

PROTECT OUR GREENBELT AND SAVE OUR VILLAGE

Name Yen-yei Cheong

Address [REDACTED] Warrington [REDACTED]

Address to:-

Planning Officer, Local Plan, Planning, Policy and Programmes, Warrington Borough Council, New Town House, Buttermarket Street, Warrington, WA1 2NH

The following statements are just a "short version" of my objections and concerns and more evidence can be found in the Burtonwood and Collins Green Action Group's file.

You cannot fail to see the open countryside and the Beauty all around you in Burtonwood and Collins Green. Feel the benefit of the fresh air and appreciate the value of a slow paced village life and tight community. All of that is under threat from a proposed development set to go ahead in 2020. Further developments are being proposed that could see our beautiful rural village evolve into an urban town. Below are some objections to the plan.

(1) CONSULTATION

The proposals for the development are vague and unclear. Many residents didn't get letters and those that did were not addressed by name. The venue for the consultation was not accessible to all and the means to complain long winded and complicated. Communication and information is lacking and appears to be mainly online based, not everyone is online. Developers and planners have access to consultants and resources, we don't. It is a highly unequal and undemocratic process. The council have a duty of care to liaise with neighbouring authorities to determine overall effects of congestion and road safety. There is little evidence of this having happened.

(2) INFRASTRUCTURE

Both hard infrastructure roads, bridges, railways etc and soft infrastructure- health, doctors, dentists, social services, education, parks and recreational facilities, law enforcement, emergency services and mental health will be affected by this and further proposed developments. Burtonwood and Collins Green do not have the infrastructure to support this development. Northern trust have said that if only 150 houses are approved the figure will be 'too limited to viably deliver the housing, open space, and, specific support for expansion of primary school facilities and primary care' In other words, no contribution to changing infrastructure unless more houses are approved. Which means longer waits for doctors, dentists, community nurse, counselling etc. School places in catchment areas no longer guaranteed.

(3) GREENBELT OVER BROWNFIELDS

The release of greenbelt has not been adequately justified and the reasoning for not using brownfields is unacceptable. The council should be forcing development on brownfields or previously developed land before any greenbelt is released. The plan involves loss of versatile agricultural land which leads to loss of income for tenant farmers. The plan relies too heavily on representations and assurances from land owners and developers.

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL—TRAFFIC— AIR POLLUTION

There appears to have been no assessment of traffic movement on Green Lane-Phipps Lane over a sustained period of time. The proposed entrance to the new development will be on Green Lane. Green lane is already critical for residents, children and parents on their way too and from school. With 160 houses comes approx. 320 more cars on the road at peak times. Couple this with other local developments and this is a recipe for

gridlock on our roads. Our children will be walking and cycling amongst this traffic which is not only physically dangerous but also has serious health connotations.

Warrington has one of the most congested road networks in the country. Air pollution in Warrington is already amongst the worst in the UK. The proposed access point to the new development is on green Lane opposite Burtonwood County Primary School. The increase in traffic on the lane will be immense. The pollutants in the air around our children and entering their lungs will massively increase. Children are more susceptible to pollutants than adults and exposure could cause or exacerbate ailments such as asthma and COPD. Adults are more susceptible to heart and lung disease and respiratory conditions such as emphysema.

(5) LOSS OF WILDLIFE HABITATS

Drastic loss of wildlife habitat (frogs, newts, toads, bats, woodpeckers, sparrows, starlings blue tits, foxes, rabbits and hares etc) is being treated like it doesn't matter. Britain has already lost half its wildlife, wildlife adds value and natural beauty to our environment and provides respite from everyday stresses. This development will decimate the local wildlife we love to watch.

I object to the proposed development plan on points _____1,2,3,4,5

Additional Comments

The local plan does not meet the *"Tests of Soundness"* due to the following:

1) The 2014 household projections are being used to set Warrington's housing targets, instead of the more recent 2016 projections. This greatly inflates the numbers for housing required and does not take into account major events that affect this number such as Brexit and the slowdown of life expectancy (as can be seen in this article published by the Office of National Statistics: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/lifeexpectancies/articles/changingtrends inmortalityaninternationalcomparison/2000to2016>). The plan is therefore not **justified** as it is not using the most recent figures and is therefore not evidence-based.

2) It specifies that a minimum of 160 homes are to be built in Burtonwood. Is this **justified**? I am **unable to find any evidence** to support that this minimum number of houses is required in Burtonwood. As the plan specifies a **minimum**, this means that developers have carte blanche to increase this as they wish.

3) In Policy OS1 – Burtonwood, sections titled **"Community Facilities"**, **"Open Space and Recreation"** and **"Transport and Accessibility"** are **not positively prepared** and therefore **fail the test of "soundness"** as they do not provide a strategy which as a minimum seeks to meet our objectively assessed development needs. These sections **do not provide any detail** as to how each of these will be provisioned for with the increased population provided by the extra housing.

The following excerpts have been taken from the local plan and I have underlined/ bolded the points that are open to interpretation and provide no specifics as to how each of this is going to be achieved:

"Community Facilities

6. The development will be required to make a **contribution** towards the provision of additional primary and secondary school places to meet the need for school places that will be generated from the development.

7. Development will be required to make a **contribution** towards the provision of additional primary

care capacity.

Open space and Recreation

9. Proposals will be required to make a **contribution** to expanding and enhancing existing or planned built leisure facilities and playing pitch provision that will serve residents of the development.

Transport and accessibility

13. A package of transport improvements will be required to support the development. Required improvements will include:

- a. Ensuring **appropriate access arrangements for the site**.
- b. Provision of cycling and walking routes within the site which connect into the wider existing footway network to the south and provide connectivity with the existing community.
- c. **Other necessary network improvements as identified by an appropriate Transport Assessment.** "

As a resident and part of the Warrington community, this leaves me greatly concerned that Warrington Council can produce a Local plan such as this- where this has not been properly thought through?! How can Warrington Council decide that a **minimum of 160 houses** are to built in Burtonwood **without properly calculating the extra support required for primary care and infrastructure? This makes me concerned for myself, current and the future Warrington Community.**

I agree to the above statements and reflect my views and those as coordinated at our local meetings that formulate our objections as to the proposed building plan.

Signed

[Redacted signature]

Date 9/

[Redacted date]

Telephone

[Redacted telephone number]

Letters of objection need to be with the Planning Officer before 5:00 pm on Monday 17th June 2019.