air quality impact - hence our appalling air quality. Bringing more traffic from the vastly exaggerated housing figures and more HGVs will adversely affect the health of Warrington residents. The reasoning is dangerously unsound - all that will be delivered is more road congestion.

The jobs that the distribution centre claims to provide are not substantiated. Omega produced nothing like the jobs it claimed it would, and it still has vacant sites which no one wants - why build another distribution centre? There is no evidence that jobs will be delivered.

In turn the vast exaggeration of jobs has fed into the vast exaggerated of the housing figures. In addition the pay workers get in distribution centres will not meet the cost of living in the Garden Suburb. It will not be affordable.

The quantity of housing claimed is not deliverable given Warrington's record to date. (359 in 18/19 not 945).

In summary, I believe the plan is unsound and will have a negative impact on the lives of the people living in Warrington now.

Yours faithfully

Julie Hoskinson

9/6/2019