

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to local plan  
**Date:** 14 November 2021 21:18:13

---

Emma Smith



Dear Sir/Madam

RE: Warrington Local Plan UPSVLP

Firstly, I would like to say that I do not believe the consultation for the local plan was sound. The biggest impact of the local plan will be in south Warrington, and yet, there were no council run consultation events south of the Manchester ship canal.

Next, I would like to formally object to the Warrington Local Plan.

I believe that the number of houses required has been over-inflated and more recent calculations (the 2018 ONS data which predicts significantly lower growth for the town and has a projected housing requirement of 458 homes per annum v the plan's 816 homes per annum) have been ignored.

The handing over of huge areas of greenbelt land to developers is not justified especially before ALL brownfield land has been utilised simply because it is easier and cheaper to develop, and I believe it is the duty of the council to protect the greenbelt land over the use of regenerated town centre land and brownfield sites.

The Plan, at point 4.1.10 of the document, confirms that Warrington has an urban capacity of approximately 11,800 homes that could be built on brownfield sites, the annual "target" pre the 10% uplift of 816 homes (which is considered to be un-sound and excessive), Implies that there is sufficient Brownfield land to support a 14 ½ year building program. On this basis there is no need to release any greenbelt until sometime well beyond the first decade of this plan and to release any greenbelt land towards the beginning of the local plan would take away

from the regeneration of the town centre and the remediation of brownfield land.

There is also a huge opportunity to utilise brownfield land at Fiddler's Ferry for housing and this must be done before releasing greenbelt land. Warrington must also complete Part 2 of the Brownfield Register so that it is clear how many houses have been given permission but not yet built.

The Defra ALC for the proposed areas in south Warrington constitutes the proposed areas of green belt release to satisfy the Warrington UPSVLP21 are classed as Very good to Moderate. This equates to ALC grades 2 and 3. These are some of the better and more fertile areas of productive land for crop growing.

Government policies and legislation were put in place with an aim of protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals. It is clear, that any plan to release greenbelt land is unsound and unjustified and will remove valuable land from food production and do untold damage to the environment. At a time when climate change and promoting a move to carbon neutral is so important the local plan goes against everything we should be trying to achieve.

The current transport infrastructure in the south of Warrington is not fit for purpose for the current number of residents and road users let alone the addition of more houses. With only 3 (bottleneck) major roads feeding into the town centre, two of which are affected by the movement of ships on the Manchester Ship Canal, to add the number of proposed houses will bring the area to a complete standstill. Any proposed new transport infrastructure (which currently lacks detail of funding or time scales in the latest local plan), will not only cause more pollution leading to a detrimental effect on the local population's health but also endanger the safety of both pedestrians and cyclists at a time when the local council has declared a climate emergency along with the government and indeed globally.

There is no room for any further crossings across the ship canal or the Bridgewater canal without having a detrimental effect on those residents living in the vicinity. As idealistic as the notion is of using an expensive local bus network, this is not city centre Manchester and the service does not actually meet the needs of the local population in the south of Warrington and it definitely can't get busy working people to their place of work especially after dropping their children off at school.

There is nowhere safe for cycle lanes to be installed from the south of

Warrington into the town centre nor can people be expected to cycle everywhere in the less than favourable weather conditions of the North West for any meaningful purpose such as getting to work, do the weekly family shop or drop off and collect the children from school. Even when Warrington Borough Council has ever had the opportunity to install a decent cycle lane with protective safety measures (such as rubber bumpers segregating the cycle lane from the motor vehicle lanes) in a similar fashion to other areas, they have failed. An example of this is Knutsford Road which did have the width to create a safe and proper cycle lane but this opportunity was missed. Another example is the farcical narrowing of the road at Bridgefoot (outside what was previously Mr Smiths) which appears to have been altered only to infuriate drivers, cause greater congestion and pollution and lead to the risk of more accidents due to the absurd filtering and part of me thinks this is all on purpose so that applications for any by-pass roads would seem more appealing and necessary. When this ridiculous change happened, why wasn't the additional space used to create a safe cycle lane instead?

With public services such as the NHS and General Practice in particular, which has a shortage of staff with more and more GPs due to retire shortly and not enough newly qualified clinicians to replace them, the need for healthcare services to deal with an increased population is not deliverable and will lead to the demise of existing struggling services.

The proposal of the 6/56 is preposterous.

As stated in the National Planning Policy Framework,

**138.** Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

When there are readily available empty warehouses being advertised and brownfield sites available, I do not believe that a warehouse which will provide car dependent low paid jobs until the automation of warehouses takes over is an exceptional circumstance that can justify the use of greenbelt land. The effect on the health, welfare and mental health of nearby residents also does not appear to have been taken into consideration.

Throughout the plan there is a total lack of detail regarding significant

infrastructure and funding, there is no regard for the wishes of local residents, there is nothing but devastation ear-marked for our greenbelt and wildlife, any figures to justify housing and employment land are over-inflated, the health needs of the population will be unable to be met and the whole plan is unsound.

Kind regards

Mrs E Smith