

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Comments on Warrington's proposed Local Plan 2019
Date: 12 June 2019 20:08:30

Objection to Warrington's Local Plan Proposal as presented 2019.

Dear Sir,

My name is [REDACTED]

Warrington's existing infrastructure is already stretched to cope with the amount of traffic it has to handle and there are occasions when the capacity is exceeded. One such example is when traffic over flows from one or more of the three surrounding motorways caused by a major incident and drivers use the town's roads seeking to find a route around it. The proposed Local Plan includes for <19000 houses and large industrial sites to be built which I believe will result in further traffic congestion. The infrastructure to support the Plan will without doubt need a significant amount of funding and I have concerns about where it will come from. I also believe that there are elements within it that have severe flaws which make it undeliverable and unsound.

I would therefore like to lodge my objections to the town's proposed Local Plan for the following reasons.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that all the infrastructure will be built in advance of the development works thus avoiding the traffic situation worsening.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that the funds for the complete Plan are available, so as to avoid the risk of a half finished job leading to utter chaos.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that the valuations for the proposed major projects are accurate. In particular the Western Link and the high level crossing of the Manchester Ship Canal between Stockton Heath and Latchford. It has been estimated by independent professionals that the Western Link could cost as much as double that being given by the Council.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that detailed plans have been made to ensure the continued flow of traffic where new roads meet existing ones, this includes both internal roads within the town and major roads leading away from it. Examples being traffic from junction 10 of the M56 (using the proposed Garden Suburb Southern Strategic Link) where it meets the A50 at Grappenhall and also traffic crossing the replacement high level bridge across the Manchester Ship Canal between Stockton Heath and Latchford.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that any consideration has been made as to the significant effect on the lives of residents, both future and existing. Health and welfare effected being due to Noise, Vibration, Air Pollution, Light Pollution and Danger to pedestrians and

cyclists. Particularly where the infrastructure passes through or adjacent to existing housing estates. Mainly

<!--[if !supportLists-->6) <!--[endif-->

<!--[if !supportLists-->7) <!--[endif-->caused by HGV's using them 24/7 as through traffic or from the new proposed industrial estates. Eg The Garden Suburb Southern Strategic Link route.

<!--[if !supportLists-->8) <!--[endif-->There is no evidence that explains why the Council contradicts its road layout proposals. In some areas it is planning to build 40 metre wide dual carriageways around the Garden Suburb yet the Western Link crossing of the Manchester Ship Canal is a single carriageway. The Council is saying that the Western Link will be the main artery around that side of the town in the future, surely that design is not consistent for such an aspiration. I suggest that there is a reason for this which has not been disclosed, could it be that the cost would be so high they wouldn't find funding and this would put at risk the route for the road from Port Warrington. So something is better than nothing?

<!--[if !supportLists-->9) <!--[endif-->There is no evidence that any effective plans are in place to reduce the already high level of air pollution in the town. It is likely that it will go even higher as a result of the increase in traffic which will come from there proposals. On this subject why are there no sensors to record pollution levels in the South of the town. Could it be that the Council doesn't take the matter seriously or is it another example of their attitude to that area of the town.

<!--[if !supportLists-->10) <!--[endif-->There is no evidence that there is any logic in the assumption that the number of cars will be reduced in the Garden Suburb area by people walking or cycling. This area is the highest point in the town with an increase in elevation of 200/300 feet from the town centre. Are people really expected to climb these hills?

<!--[if !supportLists-->11) <!--[endif--> There is no evidence that there will be sufficient affordable houses for people who will be employed in the proposed industrial estates in the area. If one was to calculate the number of jobs which we are told the industrial areas will create, there is a shortfall. Langtree claim that their estate will create 4100 jobs and Stobarts 600 = a total of 4700. The target for houses in the Garden Suburb is 5000 so given that builders have to supply 30% of that total as 'Affordable' then that figure is only 1500. Therefore around 3200 workers will have to commute into the area and so add to the traffic numbers.

<!--[if !supportLists-->12) <!--[endif-->There is no evidence that given the track record of bus services in the town there will be an adequate, long term or efficient system provided to reduce the number of residents using their own transport.

<!--[if !supportLists-->13) <!--[endif-->There is no evidence that any bus service will be able to ensure timely links for commuters with ongoing connections (trains, buses) because of the risk of delays due to ships travelling along the Manchester Ship Canal (MSC). It should also be noted that the owners of the Canal have a target to increase the throughput of containers going down it by ten-fold. This will increase the number of operations of the swing bridges and cause additional hold-ups.

<!--[if !supportLists-->14) <!--[endif-->Further to (13). There is no evidence that the Council has any control on the operation or maintenance of the MSC swing bridges nor can it predict their lifespan. They are life lines connecting the South of the town to the North and were built in the 19th Century and were not designed for the type of traffic or amount they are currently carrying. Their

maintenance and reliability is already heavily criticised and should any of them suffer major failure the consequences would be catastrophic for the town. It is absurd that a private company has such an influence over the day to day life of Warrington.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->15) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that to show justification for releasing Green Belt for development, a proposal which contradicts the Government guidelines.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->16) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that the Council's excessive estimate for the requirement of houses, beyond official National Forecasts, is justified.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->17) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that the effect on the new Mersey Gateway Bridge has been considered, especially with the `rat runs' the Council proposals will create enabling drivers to avoid paying the tolls for this bridge. An example being the new bridge about to be built over the Mersey from Bank Quay Station to Chester Road. A route will then be available for traffic to travel from the West (Liverpool and Widnes) across this bridge and then down Gainsborough Rd, through Stockton Heath along the A49 to Lyons Lane traffic lights then along Witherwin Ave to Grappenhall Lane and then to the M6. To make matters worse along the last section this road will pass three schools in Appleton and Grappenhall Heys. What cost to the health and safety of hundreds of children?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->18) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that sufficient emphasis has been made to prioritise brown field development before green field sites are built on.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->19) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that due consideration has been given to the timescales proposed for the opening of the industrial estates in Appleton Thorn. Eddie Stobart is expected to be open within the next two years, way before any infrastructure will be built. This will result in major traffic problems in the interim period.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->20) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence why the building of the previously mentioned industrial sites at Appleton Thorn (Stobart and Langtree) are being considered ahead of the acceptance of this Local Plan which is an unacceptable presumption, something which was stated as a reason for rejection of Eddie Stobart's original application to build their sort centre at Appleton Thorn.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->21) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that the Appleton Thorn Neighbourhood Development Plan has been considered or adhered to. Langtree suggests that because of the Local Plan the NDP is out of date and should be ignored. It took several years to complete and for them to suggest that it should be disregarded is outrageous. If they are so concerned about this are they prepared to put the whole process on hold until it is re-written? That would seem to me to be the fair response to their claim.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->22) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that the economic growth figures are justified.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->23) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that a detailed ecology report has been written.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->24) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that sufficient thought has been given to the effects of building an industrial area in South Warrington which is totally out of keeping with the existing environment.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->25) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that consideration has been given to building an industrial estate where the transportation of goods and materials is a key part of its purpose and should

include a rail link in accordance with the Governments intentions for such a facility in the future.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->26) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that consultations have been made with ALL the neighbouring Councils to share developments.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->27) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence that any financial provision has been made for the extra buses and the backup support for them (depots and maintenance) which is required for the plan to attract residents to use public transport. At £100k for a 50 seater bus it is going to cost many millions of pounds to transport even 15% (33,000 – the Council's target) of the estimated population (220,000). Then there are the other ideas mentioned in the Plan such as light railways and guided buses etc., what is the cost of these and where is the funding coming from?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->28) <!--[endif]-->There is no evidence for the effects on the unique individuality of villages in the area. Appleton Thorn, Walton, Grappenhall and Stretton.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->29) <!--[endif]-->There are no definitive plans to build additional crossings of the three waterways which separate South Warrington (the Bridgewater Canal, Manchester Ship Canal and River Mersey) from the North. This contradicts the Councils aspirations to attract people into the town's centre. How can the existing roads carry the extra residents living in the 7000 additional houses they want to build together with people commuting to work in the proposed industrial units in Appleton Thorn?

<!--[if !supportLists]-->30) <!--[endif]-->Where is the evidence for the claim in the Plan that there are benefits for having an industrial estate near to the South Eastern Neighbourhood Centre?

Conclusion.

My wife and I and our daughters and their families are delighted to live in [REDACTED] it is a lovely place. It has its problems which mainly revolve around the amount of traffic there is and we were hoping that the new Local Plan would make some positive moves to improve things. All in all my conclusion to what has been announced is that not only will the state of the roads deteriorate but also our quality of life and the plan to build industrial estates such as the 6/56 [REDACTED] will make the situation dramatically worse.

I hope that the above points have clearly shown that for multiple reasons this plan is unsound and undeliverable. It lacks thoroughness and accuracy and is based on speculation rather than fact. It also has a significant financial risk to it which could ultimately put the viability of the town in danger. It unfairly targets the South of the town with the majority of the developments, ruins the aspect of that area and overstretches it with totally inappropriate infrastructure.

This submission is an amended version of the one I sent yesterday which should be ignored. Could I be sent an acknowledgment of receipt of this submission please?

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Supplementary submission from William Mack regarding Warrington Council's Local Plan
Date: 17 June 2019 09:59:05

Sir

Further to my recent submission regarding the Warrington Council's Local Plan I would like to add the following. Given SSEs recent announcement that Fiddlers Ferry Power station will close down on 31/3/2020, it is my believe that Warrington Council should, with immediate effect, review its Local Plan where it intends to build an industrial estate on Green Belt land in Appleton Thorn and look into using this Brownfield land instead. The Fiddlers Ferry site is larger than that in Appleton Thorn and has been already been classed as an area which can be used for industrial purposes. It would replace the devastating plan to ruin what is commonly regarded as one of Warrington's most beautiful areas together with the catastrophic effects on the existing traffic congestion problems.

Yours sincerely [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: Local Plan
Date: 15 June 2019 10:25:19

Dear sir

As a follow up to my submission on the Local plan could I ask that I receive an invite to attend any public hearing that takes place with the Government's Inspectorate on this matter please.

Kind regards

[REDACTED]