

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PSV Local Plan ( September 2021 )  
**Date:** 14 November 2021 01:21:37

---

My name is Mark Browne and I wish to respond to the Consultation in respect of the aforementioned plan which is taking place between 4<sup>th</sup> of October 2021 and the 15<sup>th</sup> of November 2021.

1. 816 houses are required in the Plan to be built every year. This figure is calculated on a historic, out of date formula which predates and therefore takes no account of the negative effects on housing calculations caused by Brexit, falling national fertility rates, and the pandemic which will all result in a decline in the calculation formula numbers adopted in the National Planning Policy Framework. Over the last 10 years the average build rate in Warrington has been 586 and Warrington's own Housing Strategy 2018-2028, written before the start of the pandemic in 2018, called for a housing target of 586. The government have already hinted that the housing calculation formula used to calculate the 816 figure may have to be revisited, and therefore it maybe appropriate to go back to Central Government and seek clarification before proceeding with the plan as a reduction in the housing figures may negate the need to build on Green Belt at all.
2. The infrastructure required to support the proposed development is wholly inadequate. The present road and bridge infrastructure already struggles to cope with the present demands placed upon it and could not possibly cope with introduction of thousands of additional vehicles caused by the building of up to 4200 new homes and the proposed commercial development at 6/56 in Appleton Thorn. There is no new route into town from the south east and the plan still relies upon 3 Victorian swing bridges over the ship canal and inadequate single track crossings of the Bridgewater Canal. The plan hints at the use of cantilever bridge as part of a 'mass Transit Corridor' but with no timing and no detail. The Western Link would appear to be in doubt because of the cost associated to it and the removal of the Port Warrington development and the south western urban extension from this plan.
3. The proposed development would introduce 4200 car dependant homes as well as a substantial number of commercial vehicles which, besides causing traffic chaos, would significantly worsen the air quality in south Warrington. Warrington declared a Climate emergency in June 2019 and Green Energy Strategy in September 2019, yet does not appear to have moved forward in its stated aims. In order to make its 'fair share' to lower carbon emissions Warrington will have to take a wide range of measures to reduce fossil fuel use and move away from plans to increase car use on already congested roads. 40,000 people in the UK die prematurely due to conditions linked to poor air quality. 145 people in Warrington alone every year by consequence of this. This plan will exacerbate that tragedy.
4. The new plan will reduce Warrington's Green Belt by 5% and almost all of that land falls within the urban extension in south Warrington. The urban extension would accommodate a minimum of 4200 homes and Thelwall Heys will get 310 houses at an early stage in the plan. There will also be an expansion of warehouse facilities. None of this loss of green belt is properly justified. The existing Green Belt boundary was confirmed only 7 years ago in a plan that was supposed to be good for 20 years. The Council should take the precaution of looking more carefully at brownfield sites before releasing green belt for development. The environmental and ecological impact of the loss of Green Belt has not been properly assessed in the revised plan.

5. An application by Stobarts, a logistics operator, to build a new site on green belt land was refused when referred to the Secretary of State for consideration in 2020. The reason given was that such a development did not justify the removal of the land proposed for development from the Green Belt. How can the Council honestly contend that a development that is much more significant in size, and in the same geographical area, be justified. It defies logic and integrity.
6. Thelwall Heys has been earmarked for development through the building of 310 homes in the early part of the plan. A Public Enquiry held in 2006 determined that there was no justification for building housing on that site citing damage to the local ecology and wildlife, issues with drainage and propensity for flooding, damage to the rurality of the area and enjoyment experienced by people using the TPT, and Bridgewater Canal and towpath in a truly rural setting, in addition to the high quality of the arable land in this location. What has changed? This from a council that has declared a climate and ecological emergency as recently as 2019. It would be intellectually dishonest for this council to proceed with development of Thelwall Heys in its plan, showing complete and utter disregard to the residents of the area and the users of the TPT and Bridgewater canal to proceed with this aspect of the plan, and showing the Council pampering to the whims and desires of Developers determined to destroy Warrington's Green Belt.
7. In short, the Plan is not sound. There is no justification for the predicted growth. No justification for the scale of Green Belt release. No justification for the harm and damage to the local ecology and air quality. No explanation of how the already poor transport infrastructure can cope with the increased levels of traffic and no clarity on the means of delivery.

Mark Browne

[REDACTED]



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)