



Dear Sir/Madam,

GARDEN CITY SUBURB – SOUTH EAST WARRINGTON

On behalf of my family and co-residents I ask that the following observations be placed before the planning committee when considering the captioned application.

There are a large number of similar developments either proposed or approved in the same area. Whilst government agencies may press local councils to allocate a specified number housing units for the South Warrington area you have to take into account not only the demand but the timing of this demand. If all of the current applications are approved for immediate construction then there is sure to be an excess of supply with all of the infrastructure problems this will bring. The nature of building developers means that profit not environment is the driving force behind this application. The Grappenhall Heys community resists proposals for large scale housing developments which will substantially change the environment of Grappenhall Heys and the surrounding areas with only the developer receiving satisfaction. I ask that you take into consideration the following points:

1. Having viewed the developer's proposals it is clear that the provision for public spaces is extremely limited. There is a significant loss of green belt and I believe that this should not be used for construction unless in exceptional circumstances, the outlined plans are certainly not exceptional. The current green belt land is being used predominately for agricultural purposes so is not going to 'waste'.
2. I moved away from a city to live in a semi-rural area with a local town. I have not asked for nor do I want to live in a city. How has this 'city status' been conceived? Is it purely for financial gain for the town council? Why not have a referendum and ask the people of Warrington **Town** if they would like to be a city?
3. Proposals for social features such as schools, nurseries, medical centres and recreation areas are nonexistent, the developer suggest that the additional houses will be served by the existing infrastructure. The public services available to the existing residents are under considerable stress and it is clear there will be a continuation of the financial stress local councils are now experiencing.
 - a. Grappenhall Heys Community Primary school is situated in the middle of one of the three existing housing estates, during school drop offs, pick-ups and school events the surrounding roads are saturated and currently cause traffic/parking problems. How will the additional traffic be accommodated if the school doubles it's

capacity due to the addition of children from the new housing estate? There are also grave safety issues to be considered.

- b. The two main medical centres in the area, Appleton Primary Care and Stockton Heath Medical Practice do not have the capacity to incorporate all the additional registrations that will come with new houses. I believe that there is a proposal for a medical centre on the Appleton Cross plans, even if the medical centre goes ahead the demand will far outweigh the capacity available. The current proposal that Warrington A&E may close will only serve to put further demand on our already stretched medical centres. This problem needs further investigation as people's lives are more important than developers money.
 - c. I notice in the newspapers that the Chapelford Urban Village is currently experiencing significant problems with 'unruly youths' congregating in their area. An additional 9,000 houses (across all proposed developments) brings with it a huge amount of social issues which need addressing. This area does not have the policing or the infrastructure to support this many more people.
4. The existing road system is inadequate to accommodate current traffic demands never mind a potential of another 50,000 + cars in the area.
 - a. A traffic survey was conducted for a previous application and this reported that the current road infrastructure could accommodate the additional traffic – I believe that this was a desk survey – has anyone actually visited the roads and the 'pinch points' during rush hour or at all?
 - b. Bridgewater High School does not have the capacity to accommodate all the new residents and this will increase traffic flow as children will have to be driven to schools further afield. Does the local council have a budget for this additional bus expense?
 - c. Stockton Heath is not mentioned in the proposal but the impact of a development this size with bring the whole of Stockton Heath to a standstill more than it does already.
 - d. The PDO includes an 'Eastern Link Road' from M56 Junction 10 to the north of the Manchester Ship Canal (This route would cut right through the proposed new residential areas. On the downside, this would provide a new HGV access road to the Barleycastle Trading Estate (which, at the moment, is only accessible from the M6 junction). It would also provide an alternative route for traffic caught up in problems on the M56 / M6 motorways. As such, this will result in the deterioration of the quality of life for current residents who will be subjected to increased noise, pollution and vibration from the increased traffic flow.
5. [REDACTED] when we first moved to this property, [REDACTED] years ago, we were informed that the area was deemed a flood risk and struggled to get appropriate insurance. Since that time the fields have 'taken the brunt' of the wet weather, thus keeping the roads flood free, this needs to be considered before all the fields are dug up and no appropriate drainage is installed for the existing estate.

6. The local wildlife, although deemed not at risk will need to be considered, it is our responsibility as human being to ensure that the herons, foxes, badgers, buzzards, falcons, ducks etc are not harmed. The fields are their hunting grounds.

All of the above comments are germane to my objection to this development and, in particular, to the scale of the proposal. The government has issued planning guidelines to local councils suggesting brown field development first followed by small **unintrusive** expansion of established built up areas. This large scale development runs rough shod over local residents aspirations.

There is too much development of this nature planned for our area, at one time. To compress 20 or so years of progress into a short time scale because builders see an immediate profit stream cannot be to the long term benefit of existing or future South Warrington residents. This application should be refused or, at a minimum, delayed, until the road infrastructure is changed and the social features expanded.

Do you have any comment to the fact that the council receive money from the New Home Bonus – this potentially could earn the council a phenomenal amount of money – where will this money be spent?

Regards

