

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to Warrington Local Plan  
**Date:** 10 June 2019 08:06:29

---

Hello

My objection to the Warrington Local Plan for South Warrington is centred around the unnecessary scale, the destruction and disruption it will cause to the area and for what - more house, more people with an infrastructure that is already braking at the seams. The plan is not sustainable and needs to be entirely re-evaluated in light of all the concerns raised by constituents and in line with government guidelines. This plan is UNSOUND and UNDELIVERABLE. My objection is set out below:

Economic Growth;

It is our opinion that the economic growth targets have been set by those who have a vested interest in overstating growth predictions for their own purposes. Examples are Warrington & Co. and the LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership). Indeed the economic growth prediction figures used have come from the LEP without ANY major proposal to back up such a prediction. Official figures predict much slower growth than that detailed in the plan and hence there is no Justification to use such forecasts in predicting the Towns housing need.

The planned number of homes is well beyond government housing targets.

The employment land is not backed by any meaningful economic strategy for the town.

No need for development which destroys character and distinctiveness (unchecked housing sprawl destroying unique character of each village).

No Town centre development plan to ease pressure on the development sites be they be brown or green.

No case made for release of green belt.

No case can be made for the immediate release of land from Greenbelt (ie before brownbelt has been developed).

Warrington has a very poor delivery of housing. Previously the maximum supply rate is less than 550 per annum. Yet in the plan the build rate peaks at circa 1600 houses per annum!

All of the above demonstrate that the plan is NOT SOUND or DELIVERABLE!

Infrastructure;

This is not just roads. Its everything needed for the plan to succeed. Hospitals, Doctors, Heath Centres, Schools, roads etc etc.

Non of the infrastructure proposed uses public money and it is not detailed in the plan where the money is coming from?

Vague crossings across the canals. No detail, only suggestions all of which are unfunded.

Estimates of £50m for the Cantilever Bridge to be developed. This is not only unrealistic it would not cover the cost of the housing/land that would need to be purchased.

Vague road network in the South. Again, no detail, only suggestions all of which are unfunded.

Some of the infrastructure is 'considered' in LPT4 (Local Transport Plan 4). However this is just a 'wish list' of considerations and has no substance.

No detail of health and well-being facilities required, how they will be funded or when they will be built.

No detail of schools provision, how they will be funded or when in the plan they will be built.

The WWL (Warrington Western Link) will not help the plan at all. It merely brings traffic to existing bottlenecks whilst adding more traffic from those avoiding Tolls on the Mersey Gateway crossings.

Total reliance on the road network for residents and the local economy. No coherent plan on how to solve traffic problems.

All of the above demonstrate that the plan is NOT SOUND or DELIVERABLE!

#### Air Quality & Environment

Warrington is already overburdened with poor air quality. Published government reports have confirmed this.

Removal of green space will make air quality much worse, yet the plan even argues the opposite

The plan's over-reliance on the car and ensuing traffic will exacerbate the situation.

No realistic traffic assessments undertaken.

Loss of habitat for many species not considered in any detail

Loss of landscape, setting for the villages is lost. Character and distinctiveness is lost.

The Plan does not guide people back to the town centre, in fact the opposite.

All of the above demonstrate that the plan is NOT SOUND or DELIVERABLE!

#### Greenbelt;

The plan doesn't meet the 5 criteria for release from Green Belt which are...

to check the 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

All of the above demonstrate that the plan is NOT SOUND or DELIVERABLE!

I am firmly against this plan in its entirety and I am extremely disappointed in this council's approach to the

whole thing. In no way do they have the best interest of the people/communities at heart.

Regards

Ann Broughton

