

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Local plan consultation.
Date: 18 June 2019 15:57:11

I wish to object to the proposed local plan as I do not believe it is sound.

The reasons for my objections are as follows:

- 1) There is no justification for the release of green belt which should only be done in exceptional circumstances. The council have already gone against the current guidance for this by granting travellers retrospective planning permission at Fir Tree Close on the basis that the land they moved onto and developed without prior permission was "low quality green belt". Green belt is classed as green belt for a reason and should be maintained "low quality" or otherwise. The local plan is another example of going against published guidance. Much of the green belt land to be taken for development in the local plan is prime agricultural land and should be maintained as such. Release is not needed for the predicted population growth stated which is over ambitious and is higher than the governments own suggested figure for what is required. 20 years is too far ahead to plan for - it is more unusual to plan for 15 years
- 2) If a 15 year plan was done release of the green belt would not be needed plus in that time further brown field sites would become available for development. As stated above the housing numbers being used are too high well above the actual official population increase predictions which would only need around 528 houses per year to meet.
- 3) The infrastructure needs for roads and canal crossings have not been adequately addressed. The current proposals would lead to congestion, air pollution, and grid lock around Stockton Heath and Latchford which are already pinch points for travel as is bridgefoot now that the Mersey Gateway toll bridge has opened. The influx of the additional vehicles that would occur should this plan be implemented would be catastrophic.
- 4) The local plan would destroy the nature of the Grappenhall, Stretton and Appleton and Hatton which would just become one urban mass.
- 5) There is no definite commitment to the provision of schools, medical centres and shopping areas. Without a firm commitment to these facilities to meet the new population demands the plan is unsound. The existing facilities provided to meet the current needs are already overstretched.
- 6) I consider the housing numbers driving the plan are unrealistic relative to anything Warrington has achieved in the past. The town centre has been decimated by the planning that has already been done. This plan is another example of lack of foresight of what is actually needed. The poor highway infrastructure and geographical limitations of the land south of the Mersey make the plan undeliverable and if implemented in the form proposed will be to the detriment of the existing population and area.

M.E. Holden

[REDACTED]

Warrington

[REDACTED]