

# Response 777

## Respondent Details

Information	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

## PART A - About You

1. Please complete the following: Please note the email address (if provided below) will be sent a full copy of the submitted response and a unique ID number for future reference (pdf attachment).

Name of person completing the form: Tanya Henry-Dormer

Email address: [REDACTED]

2. What type of respondent are you? Please select all that apply.

A local resident who lives in Warrington

A person who works in Warrington

Local Business owner/Manager

3. Please complete the following:

Contact details	
Organisation name (if applicable)	-
Agent name (if applicable)	-
Address 1	[REDACTED]
Address 2	[REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Telephone number	[REDACTED]

## PART B - Representation Form 1

1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? From the drop down list please select one option.

Draft Local Plan (as a whole)

2. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph (s) or policy sub-number (s)? Please select one option.

None of the above

3. Do you consider the Draft Local Plan is: Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No
Legally Compliant		
Sound		X
Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate		

4. If you have answered 'No' to any of the options in the above question then please give details in the box below of why you consider the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

I believe the Plan is unsound because:

Affordability of housing:

The housing crisis is one of affordability and not simply supply. Many houses planned for Green Belt are out of the reach of first-time buyers and elderly retirees, whom the developments are supposedly aimed at. We are increasingly allowing developers to cherry pick land to maximise their profits. Simply building on Green Belt land will not help those simply locked out of the housing market because of affordability.

For the impact on affordability to be significant, a very large number of the extra dwellings would have to be social dwellings supplied by housing associations or local authorities and this is not the case with the existing development plan.

Services and infrastructure:

Developers, the real beneficiaries of the proposed developments, should have a responsibility to fund new facilities, services and infrastructure needed to support their developments.

Building houses without proper consideration for supporting infrastructure and services – new schools, GP surgeries, dentists, policing, utilities, etc – will do nothing to boost the local economy.

Existing services are already inadequate for serving the current population of this area and the proposed developments will simply increase the burden. The Plan should not only include a detailed analysis of services and infrastructure needs, but should ensure that these are provided in tandem with the building of new homes.

Roads and congestion:

The lack of a detailed plan for dealing with traffic is unacceptable. The Plan states that "... issues will require further study and assessment over the first five years of the LPT4", but this is clearly too late. Transport and highways issues need to be resolved and in place before new homes are built. Retrospective works will cause mayhem for the new larger community and increase the overall project costs, especially considering the likelihood of repeated excavation for utilities that should be synchronised with construction.

We already suffer intolerable road congestion in the area. Existing access routes are not fit for purpose and congestion is only set to get worse. We need real and workable solutions to these problems now.

Furthermore, increased traffic throughput will cause even more damage to local roads, many of which are already in a poor state. The local authority already struggles to meet demands for repairing damaged sections of road and the extra traffic will put even more pressure on local authority budgets.

Green transport initiatives:

We live in an area, and at a time, where consideration for our environment is more important than ever, yet the development proposals do nothing to deter use of cars. The very large number of new homes, concentrated in a relatively small area, needs better, greener transport alternatives, and whilst LPT4 proposes investing in new walking and cycling routes, it does not provide an incentive for people to resist the temptation of driving.

Warrington needs a complete revamp of its existing road transport infrastructure, with a focus on both greener public transport and improving connections with other towns and cities in the region. Warrington is unique in its location between Liverpool, Chester and Manchester, but it falls far short in terms of connectivity and transport infrastructure. This is a detriment to businesses considering a move to the area and a will deter commercial use of the town centre and job creation.

Transport and related services cannot be planned once building has started as the necessary land will be gone, forever. Simply increasing the number of buses will only serve to put more vehicles on the road and increase the temptation for residents and visitors to use private vehicles instead.

Pollution and the environment:

The proposed new housing and industrial zones will lead to increased pollution through increased emissions, risking higher mortality and an increasing spectrum of illnesses now known to be caused by the ingestion of even low levels of toxic materials. This will be

particularly dangerous to children and vulnerable residents and will be seen as a direct and measurable correlation to increased traffic congestion on Warrington's already gridlocked roads.

#### Employment opportunities:

Employment opportunities created by both the housing and the industrial developments will be aimed predominantly at low wage workers. The new homes will be not be affordable to most of them as the affordability calculation takes no account of real local wages. Consequently, the majority of workers will be forced to travel from outside regions. This will offer no contribution to the local economy and will further increase the burden of traffic on our roads, in particular, increasing the throughput of heavy vehicles. In addition, during the building phase many of the jobs will be temporary, with workers laid off once building has finished. Also, the industrial zone strongly aligned to warehousing and logistics is a prime candidate for automation, with the inevitable resultant decline in numbers of human employees.

#### Green Belt:

The loss of our Green Belt is irreversible.

The Conservatives, in their 2015 general election manifesto, pledged to maintain Green Belt protection, and this has been repeated in statements by other senior politicians. In 2016, Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, stated in Parliament that the Green Belt is "absolutely sacrosanct".

Green Belt is there to benefit us all. The need for open green spaces is extremely important in helping us dealing with the daily stresses of modern life, providing us with recreational and educational opportunities, walking routes, nature trails and fresh clean air to breathe. Without Green Belt, we will all suffer from a lower quality of life and an impoverished environment.

Much Green Belt land is agricultural or has agricultural potential and provides a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection. We should be looking at ways to improve the livelihoods of farmers instead of allowing the closure of farms in the interest of expanding urban sprawl. It is understandable that any farmer would accept a sale price of ten times the value of their land from a developer who knows they can get planning permission because of an arbitrary, poorly researched Government directive.

Our priority should be to source suitable brownfield sites and focus on community-led schemes of genuinely affordable housing, including a higher provision of social housing.

#### Wildlife – flora and fauna:

Green Belt is home to a huge variety of local wildlife, including rare and protected species. These green spaces provide local habitats and corridors for the safe movement of our wildlife.

The Plan will ultimately result in wiping out many species, not only destroying local biodiversity but decimating species which are vital to food production. We are already feeling the impact of dwindling numbers of bees and insects through destruction of flora.

Large numbers of species are being forced into extinction because of our continual destruction of their habitats. For us there is always an option – we can find alternative solutions for dealing with the current housing "crisis"; for them there are no alternatives when their habitats are destroyed.

The Plan shows Internationally Designated Sites for local flora and fauna in and around Warrington, such as Rostherne Mere and other local nature reserves. However, wildlife does not simply exist in the areas we choose to designate as wildlife habitats out of a misplaced and naive sense of morality. Every small piece of woodland, every field, tree, hedgerow, pond, is home to multiple species and it is our duty to consider and respect and protect them.

Any proposal to destroy part of Moore Nature Reserve is absolutely unacceptable and must be stopped.

#### Flooding and water pollution:

Not only does Green Belt act as a carbon sink and protect our water supply by filtering nitrate from the soil, it provides drainage space for water to prevent flooding,

Building on green spaces with impermeable surfaces exacerbates surface water flooding. Properly managed green spaces can act as critical flood management systems by providing space for managed flooding, protecting built up areas.

Climate change is bringing an increased risk of flooding and Green Belt is now more important than ever.

#### Questionable reasoning:

According to the Plan, we must build on Green Belt: "... in order to meet our development obligations. If we don't, the Plan would not get through independent examination, in some cases, the Government could intervene and we'd lose control of the process."

The directives of a transient Government, particularly one that has made a U-turn on its vow for protecting Green Belt, are not sufficient reason for destroying our open spaces, cruelly destroying wildlife habitats and increasing the risk of creating housing zones so prone to flooding that they may one day no longer be habitable.

#### In summary:

A plan that puts developers first, provides only short-term benefits to workers and local residents, does not effectively deal with the pressing issues of inadequate infrastructure, threatens our local wildlife and green spaces, and increases our risk of severe flooding, is

██████████

## **I believe the Plan is unsound because:**

### **Affordability of housing**

The housing crisis is one of affordability and not simply supply. Many houses planned for Green Belt are out of the reach of first-time buyers and elderly retirees, whom the developments are supposedly aimed at. We are increasingly allowing developers to cherry pick land to maximise their profits. Simply building on Green Belt land will not help those simply locked out of the housing market because of unaffordability.

For the impact on affordability to be significant, a very large number of the extra dwellings would have to be social dwellings supplied by housing associations or local authorities and this is not the case with the existing development plan.

### **Services and infrastructure**

Developers, the real beneficiaries of the proposed developments, should have a responsibility to fund new facilities, services and infrastructure needed to support their developments.

Building houses without proper consideration for supporting infrastructure and services – new schools, GP surgeries, dentists, policing, utilities, etc – will do nothing to boost the local economy.

Existing services are already inadequate for serving the current population of this area and the proposed developments will simply increase the burden. The Plan should not only include a detailed analysis of services and infrastructure needs, but should ensure that these are provided in tandem with the building of new homes.

### **Roads and congestion**

The lack of a detailed plan for dealing with traffic is unacceptable. The Plan states that “... *issues will require further study and assessment over the first five years of the LPT4*”, but this is clearly too late. Transport and highways issues need to be resolved and in place **before** new homes are built. Retrospective works will cause mayhem for the new larger community and increase the overall project costs, especially considering the likelihood of repeated excavation for utilities that should be synchronised with construction.

We already suffer intolerable road congestion in the area. Existing access routes are not fit for purpose and congestion is only set to get worse. We need real and workable solutions to these problems now.

Furthermore, increased traffic throughput will cause even more damage to local roads, many of which are already in a poor state. The local authority already struggles to meet demands for repairing damaged sections of road and the extra traffic will put even more pressure on local authority budgets.

### **Green transport initiatives**

We live in an area, and at a time, where consideration for our environment is more important than ever, yet the development proposals do nothing to deter use of cars. The very large number of new homes, concentrated in a relatively small area, needs better, greener transport alternatives, and whilst LPT4 proposes investing in new walking and cycling routes, it does not provide an incentive for people to resist the temptation of driving.

Warrington needs a complete revamp of its existing road transport infrastructure, with a focus on both greener public transport and improving connections with other towns and cities in the region. Warrington is unique in its location between Liverpool, Chester and Manchester, but it falls far short in terms of connectivity and transport infrastructure. This is a detriment to businesses considering a move to the area and a will deter commercial use of the town centre and job creation.

Transport and related services cannot be planned once building has started as the necessary land will be gone, forever. Simply increasing the number of buses will only serve to put more vehicles on the road and increase the temptation for residents and visitors to use private vehicles instead.

### **Pollution and the environment**

The proposed new housing and industrial zones will lead to increased pollution through increased emissions, risking higher mortality and an increasing spectrum of illnesses now known to be caused by the ingestion of even low levels of toxic materials. This will be particularly dangerous to children and vulnerable residents and will be seen as a direct and measurable correlation to increased traffic congestion on Warrington's already gridlocked roads.

### **Employment opportunities**

Employment opportunities created by both the housing and the industrial developments will be aimed predominantly at low wage workers. The new homes will not be affordable to most of them as the affordability calculation takes no account of real local wages. Consequently, the majority of workers will be forced to travel from outside regions. This will offer no contribution to the local economy and will further increase the burden of traffic on our roads, in particular, increasing the throughput of heavy vehicles. In addition, during the building phase many of the jobs will be temporary, with workers laid off once building has finished. Also, the industrial zone strongly aligned to warehousing and logistics is a prime candidate for automation, with the inevitable resultant decline in numbers of human employees.

### **Green Belt**

The loss of our Green Belt is irreversible.

The Conservatives, in their 2015 general election manifesto, pledged to maintain Green Belt protection, and this has been repeated in statements by other senior politicians. In 2016, Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, stated in Parliament that the Green Belt is "***absolutely sacrosanct***".

Green Belt is there to benefit us all. The need for open green spaces is extremely important in helping us dealing with the daily stresses of modern life, providing us with recreational and educational opportunities, walking routes, nature trails and fresh clean air to breathe. Without Green Belt, we will all suffer from a lower quality of life and an impoverished environment.

Much Green Belt land is agricultural or has agricultural potential and provides a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection. We should be looking at ways to improve the livelihoods of farmers instead of allowing the closure of farms in the interest of expanding urban sprawl. It is understandable that any farmer would accept a sale price of ten times the value of their land from a developer who knows they can get planning permission because of an arbitrary, poorly researched Government directive.

Our priority should be to source suitable brownfield sites and focus on community-led schemes of genuinely affordable housing, including a higher provision of social housing.

## **Wildlife – flora and fauna**

Green Belt is home to a huge variety of local wildlife, including rare and protected species. These green spaces provide local habitats and corridors for the safe movement of our wildlife.

The Plan will ultimately result in wiping out many species, not only destroying local biodiversity but decimating species which are **vital** to food production. We are already feeling the impact of dwindling numbers of bees and insects through destruction of flora.

Large numbers of species are being forced into extinction because of our continual destruction of their habitats. For us there is always an option – we can find alternative solutions for dealing with the current housing “crisis”; for them there are no alternatives when their habitats are destroyed.

The Plan shows Internationally Designated Sites for local flora and fauna in and around Warrington, such as Rostherne Mere and other local nature reserves. However, wildlife does not simply exist in the areas we choose to designate as wildlife habitats out of a misplaced and naive sense of morality. Every small piece of woodland, every field, tree, hedgerow, pond, is home to multiple species and it is our duty to consider and respect and protect them.

Any proposal to destroy part of Moore Nature Reserve is **absolutely unacceptable** and must be stopped.

## **Flooding and water pollution**

Not only does Green Belt act as a carbon sink and protect our water supply by filtering nitrate from the soil, it provides drainage space for water to prevent flooding,

Building on green spaces with impermeable surfaces exacerbates surface water flooding. Properly managed green spaces can act as critical flood management systems by providing space for managed flooding, protecting built up areas.

Climate change is bringing an increased risk of flooding and Green Belt is now more important than ever.

## **Questionable reasoning**

According to the Plan, we must build on Green Belt: “... *in order to meet our development obligations. If we don’t, the Plan would not get through independent examination, in some cases, the Government could intervene and we’d lose control of the process.*”

The directives of a transient Government, particularly one that has made a U-turn on its vow for protecting Green Belt, are not sufficient reason for destroying our open spaces, cruelly destroying wildlife habitats and increasing the risk of creating housing zones so prone to flooding that they may one day no longer be habitable.

## **In summary**

A plan that puts developers first, provides only short-term benefits to workers and local residents, does not effectively deal with the pressing issues of inadequate infrastructure, threatens our local wildlife and green spaces, and increases our risk of severe flooding, is worse than no plan at all.

Now, more than ever, is the time to resist these arbitrary, unsupported directives and work as a community to find better, harmonious solutions that will benefit us all.

Warrington’s legacy to future generations deserves better than this.