

Response to Warrington Local Plan, 6th September 2017

Dear Sir/Madame,

I am writing to respond to the ideas presented in the Warrington Local Plan, and as discussed with your Representatives at the Lymm Parish Hall Consultation event a few weeks ago. I am a Warrington resident [REDACTED]

I wish to register my objection to the plan, on the grounds of

1. Excessive numbers of houses (6,000-8,000) suggested to be built on green belt land.
2. Inadequate and untested proposals for infrastructure, particularly road, water supply and sewage. Other residents have also voiced concerns for additional demand for schools, nurseries, GP practices in the area.

I believe that historically, since the initial expansions of the New Town, Warrington has gained an unfortunate reputation for poorly considered developments with astonishing lack of forethought regarding the required road infrastructure. Cromwell Avenue has been a classic example, serving the large New Town suburbs of Old Hall, Westbrook and Callands, as well as the large Ikea/M+S retail park, with just a single carriageway link to the rest of the town, routed indirectly and chronically congested.

This proposal in the local plan for South Warrington appears to build in comparable problems.

To link 6-8,000 new homes (which will of course represent 20,000 – 30,000 additional residents with perhaps 15,000 vehicles) to the rest of this growing town, would realistically require a four lane, high level link across the Bridgewater and Manchester Ship canals. Such a link was previously considered and rejected in the early 1990s.

What new road connections to the rest of the town have been suggested by the Local Plan?

Firstly building an expressway between the two motorway junctions (M56 J10 and M6 J20) directly through the newly built areas is not helpful and will only serve to channel polluting motorway traffic through the “garden city” regularly at times of congestion on the M6/M56 network. This does not connect the garden city to Warrington at all, and in my view questions the very concept.

Secondly we have three black dashed lines labelled “Potential conceptual desire line for better public transport connectivity” across the Bridgewater Canal to Chester Road in Grappenhall. These appear to threaten existing housing, including a conservation area and overwhelm existing roads. At the meeting your representatives were unable to clarify whether these “conceptual desire lines” were meant to represent footpaths, cycle ways or metalled, trafficked roads. How far has this really been thought through?

Finally there is a (blue dashed line) “Potential to provide a new strategic road/ public transport route” along the former, now derelict Victorian Railway bridge over Latchford Locks. This appears to strategically channel thousands more commuter vehicles by a very indirect route onto the Transpennine Trail and across the canal to the former railway embankment by Latchford Village. This embankment now has new housing built on it. How far has this really been thought through? Should the map be relabelled “Potential to demolish existing housing”?

As I personally clarified in discussions with your representatives at the public meeting, none of these concepts have been tested with traffic projections or priced for viability. It is unlikely that any of

them, or indeed any required four lane high level two-canal crossing would pass through the planning process with the predictable storm of public protest.

In surgical practice, before a new organ is transplanted into the body, it must be shown that there is sufficient arterial and venous blood supply available. This is essential to connect the newly transplanted organ to the rest of the body and maintain both the organ and the recipient patient in a healthy, viable state. If the two cannot be connected, it is in nobody's best interests for the procedure to go ahead.

Similarly, without a clear, tested, priced and realistic means of connecting these major new housing estates to the rest of the town, I would suggest that the whole Local Plan for South Warrington as it stands, becomes unviable and unrealistic.

I hope that you will take the above questions into consideration.

I look forward to your early reply.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.