



12 November,2021

Dear Sirs,

Warrington Local Plan Consultation

I am writing to object to the Warrington Local Plan, currently out for consultation, in response to which I would comment under.

There would appear to be significant areas of brownfield sites within the town itself and its immediately adjacent area which could, if properly identified, be utilised to provide starter/affordable and second homes in which categories we are told the need is critical. Indeed the once beautiful Georgian high street leading from Bridgefoot to Golden Square, currently a derelict eyesore could be revitalised to provide starter/affordable and second homes located within walking distance of the town centre, thus obviating the need for first and second time home owners to own and park a car. Everything within walking distance from high street store to select individual shops and leisure facilities. Look to the lovely High Street in Guildford, built in a similar vein and the urban regeneration around Stratford, East London for inspiration. A desirable new mixed use area - Bridgefoot Village - could be created. A detailed assessment of such brownfield sites, derelict shops and industrial buildings within the borough should first be undertaken and the number of new homes these would support calculated before any incursion is made into the Green Belt. The proposed plan only requires developers to build a maximum of 30% affordable homes, this recommendation would produce many more. The regeneration of the town centre must be a priority or the owners of any new executive homes built in the area will be forced to spend their disposable income in other seemingly safe, attractive and well thought through previously regenerated towns and cities such as Altrincham and Manchester. For others seeking a different shopping experience Cheshire Oaks is already a magnet. The town centre must be regenerated as a priority with a mixture of affordable housing, attractive shops and leisure facilities.

Any new homes built must be supported by increased hospital infrastructure and staffing; new schools and other educational facilities and dental and other community based health provision. No mention of these or indeed how the required new facilities will be staffed are addressed in the plan. The hospital, community health provision and schools appear to be under significant stress at present and this strain shows no sign of diminishing . Detailed planning must be in place to provide all the additional resources required for any new homes built before any further development takes place and not after. This planning document for such should be published for consultation prior to any further development.

The plan to build a further distribution/warehousing facility in the vicinity of the M6/M56 would attract few further skilled jobs to the area, particularly with ever increasing computerisation and mechanisation. Lower skilled workers would be forced to commute to work increasing air pollution in the area and creating further congestion on the motorway and surrounding road network. There is no clear plan for the already overstretched road infrastructure to be enhanced and it is already reliant upon three ageing Victorian swing bridges and the cantilever bridge all of which would appear to benefit from maintenance and repair. The increase in the requirement for and dependence on road transport flies in the face of the requirements of COP 26. Congestion, particularly around the proposed M6/M56 development, Junction 20 of the M6, junction 10 of the M56 and in the areas Stockton Heath and Lower Walton will inevitably result in significantly reduced air quality. The provision of well thought through commuter rail transport is omitted from the proposed plan. There is also the question of litter. The B5356 from the M6 Junction 20 past the Inland Border Facility to the present industrial estates is littered with detritus. No one wishes to drive to their home, new or existing through verges strewn with all kinds of litter and unless this is

dealt with under the principle of the polluter pays, the construction of a further distribution/warehouse facility is only likely to exacerbate the problem.

In conclusion COP 26 is now drawing to a close wherein most nations of the world, including all political parties in the UK are signing up to ambitious Climate Change aspirations. With this ill thought through proposal, Warrington Borough Council are flying in the face of such laudable aspirations. We need you to "do your bit" too. Green Belt should be used for carbon sequestration not for the building of unnecessary new homes. The building of new houses will not create sustainable, long term jobs. A well thought through package providing growth in green technologies will create sustainable potentially high wealth jobs from which the need to provide appropriate housing will emanate, not the other way round. We are all being urged to "do our bit" however small that may be whether this be planting up a window box or planting a tree. Emphasis is being placed on retaining Green Belts, existing trees and woodland areas. The plan as submitted flies in the face of all COP 26 sets out to do. The Green Belt boundary in the Warrington area was only confirmed 7 years ago and was supposed to be good for 20 years. The proposed plan is unnecessary and catastrophic in ecological and environmental terms and requires a full impact assessment prior to implementation.

If the Council wishes to demonstrate its green credentials and save money, bin the plan, switch off street lighting in residential areas between the hours of 00.01 and 06.00 and cut grass verges twice a year collecting the cuttings in compliance with environmental evidence and the recommendations of Bee Line, except of course where safety is a priority such as at junctions.

We object to the plan on the following terms, there is:

- no justification for the predicted growth
- no need for the volume of housing and mass of employment land on Green Belt
- no justification for the scale of Green Belt release
- no need for the harm to air quality and ecology
- no need to destroy the landscape and character of our villages
- no clarity of means of delivery
- no explanation as to how the already poor transport infrastructure of South Warrington can cope with increased levels of traffic
- no plan in place to increase hospital or community based medical facilities and educational facilities
- no understanding of how development in Warrington should take account of what is happening in Greater Manchester, Merseyside and Cheshire.

We are not against the development of any homes and infrastructure needed but we are against the unnecessary use of Green Belt land which should rather be used for carbon sequestration in compliance with the aspirations of COP 26.

We shall be sending a copy of this letter to the MP for Warrington South, Andy Carter, and by so doing request his support to prevent the implementation of this ill thought through plan.

Yours faithfully,



R. J. and Mrs M. E. Newton