

Dear Sir/Madam

**Warrington Borough Council Local Plan. Preferred Development Option Regulation 18 Consultation**

I wish to object to the current Preferred Development Option for the following reasons:

- Public consultation was not adequately advertised and held in the peak holiday season, statistically when the highest number of people are out of the UK or on holiday in the UK. This is treating the people of Warrington with utter contempt. At the meeting in Lymm I asked a planning officer 4 times why Green Belt land was being used? Is it because you have used all available brown land. Each time I was not given an answer. It is therefore impossible to make any assessment about the need for using green belt land

The case or lack of for building land cannot be tested without the release of figures for brownfield land. As the **National Planning Policy Framework** says about the 5 purposes of the green belt are:

**80. Green Belt serves five purposes:**

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

Also from the same document:

**85. When defining boundaries, local planning authorities should:**

- ensure consistency with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development
- not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open
- where necessary, identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period
- make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following a Local Plan review which proposes the development
- satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period
- define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent

The council has already committed to the current Green belt as outlined in document:

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO WARRINGTON LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY

- “This regeneration first strategy is aligned to the now revoked NWRSS, which identified the first growth priority in the regional centres of Manchester and Liverpool; and secondly, in the areas immediately surrounding these centres. Towns such as Warrington were included in the third out of four regional priorities, with the requirement that development should be focused in and around the centres of these places. As part of this pattern of development, NWRSS stated that there was no need for any exceptional, substantial strategic change to the Green Belt and its boundaries within most of the North West before 2011, whilst Warrington is singled out in NWRSS policy RDF4 for no strategic change to its Green Belt before 2021.”
- What has changed so much that there is a huge reversal of plans ?
- 
- The Assessment of the “value” of the Green Belt by ARUP is very misleading. Using words like “unproductive” is a subjective term. The green belt should be assessed on the “Five Purposes” as I have already indicated in the **National Planning Policy Framework**. Warrington is very close to Halton and its other near by authorities. The Green belt prevents “**neighbouring towns merging into one another**”. I was staggered to see that the Viking Settlement of Thelwall and Lymm with the first Canal were not seen as historic communities “**preserve the setting and special character of historic towns**”. I utterly reject all the reports by ARUP as completely missing the whole point of the Green Belt. I was surprised to ARUP were paid by me and my fellow council tax payers to carry out this survey. ARUP’s have a long standing commercial relationship with Peel Holdings who have applied to make massive developments in this plan. Are ARUP ruling themselves out of carrying out any work in the area covered by this plan ? If not they are advising on a plan they have a commercial interest in seeing development. This is a serious conflict of interest. I’m asking for their report to be immediately removed and I will be asking for a review of professional standards by WBC planning office to see if rules have been broken.
- The infrastructure feasibility study results have not been comp published so why is the case before the Public consultations ? We have been asked to comment without the facts.. Council representatives have been unable to answer whether the feasibility study is taking place on all 5 reported options or just the preferred development option.
- The Maps provided are outdated and unclear. They were of a substandard quality and not clear when presenting plans at the public consultations. The officers refused to give clear figures on brownfield sites which is a requirement. It is misleading of the council to let the public to believe that the volume of housing required is something that is set by Government when it is WBC who have calculated the volume requirement.
- There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses. Potentially enough to meet a reduced housing requirement. Therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve existing green belt land.
- The development proposed is far beyond the projected population growth figures that far exceed any need for the people of Warrington. It is part of the council leaders not so secret plan to turn Warrington into a city. This plan is designed to draw in people from outside the area to swell the population to meet his plan. Actual need for population growth needs proper scrutiny because the plan uses information that is pre Brexit and assuming the highest population growth level. Since 2015 the immigration figure has fallen dramatically therefore there are no reliable figures to base growth on.
-

- I am surprised to see proposals for a port being built in Warrington by Peel Holdings. If they wanted one why didn't they use the perfectly good one they had in Salford Quays. The are not the ships or traffic to justify this and it is I believe merely a device to change the land use and make a huge profit for its non uk tax paying owner. The details of this project are sketchy and planning cannot even be considered unless Peel Holdings come forward with more details. I can see no commercial argument for a port and its construction would have a massive impact on the lives of many people living across Warrington
- Lymm has seen a denudation of services from the loss of its library, post office and now our final bank is going. This plan will simply pile more people onto these reducing resources. The busy roads and tiny car parks are already over capacity.
- I can find no reference to any of these proposals in the local parties manifestos , which they presented to the electorate Therefore the council has no political mandate for any of these plans. It represents a dishonest approach and a contempt for the people of Warrington. The level of real distress and anger this has caused the residents all over Warrington has demonstrated the WBC has not taken the residents views into consideration.
- The proposals for the new village which will devastate Moore and Walton areas are completely without justification. I go regularly to Walton Hall and we visit the crematorium [REDACTED] [REDACTED] It's a beautiful peaceful area. Only WBC planners could slap a development in the home of Alice in Wonderland. There is no mandate for it nobody wants it and it needs to be shelved immediately.
- The relief road is only justified by the proposed huge expansion on the southern side of the borough. I have looked at the route and all it will achieve is huge congestion at its end. Our whole road network is currently overloaded by the current population and traffic. Creating one road on a poor network solves no problem. It will demolish houses, increase pollution and simply relocate congestion rather than cure it. It's a complete white elephant..

The Plan in its entirety is badly thought out, a cut and paste copy from the "City of Warrington" plans that have already failed. Its scope plans for a population that could only be achieved by a huge influx of people from outside Warrington. The plan is shoddy in its maps and detail. The use of ARUP is in my view highly questionable. There is no political mandate, nor any appetite for this project outside the walls of town hall. Warringtonians don't want huge scale development neither do they want to become a city. Rarely have politicians and planners so misjudged the Council tax payers and voter of this town.

