

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 November 2021 14:42  
**To:** Local Plan  
**Subject:** Warrington Local Plan Consultation.

My name is Kathryn Buckley,  
My address [REDACTED]

I am writing to you to let you know that I Disagree Strongly with the Warrington Local Plan as it is. I say no to this new Local Plan.

I realise that Warrington has to have an achievable plan but the plan has to meet the needs of the Town and people who live there. The starting point of the Local Plan should be 'no use of the Greenbelt'. This plan appears to do nothing for the Town Centre.

One of the main areas of concern is the lack of infrastructure.

The building of homes, and areas of employment many of which, are away from the centre of town, will mean reliance on roads and bridges which are already congested. The pollution from this traffic will mean more pollution and further congestion.

There is no information how health, education and transport will be handled after the developers have finished building

Are the increased number of houses justified.?

The most recent calculations show a smaller future population than has been used for the plan.

It is concerning that, there is nothing to suggest that the development will use brown sites to develop before the green fields and green belt.

In the plan, large areas of Greenbelt are identified for development and given that there is uncertainty of the number of homes needed there should be a focus on using Brown Field sites.

The plan proposes removing large areas of Greenbelt at M6/M56 for large scale distribution logistics and industrial uses. What has not been established is access, transport improvements, utilities and green infrastructure, this seems to be left to the developers. There is no information of the type of jobs in this area and it is concerning that these jobs will be low paid and low skilled. Thus the workers will have to commute to work, causing more pollution and congestion, as the houses being built in the south will be very expensive and unattainable for low paid workers.

There is no need to destroy the local villages and no need for the volume of housing and mass of employment land. There is no justification for predicted growth, therefore THE PLAN IS NOT SOUND.

Regards

Kathryn Buckley.

Sent from my iPad