
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 September 2017 21:19
To: LDF
Subject: FAO the Planning Policy Team - Objections to the 'Preferred Plan Option'.
Attachments: Plans complaint.docx

To the Planning Policy team.

As I feel so strongly about the 'Preferred Plan' changes, I felt the need to raise my objections and concerns. Please refer to my attached document.

Regards

[REDACTED]

I am writing to voice my many objections to the 'Preferred Plan change' in relation to the Grappenhall, Thelwall and Latchford area.

The speed at which this has been progressed with no formal consultation seems very underhand considering the potentially significant impact to South Warrington.

I have tried to read and digest the contents of the document produced, but it is long winded and does not summarise clearly the options considered and the reasons why they have selected the preferred option, requiring people, such as myself to take time to try and make sense of this monster of a document.

I am concerned that many residents in Warrington, myself included do not necessarily want to live in a city, and object to the council plans to extend the housing and infrastructure to the detriment of the greenbelt and surrounding country side

Based on what I have read, I have tried to prioritise these below, but I have so many concerns it is difficult to allocate relative priorities to some of them, though what I am most concerned about is the proposed use of part of the transpennine trail as a transport route.

Use of the Transpennine for a Transport Route.

Development of this proposed route will just add yet another noisy road within a residential area, which no doubt will become just as congested as the rest when there are issues with M6.

What is the purpose of this new road? Why is it needed and why can't the existing roads be improved? Why does it appear that a bypass from the M56 junction at Stretton is being proposed to run through Greenbelt, and into Thelwall, Grappenhall and Latchford, to provide an extra crossing of the Ship Canal? Not the most direct route, or have the Stockton Heath residents already raised concerns over any changes to the A49, thus forcing the new route through the Trans-pennine trail? It just appears to be a convenient Bypass for Stockton Heath being 'sold' as a necessary piece of infrastructure for a 'New City' that nobody wants.

The proposed A56 to A57 link ought to significantly reduce the traffic through the Walton Road and Stockton Heath Ship Canal Crossings, so I would challenge why the proposed route using the Transpennine trail is necessary. Until this is in place, how can it be assessed whether a further crossing is required?

It is not clear what other options have been considered and dismissed for potential crossings for the Ship Canal.

What about the proposed crossing alongside the Cantilever? The property adjacent to this was I believe, purchased through a Compulsory Purchase order (many years ago) and still remains unused. Is this

likely to happen to homes adjacent to the Transpennine trail, resulting in an unkempt area and unnecessary destruction of people's homes for a crossing that may never get funded or built?

Who has decided that Warrington ought to be a city, when in fact it is a town with (at present) a number of surrounding village, as this seems to be the key driver for the expansion of the residential areas and therefore necessitated the need for this additional crossing.

Have the residents of Warrington been asked if they want 'City Status' or is this something being forced on us, along with increased noise, traffic, pollution and no doubt crime and then associated hikes in household and vehicle insurance.

Why should the residents adjacent to the new route have to suffer from additional noise pollution, traffic fumes, and devalued properties? Has a proper survey been conducted or is this just a convenient route that someone has suggested with no consideration being given to the effects on the environment or impacted residents.

The air quality is far from perfect due to the industries on the Latchford side of the canal. The proposed transport route will only exacerbate this, with potential Heath impacts to residents.

And in the interim, what effect will this have on property prices whilst this plan is considered and debated. I pity anyone close to the trail who is currently trying to sell their home.

24,000 Homes based on what?

How have the housing figures been arrived at? Is this using growth figures from the Pre-Brexit view?

How can the original figures have jumped so radically? Is this pressure from greedy landowners to sell or developers whose primary motive is profit? Why do they or should they have such a significant influence and be allowed to exert pressure for the Council to revise housing numbers. Is this a case of the 'Tail Wagging the Dog'?

How many properties have already been built in recent years in Warrington already, and why are such a large number of additional homes required within such a small boundary i.e. engulfed by the motorway networks?

If this preferred plan goes ahead, many of the 'villages' in South Warrington will become part of a massive estate, losing their identity and spoiling Warrington for the existing residents who chose to live here.

It would appear that the planners are trying to cram as much housing and employment into one small area of Warrington. It would seem that doubling the size of Lymm and Culcheth has been dismissed, but that does not seem to have been considered for Grappenhall.

If the true purpose is to provide more housing, why isn't Cheshire being looked at as a whole rather than inflicting ridiculously large numbers of properties onto one town, or indeed within such a small

boundary. Are there no other opportunities outside of the Motorway boundaries, which would move traffic away from the town and leave us with some countryside?

In fact there is reference to the Governments review on calculating the Housing needs, so surely the Warrington plan needs to take account of any directed changes from the Government when calculating projected numbers.

Aside from this, why is the Greenbelt and South West of Warrington being targeted to take the majority of these new houses, at the detriment of the environment? The plan shows very little, use of urban sites with the majority impacting on Greenbelt.

What about other urban areas - Fiddlers Ferry, when it closes would provide a significant opportunity for development, and who living near to that site is likely to complain at the loss of such a colossal structure.

Similarly, there have been suggestions that Warrington Hospital needs to move, so that site would too provide another prime urban location which already has much of the required infrastructure.

The NPPF states that Greenbelt should only be used for development in exceptional circumstances. I can't really believe that the desire of the property developers to build 24,000 homes on Greenbelt, when there are other alternatives, can be considered justified or an exceptional circumstance.

The five purposes of Green Belt in the NPPF are:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
- to prevent neighbouring towns from 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.

All of these are being ignored by the preferred plan which in my opinion, is in breach of every single one of these.

The whole selection of the preferred option seems to be based on the provision of a New City, which I believe the majority of Warrington residents would be opposed to. Without this, there is little weight in the argument that this is an exceptional circumstance which is being used to destroy such a significant amount of Greenbelt. Are there any other reasons why this was selected over Option 1?

From all of the documents it appears that only a significant development of the South West of Warrington is even seriously being considered, and all of this with little or no consultation with existing residents.

Already too many parts of South Warrington are being overdeveloped and causing what were rural areas to become large housing estates.

This option also adds to the traffic issues with crossing the Ship Canal. If this is already an issue, surely the addition of 24,000 more homes in the South, even with additional Ship Canal crossings is not going to alleviate this, but will just add to the congestion.

Working demographic of Warrington

Of the population of Warrington, how many actually work and of these how many work in Warrington currently and how many elsewhere.

I myself have lived in Warrington for most of my life, and spent 37+ years working outside of Warrington with no desire to change that.

Do we really believe that we need to provide housing for all of the people who will take up new employment opportunities within Warrington, as with us being served by a multitude of motorways, there will always be an influx of workers from outside of the town?

So whilst I agree there must be some uplift in housing if Employment opportunities increase, I don't agree that we need to cater for all workers. It also needs to be considered what the types of employment will be offered in Warrington as currently, many of the new opportunities are lower paid warehouse and call centre type roles, that wouldn't necessarily provide sufficient income to purchase properties.

Again, why is the largest proposed employment site in the preferred plan again in the South West of Warrington, when there is far more space available on the North. Is this to justify the sacrificing of the Greenbelt for additional Housing to meet the needs of those employed there?

_Would the planner, who conveniently doesn't live in Warrington, so won't be affected by the proposals, like his local area to become overdeveloped, or have his house subject to a compulsory purchase order to make way for new transport links? What right have the planners to inflict this on residents?

Why can a small number of planners make decisions such as these with little or no consultation? If the same people working on these plans are the ones who plan the existing road layouts in Warrington, then this too raises concerns. How many dual carriage ways have been 'echeloned' into single lanes thus reducing the flow of traffic and slowing progress? How many sets of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings are so badly managed that they result in long tailbacks whilst pedestrians have more than adequate time to stroll across the roads - Stockton heath being a prime example.

This plan is causing considerable stress and uncertainty to many residents, especially regarding the potential loss of homes due to compulsory purchase orders.

In Summary, I would like there to be proper documents issued to all Warrington residents about these proposed changes and consultation sessions held where people can raise their concerns and get answers. I do not think such radical changes should be permitted without having votes on the individual key aspects of the proposals.