

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Local Plan
Date: 14 June 2019 22:55:35

Having attended one of Warrington Councils information sessions about the Local Plan, and studied the Proposed Submission Document available on the Council website, I do not believe that the plan is sound, as it is neither justified nor deliverable.

The plan for additional housing in the local plan is not justified, as it is actually higher than the Government requires. Recent experience suggests that such a high rate of house building is not deliverable in any case.

The Local Plan is also disappointing in the way that warehousing and logistics is the basis for so much of the new employment south of the river. It would be bolder to encourage employment in science and engineering, which would bring quality jobs to the area that might command the sort of salaries that would enable people to buy houses in the new 'garden suburb'. Otherwise all that will be delivered is housing for commuters from outside the area, which will only exacerbate the climate emergency without contributing to wealth generation in Warrington itself, while low paid and low density employment opportunities in warehousing will further add to the burden on the roads and the environment from people commuting in from other parts of the area. Sacrifice of Green Belt land should only happen in exceptional circumstances. It is neither justified nor meeting the borough's needs to sacrifice Warrington's Green Belt to build houses that will end up benefiting other areas and contribute to the climate emergency.

It would be a more enlightened plan if any new homes were required to be carbon neutral. The climate emergency means that words like 'encourage' should be replaced by 'insist', and a target of 10% renewable energy is inadequate. We need to build the sort of housing we need now. Now that the Government has pledged to cut carbon emissions to zero by 2050, it is not justified to produce a plan fit for the 20th century. We need one for the 21st century and meets the Government's policy aims.

The sacrifice of the Green Belt is all in the south of Warrington. Yet the road infrastructure seems curiously local. It will be easy to get from the garden suburb to any one of the already overused routes to the rest of the borough. The parallel local transport plan features a new crossing of the Mersey that has nothing to do with this development, and a rapid transport plan that, even if it ever leaves the drawing board, is dominated by routes north of the river. Meanwhile cycle routes imply that users should be directed to parts of the current infrastructure, for example through Stockton Heath, that are already coded as difficult for cyclists on the Warrington Cycle Map. In such a built-up area a new safe cycle route isn't feasible. It isn't justified to add so many houses, and thereby twice that number of cars, without a more radical approach to transport. This should start with putting the jobs and houses that match each other in close proximity, so that transport isn't the problem.

The local plan covers a span of time longer than it needs to, and sacrifices Green Belt when it is known that two large brownfield sites are due to become available. The plan was drawn up before the recent announcement that Fiddler's Ferry power station is to close, and it is known that the hospital will be relocated. It is unsound to draw up a plan with such a timeline that it has to ignore these known parcels of land, especially as one of them has now been announced. The Green Belt should only be sacrificed in exceptional circumstances. The circumstances that at least one and probably two areas will become available means that the plan is not justified.

Jennifer Myall

[REDACTED]

Warrington

[REDACTED]