For the attention of:

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

I am writing to voice my objection to the council's local plan which I believe is unsound for many reasons.

Firstly, I would like it noted that the consultation for these proposed developments have been very poor, vague and unclear. I have only recently become aware of these plans through word of mouth and have seen posts on Facebook. Through further investigation I and am shocked to hear how much over development is planned across the whole of Warrington. This development will hugely impact myself, my family and community yet I only hear of it by word of mouth and with only very little time to raise my objection. It seems the council are trying to rush this plan through without fairly informing people of the plan and giving them opportunities to object.

Due to the lack of time I have had to prepare my opposition I have appended some posts and information I have seen through facebook and would like this information to be accepted as part my reasons for objecting to thee plan.

In brief I object to the plan for the following reasons:

- The consultation process has been unfair and vague. The proposals for development across the whole town are disjointed and have been presented in a way which I believe makes it hard for people to see how each development across Warrington impacts on the next. Presented individually they may sound like small developments but added together and they are huge. Couple this with the fact that neighbouring authorities also have huge development plans on our border (e,g St Helens) that will also impact our town. The way that the plan is presented is misleading. I also feel that the council have tried to overwhelm people by having pushing through other developments at the same time- SIX 56, LTP4 Transport Plan and Stobarts.

- The plan is built upon an unjustified economic growth estimation based on old data and ambitious assumptions. The numbers of houses proposed to be built huge, over 18,900 houses across Warrington by 2037. We simply do not have infrastructure to support these developments across the town. These developments will lead to urban sprawl which from my understanding one of the reasons we have greenbelt. Many of these homes will not be affordable and I believe are aimed at people who will want to move into Warrington purely to be able to commute to surrounding cities and London on the planned HS2. Quite simply these homes are not for local people and do not fill a local need.

- The proposed commercial premisies near Appleton thorn/ grappenhall are also overwhelming and unjustified use of our precious greenbelt. These

premises will be the 2nd biggest in the country behind Trafford park. We have already had the huge omega development in the north of the town and we can simply not support any more of this type of development.

- The additional traffic from all these homes and commercial properties will have a huge impact on our already poor air quality. We already have some of the worst air quality in Britain according to the WHO. We are also in a time where we know about the dangerous impact C02 is having on our planet and are in a crisis situation where we should be trying to reduce C02 not increase it by replacing or green spaces with houses, warehouses, cars, HGV's etc....

- The release of greenbelt has not been adequately justified and brown-belt should always be used first. I believe there are no special circumstances for the release of our greenbelt for these developments and that ALL brownfield sites should be used first. I do not believe the council has adequately explored all the brownfield sites available to them and this plan should not go through until they have. For example we not have confirmation that Fiddlers Ferry will be decommissioned and this alone should mean that the current proposed plan needs to be altered to take this into account.

- The transport strategy is poor and lacking essential data. Lots of the road infrastructure is unplanned or only aspirational across the lifetime of the Local Plan. It seems that some of the infrastructure projects such as roads and bridges will be massively underfunded and therefore making the whole plan undeliverable.

- The impact on our wildlife that the loss of their habitat will bring is huge and it seems as though this has been treated like it doesn't matter. We have already lost a huge amount of wildlife across Britain and we should be protecting what is left. Not destroying it for greed.

- Finally, I want green spaces for my children and children's children and natural beauty for them to enjoy. We already know the importance that greenspace has towards our mental health and at a time when people seem to be struggling with their mental health more than ever we should be preserving this greenspace for everyone.

Thank you for taking the time to read my reasons for opposition. These are only in brief and

only begin to cover the real concerns that I have over this plan as well as the transport plans. I would like to ask that you also take time to read through the appended information I have attached.

Thank you,

Name C. Walkden

Addres [redacted]

Email

On May 26th local parish councillor and local media man gary Skentelbery sent this heartfelt and honest letter to Councillor Russ Bowden .... please re-read the letter and appreciate this was sent before we knew about the possibility of fiddlers ferry - the growing concern over rising costs for the Western link and the dawning realization that the local plan and the vague Ipt4 are both unsustainable and undeliverable .
So far - unless I'm mistaken - the council leader has chosen not to reply - I find that at best rude at worst wholly unacceptable . If ever you needed a motivation to object to this plan before 1700 Monday June 17th his inaction and obvious contempt for everyone's views is it - make sure you get those objections in - south Warrington - burtonwood - hood lane - peel hall ... this exec wants to destroy yours and your families future for developer profit over quality of life -,shame on them all and vote them out May 2020

Here is the great letter gary sent to mr bowden .... as I said .. unanswered . Thank you Gary for writing this !

PLEASE SHARE if you agree with these sentiments! If we don't stop the development of our #GreenBelt we will lose views like the one in this photograph!
Dear Russ Bowden
During a run through some of our beautiful countryside in #Warrington it gave me the opportunity to clear my head and do some blue sky thinking.
As leader of Warrington Borough Council the future of our town and our green belt is within your hands and that of your controlling Labour Group and the senior officers at the town hall.
Together you are tasked with ensuring our town provides for those in need of homes and good health together with employment opportunities.
As town's go we are already doing better than many on various fronts.
Unemployment is relatively low and many of our jobs are filled by those who live outside the borough.
So why exactly do we have to surrender our green belt land on which we depend for the very oxygen that fills our lungs?
Over 40,000 people each year are dying from pollution related illnesses and Warrington has been identified by the World Health Organisation as one of the worst polluted town's in the country.
So why are we even entertaining the thoughts of huge logistics developments on Green Belt land? I say entertaining because your council officers have previously recommended approval for one such distribution centre on prime green belt which was thankfully rejected by members.
But more applications are rolling in, fanned by the fact officers believe this is acceptable in a polluted town often gripped by gridlock.
Planning law, while often complicated for the common man, is quite straight forward regarding green belt - no development unless "exceptional circumstances".
Well creating wealth while sacrificing health is far from exceptional circumstances.
Nothing in these planning applications does anything to improve our health and well being.
We have far more important issues in our town, with an out dated hospital, lack of recreational facilities and not even enough sport pitches to accommodate our existing teams and clubs.
So what is the solution, particularly in times of austerity?
Well how about borrowing some money with low cost interest rates like you already have successfully done to invest in business and commercial ventures and invest it in our green belt, buying the land under threat of development and then using it to create health and leisure facilities and parklands.
This could be matched by some crowd funding, with those who can afford to, donating money to help fund these projects.
Resident and parish council groups have already demonstrated how they can work together and raise funds to challenge these plans to develop our green belt - imagine having access to that money to preserve our green belt and invest in health and well being.
It could even be used to invest in solar energy and all weather sports pitches, which help raise additional revenue and make it sustainable.
Surely much more acceptable in our countryside than huge logistic centres putting thousands of extra vehicles on our roads and destroying our green belt for ever.
I see in the local plan it states it is only 10 per cent of our green belt being given up - but that is 10 per cent too much.

Thousands of people in our town are suffering from asthma and other health issues which are made worse by pollution.
This is not a NIMBY issue in the south - it is our whole town under threat, from Lymm through Appleton and Grappenhall, across Latchford, across the town centre and right out to Culcheth & Glazebury in the North.
The whole town needs our green lungs - and the whole town needs better health and leisure provision. There are some shining beacons at Orford Park and Great Sankey and Woolston Community hubs.
Let's see one south of the ship canal instead of lorry parks and warehousing.
Come on Russ - you have the opportunity to leave a legacy we can all be proud of - or you can just allow the developers to continue ploughing up our fields.
Thousands of new homes have already been earmarked for green field sites, with many more and employment opportunities already planned in the town centre and brown field sites.
Let's see how these go BEFORE we even think about building on Green Belt.
We have years ahead to meet government guidelines and we have already seen the goal posts moved on these - who is to say they won't be moved again?
The birth rate is falling, the ageing population is starting to level off, with the first signs of people dying sooner than expected due to various health issues brought on by obesity and general unhealthy living.
Let's put the foot on the brakes a little with all this proposed development, take a deep breath and enjoy our precious countryside so we can keep on running for years to come without breathing in more toxic fumes.
I am sure you will get the support of the vast majority of people in our town if you can look at and adopt this common sense policy.
I also call upon like minded people and politicians to take on board my concerns and act in a responsible manner and lobby for a healthy future for our town.
Thank you for taking the time to read this and for those of you who agree this is a sensible option please feel free to share on your networks so the council know there are plenty of people out there who are passionate about saving our green belt and improving our health and well being.

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government

Rt Hon James Brokenshire MP
Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Tel: 0303 444 3450
Email:
james.brokenshire@communities.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/mhclg

Cllr Andy Carter
Warrington Conservatives
1 Stafford Road
Warrington
WA4 6RP

8 April 2019

Dear Andy

Thank you for your communication of 21 March regarding the standard method for assessing local housing need.

Following on from a technical consultation which closed on 7 December, the Government has stated that local authorities should continue to use the 2014-based household projections as the demographic baseline for the standard method. We believe this is the most appropriate approach for providing stability and certainty to the planning system in the short-term.

I would emphasise that a housing need figure is not a target. Local authorities should make a realistic assessment of the number of homes their communities need, using the standard method *as the starting point* in the process. Once this has been established, planning to meet that need will require consideration of land availability, relevant constraints, and whether the need is more appropriately met in neighbouring areas. This will then be scrutinised, as part of the examination undertaken by an independent inspector.

The revised National Planning Policy framework also strengthened protection of the Green Belt, by making clear that its boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are "fully evidenced and justified", and once all other reasonable options for meeting identified development needs have been examined. Whether these conditions are satisfied will be tested through the examination of locally-produced plans, following consultation with local people.

With my Best Wishes;

[redacted]

RT HON JAMES BROKENSHIRE MP

Andy Carter

Early in the consultation process I asked the Secretary of State for clarification as to who was responsible for permitting the development of Green Belt locally. In his response, he gave clarity around the process and also restated that changes to the green belt should 'only be made in exceptional circumstances and if fully evidenced and justified'.

Last week i wrote to the CEO of SSE to ask for clarification on their plans for Fiddlers Ferry, as the Local Plan document contained little detail on how this vast site might be used when power generation ends, because of Govt legislation requiring coal-fired plants to close by 2025.

The Council responded publicly saying "there is not currently sufficient certainty for the site be included within the council's developable employment land supply, but given the scale of the site, this will be kept under review".

Just a week later SSE gave a straight answer to my questions and announced the plant's closure by March next year. Perhaps if the Council has asked the Board of SSE about the strategy for this key location they would have had more certainty!

This news significantly changes the level of brownfield land supply within the proposed plan period and whilst the site may not be suitable for housing it can certainly be used for employment land, which means the argument that green belt should be released because of a shortage of suitable land in the Borough is greatly diminished.

There's a presumption in NPPF that brownfield should be used before green belt land. WBC should make changes to the plan before submission to the Planning Inspectorate, removing green belt employment land south of the Ship Canal from the proposed plan. This news also supports the argument that applications by Stobart and Six56 are premature, as there are significant changes required to the plan.

Having spoken at public meetings in Appleton, Lymm and Stockton Heath over the last month it's clear there are many worries and much anger over the willingness of WBC to listen to residents. That worry is based on the lack of changes made in this plan compared to the previous PDO which generated 4,500 responses.