

From: [REDACTED]
To: Local Plan
Subject: objection to local plan
Date: 17 June 2019 17:10:18

Please accept this email as my objection to the local plan.

I do not support the plan and the plan is not sound for the following reasons:

- We must use all brownfield available before ever using green belt
- Numbers should be decided locally, based on sound forecasts and trends, not wishful thinking or unrealistic expectations. The latest 2016 population growth figures should be the starting point for forecast, not 2014s.
- The plan need only be for 15 years. 20 years is too long. A shorter period would mean fewer houses need to be in the greenbelt.
- The Council is placing too much emphasis on logistics and distribution which are becoming increasingly automated generating fewer jobs. These are 24-hour businesses requiring huge numbers of vehicle movements and considerable space
- More affordable houses are needed which match the pay of the jobs in the immediate area..
- Govt rhetoric has pushed for strengthened protection of the Green Belt, not less. The very special circumstances to release it have not been demonstrated, esp when so much available brownfield exists.
- The Council's vision is for a vibrant town centre surrounded by attractive countryside and distinct settlements. This would wreck Walton, Grappenhall, Appleton Thorn and Stretton.
- Congestion is already a major problem on roads in the south of the town and at Junction 20 on the M6. Infrastructure must be in place and built before houses, not afterwards. The cost has been underestimated and should be challenged.
- What guarantees are there that developers will contribute to these facilities when they are needed?
- Air pollution is increasingly recognised as a serious health problem. Warrington has a bad record. All the new vehicles will make matters worse.
- Green spaces are good for wellbeing and mental health. Part of Moore Nature Reserve would be lost.

The Plan is not deliverable and is therefore unsound

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

From: [Susan Stewart](#)
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: objection
Date: 17 June 2019 17:00:03

Susan Stewart
35 Astor Drive
WA4 3DS

Please accept this as my objection to LTP4

1. Council traffic planners have confirmed LPT4 as a 'concept' aspirational document which only outlines some options and preferences. Therefore it lacks important detail for residents to make real informed judgments. The schemes, or possible schemes, listed in the LPT4 will cost a very significant sum. Given the pressures on overall UK public expenditure, and specific pressures on the Department for Transport there is little prospect that no more than a very small fraction of Government subsidy will be realised within the timescale of the PSV Local Plan period. Almost all of the LPT4 is an aspirational wish list and no timescales whatsoever are offered regarding delivery. Therefore the Council should not commit to large scale development in the South of Warrington until they achieve certainty of the necessary transport infrastructure.

2. Air Quality is a major issue in Warrington with the Town identified by the World Health Organisation as being in the top 5 Towns/Cities in England that exceeds the pollutants limit. I have no doubt that the proposed new housing in South Warrington (circa 7000 dwellings), Six/56 and Stobart's developments will have a significant negative effect upon air quality and noise, particularly in existing congested locations such as the A49 thru Stockton Heath and Latchford village.

3. No credible strategy is being put forward as to how existing highway congestion bottlenecks are to be relieved. These include Stockton Heath High Street, Stockton Heath swing bridge, Lumb brook underpass bridge, Knutsford road bridge, and the Latchford/Kingsway gyratory. The effects of the increased domestic and commercial traffic on the existing highway infrastructure will be enormous i.e. A49, A50, A56 bringing increased pollution, noise, and congestion.

4. LTP4 (apart from the Western link which adds little or no benefit for the majority South Warrington commuters) excludes any significant improvements or forward investment in the South of Warrington highway infrastructure the existing roads and bridge crossings of all three waterways (Bridgewater canal, Manchester Ship Canal and the river Mersey). Congestion at these key points will only get worse resulting in more pollution and potential Health issues.

5. There appears to be no coherent strategy for managing any adverse effects from increased HGV movements, including those that would result from the enhancement of Port Warrington, proposed Six/56 employment Park, proposed Stobart's national distribution centre, and Warrington Business Park developments etc. There is no Rail or Water access to either of the Six/56 and Stobart's, which will inevitably strengthen the focus of freight movement exclusively upon road vehicles. Both schemes contravene the Councils and Government policy in regards to supporting Rail freight and sustainable use of existing waterways i.e. Manchester Ship Canal.

6. The Councils traffic model is unrealistic. When the swing bridges are open, always causing problems, these models do not apply. Nothing has been added to account for the future deterioration due to increased openings and traffic usage. The model also does not allow for disruptive road works anywhere in the Borough, which is both ridiculous and unrealistic.

7. The concept of a Mass Transit System (MTS) is floated in the LPT4, however it is clear from the documentation that the concept of developing a MTS is at a very early stage with little serious work having been undertaken, therefore it is unwise for the Council to put forward such a scheme without having carried out the necessary background work to establish its viability.

8. 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.

9. Council Officers have repeatedly stated that the Garden Suburb Southern Strategic Link Road is only illustrative, however it's currently indicates a new traffic junction on the A49 (between the Cat and Lion Junction and the M56-J10, this suggestion will undoubtedly cause severe traffic congestion. This matter requires a fundamental review with Highways England, as this adhoc illogical solution has the potential to create serious traffic congestion problems , particularly on the M56- J10 at peak periods.

10. The success of LTP4 is dependent on securing significant changes in Public behaviour, including walking, cycling and bus patronage. No evidence is offered, other than optimistic hope that these changes of mode, away from car usage, will in fact occur. The LPT4 also envisages tripling local public transport use during the Local Plan period. However, bus use has fallen by almost 50% over the past decade, therefore this laudable aspiration is very likely to be unattainable due to high car ownership, Town Centre retail

decline, traffic congestion resulting in lack of certainty and reliability, relatively high fares

11. The LPT4 makes needs to address the Three 19th century swing bridges (125 year old), therefore how credible/ viable is a Transport Plan that fails to address the Councils reliance on a Victorian infrastructure that is controlled entirely by a Third Party whilst proposes unprecedented large scale housing and employment developments without any surety of the necessary highway infrastructure to serve the resultant increase in traffic

12. The conceptual high level Cantilever Bridge replacement is only planned for the medium term which will present major planning problems. In addition the PSV Local Plan indicates safeguarded land adjacent to the weight restricted Cantilever Bridge. An unanswered serious question is what will the new Bridge be design to carry I.e. HGV's or Light Traffic as currently ?. There has been no regard given to necessary highway infrastructure and this is a major omission and is of Public concern.