

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Re: Objection to local plan for Warrington
Date: 17 June 2019 17:32:11

> To whom it may concern,

>

> It appears that the authors of the local plan are keen to emphasise that councils “hands are tied” regarding the unlocking of green-belt land, due to a “minimum number of homes set by the government”. They are also keen to emphasise that they are only proposing the release of 10% of the green-belt (as if this is some trivial amount) and that the proposed development will be a sustainable “Garden-suburb”. The attempt at “greenwashing” this clear exploitation of our natural areas is all too transparent and it is clear that the authors have no genuine concern for sustainability or the impacts on future generations. The justification of “Using the Government’s minimum housing needs calculation” is opaque, as it is not clear where the numbers for this calculation are coming from. How are we to assess the quality of the data used for this calculation if it is not made explicit? The authors clearly lack imagination and ambition if they genuinely believe they have no alternative options available.

>

> I strongly recommend that the authors revisit the widely reported UN assessment "IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services". Which makes it explicitly clear that the continuation of increasing urbanisation “business as usual” is no longer tenable, if we are to avoid catastrophic ecosystem collapse.

>

> "Urbanization is one of the most forceful drivers of ecological change" - Chapter 6. IBPES, 2019

>

> “In urban areas human populations and human built infrastructure are the most dense (Grimm et al. 2008), and can drive significant impacts on local, regional, and global nature and its sustained contributions to people’s quality of life” - Chapter 6. IBPES, 2019

>

> As if the effects of this irreversible destruction of natural spaces isn’t bad enough. It appears that the authors have designed the plan to maximise ecological damage, due to the proposed layout. Specifically, the proposed plan severely restricts the greenbelt wildlife corridors between Appleton and Lymm, and through the middle of Walton. The link between the fragmentation of habitats in this manner and the loss of wild species diversity and abundance has been well documented. Furthermore, the links between declining biodiversity and the loss of ecosystem services (and the resulting impact on human lives) has also been clearly articulated.

>

> In sum, the authors seem to have considered the “sustainability” of this proposed development only as a fig-leaf rather than any genuine concern for our green spaces, which is ultimately a source of value in the area, in addition to it’s importance for the survival of future generations (this may sound like hyperbole, but I can assure you that this is the consensus among scientists). I would also like to echo the concerns of others regarding provisioning of adequate infrastructure and the predictable increase in car and vehicle emissions in the area.

>

> “If we leave it to later generations to clear up the mess, I don’t think they will forgive us.” - Andy Purvis, IPBES author

>

> Regards,

> Sam Whiteford

[REDACTED]