

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Stephen Taylor [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 November 2021 14:23  
**To:** Local Plan  
**Subject:** Local Plan objection

Dear Local Plan consultation team.

I wish to object to the latest version of the local plan for which the consultation period ends today 15/11/21.

I am writing to you mainly as a concerned resident who feels the plan will significantly impact my life and living standards in a detrimental way; Implementing plans of this nature I would and should be able to anticipate the opposite. I also write in my capacity as Parish Councillor for Stockton Heath and on Balfour of many residents who have approached me during the consultation period with exactly the same concerns.

My reasons for objection are as follows:-

1) The public consultation process has been woefully inadequate and the council has failed to meet its' statutory obligations. From my understating, the proceeds run but the council only engaged with 0.1% of the residents in the town; this represents and substantial failing in public engagement.

2)The plan fails to meet many requirements of the NPPF, P16 and fails to demonstrate sound economic, social and environmental justification for the plan as it stands. The levels of economic growth and housing demand in South Warrington are predicted on a need created by wholly unjustified destruction of large area of distinguishes=cities green belt that are highly valued by Warrington South communities. The need to utilise large areas of green belt for semi-industrial/logistics purposes is not soundly justified. Developers will latch on to any opportunity, so need becomes apparent, however the plan fails to address whether other locations either inside or outside the borough are available on more suitable sites. Locating more logistics sites in the borough is also contrary to the councils own climate change objectives, these sites rely heavily fossil fuel traction and there are no options for multi-modal facilities. This part of the plan also fails to address the impact of more traffic of this nature on air quality and traffic congestion.

The South East employment area proposal ironically leads to a flawed justification for destroying even more green belt. The increased employment on this area is further sued to justify many of the 2400 homes and further 1800 homes on green belt which the plan highlights a need for; a need for which there is little justification. As well as this, the ability to deliver any associated 'affordable' homes is not evidenced in the plan.

2) A major flaw in the plan, is the lack of appreciation around how people in South Warrington are employed. Many residents work across the North West Region and have a consequent reliance on personal (car) transport. The content of LTP4 will ail to deliver the change in transport behaviour that it hopes for as LTP4 is predicated on travel to and from the Town Centre, with out any commitment to a mass transit system or any desire to integrate the public transport system across the town or make it attractive. Buses alone are not the answer. This plan as it stands will release green belt lad without first addressing the transport shortcomings. Waiting for s106 money to provide for facilities is far too late.

3) The current plan fails to recognise the constraints on access from the south to the town centre over the ship canal, river Mersey and Bridgewater canal; the plan repeats past errors in relation to this. Another 800 homes in Grappenhall Heys and Appleton Thorn were approved in 2017 despite planners admitting that the A49/A56 junction in Stockton Heath was already at capacity. No transport improvements or mitigation have been offered. The North South route to the Town Centre is overloaded and unable to be widened, without an alternative to provide mass-transit on this route, the plan fails to deal with these issues. There are other proposals to modify various junctions to help cope with traffic demand for the new houses in the area; however theses proposal are merely window dressing

to justify the building of the houses and they actually fail to recognise the real problems of lack of infrastructure or any proposal to deal with this imaginatively in a different way that meets the needs for the future.

4) The use of 2014 ONS data to determine population Granth is inappropriate and there is a strong case to use 2018 data. The 2014 data should be seen as a starting point not an absolute target; for the plan to be meaningful this aspect should be looked at again.

5) The global issues for climate change and the environmental impact of the loss of large swathes of green belt are not reflected in this plan as it stands. Therefore, the urban extension plans for unsustainable developments; this plan totally destroys any remaining rural distinctiveness of South Warrington and changes significantly the character of the existing parishes. The plan does not justify the very special circumstances for the release of green belt to use for the purposes outlined, in particular logistics. The requirements of p140 of the NPPF are not met.

6) The plan has insufficiently considered all the aspect of Town Centre regeneration given the changing shopping and leisure habits across the nation and Warrington is not different from this. Whilst some part of regeneration recently have been successful, much of the Town Centre remains bereft of investment and there are no options in the plan to address the regeneration of the larger part of the Town Centre. The planners have over the past years approved many out of town shopping areas at the expense of the Town Centre and there is nothing in the plan to counter this either with shopping or living options. The plan presents a missed opportunity!

7) The plan fails to prioritise brownfield opportunities for development which would help meet urgent housing need and put affordable home at the heart of regeneration; these homes would be located where people need them, close to transport hubs, shopping, entertainment and will refuse the need to private transport with all the advantages this brings economically, environmentally and socially.

8) Fiddlers Ferry, a late inclusion in the plan would be better as a housing location rather than iced use and would alleviate some of the burden the current plan places on the green belt. It has a potentially re-useable rail connection and connection to the Town Centre would not be predicated on cars.

To summarise, I am totally opposed to the loss of green belt that this plan proposes merely to accommodate more logistics hubs and over 4000 new homes that are not needed. I am concerned at the lack of focus on brownfield sites to locate houses that are where people need them rather than where they attract the most income. The plan seek in my opinion to protect and build upon the logistics income base that the council has staked its future growth. These developments will change the distinctive character of this part of the borough for ever. The plan does not provide for economic, social or environmental sustainability, and future generations will be left with this legacy.

It is my belief that the council should seek support from the Government to put this plan on hold rather that force it through just because of a timescale that leads to a bad outcome. It's i my belief that is the council did this they would find favour and support from the Secretary of State as the departments stated intention is to protect green belt wherever possible; i believe that the council with ore time, better consultation and Government support can produce a plan that does what residents in Warrington need and meets the aims of sustainability.

Best regards Stephen Taylor

