

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Resident in Warrington.

I wish to register my disagreement with the document titled preferred Local Plan preferred development option issued by Warrington Borough Council in July 2017.

My fundamental points of disagreement relates to the release of greenbelt land to enable the construction of the Garden city suburb and the Warrington South West extension.

I generally disagree with the redesignation of any greenbelt land to facilitate the construction of more homes in the general warrington area.

I cannot find any extenuating circumstances that makes the release of greenbelt a requirement now.

I do support the imaginative use of the brownfield sites that currently exist within the Warrington area to increase the supply of housing as required by the growth of the indigenous population of Warrington.

I do support the imaginative use of alternative transport systems to allow the movement of people around Warrington, tram system, light railway, water bound transport.

The principal issues I wish to raise with you Are outlined below.

1. Throughout the document local plan preferred development option, there is a desire to create a city status for Warrington, I do not believe there is any mandate to create such a city status. Nor do I believe that the case has been made as to why South Warrington should be sacrificed for what appears to me to be a political objective. How is the population of South of Warrington been properly consulted in relation to this?

2. I cannot concur with the growth targets that have been set, I believe these are far in excess of those required to support the growth of the indigenous population of Warrington.

I believe that if more homes are required to support the growth of Liverpool, Manchester and Chester, these homes should be built in those cities and that South Warrington should not be turned into a dormitory suburb of those cities.

3. Other towns and cities throughout the north-west are constructing their own local plans, I do not believe there has been sufficient consultation and understanding of where the jobs are to be created to support the growth in these towns and cities. Once this is understood where the growth is to be created in employment only then can it be determined where additional homes are required. It is quite ridiculous to grow Warrington if the growth and employment is to be in Liverpool Manchester and Chester. This will only lead further congestion of local roads and the motorway is leading to those cities.

4. I believe that it is in the best interest of Warrington too in the first instance concentrate its development effort in the Renaissance of the town centre and surrounding districts by a program of Brownfield development. The development of 15,000+ new homes on the available brownfield site should be the current priority. An understanding of what scope A redevelopment of the Fiddlers Ferry powerstation site could add to the brownfield growth of Warrington should also be factored in.

Until all brownfield sites have been redeveloped no Greenbelt site should be redesignated as development land. The brownfield sites provide significant scope for the growth of Warrington on those sites and a real life testing of the growth targets that are currently being used to extrapolate a trend that purports to require the re-designation of greenbelt.

I do not believe today is there any exceptional circumstances that require the re-designation of greenbelt for development. Only when the brownfield sites have been fully developed can it really be determined if any exceptional circumstances exist for greenbelt release.

5. The current LDPDO if it were to be implemented would destroy the amenity of South Warrington and create a sprawling suburb as the green belt that makes South Warrington such a great place to live is destroyed.

6. The development of South Warrington has significant infrastructure challenges, already the motorway junctions on the A49 and poplars 2000 are heavily congested how could these cope with an additional 6000+ homes in the South Warrington area. South Warrington also has three significant water barriers between its residential location and the town centre of Warrington, each of these water barriers creating a pinch point at which traffic will inevitably become congested. These water barriers create a disincentive for those people who are resident in South Warrington to use Warrington town centre for recreation and leisure and retail shopping. The existence of these water barriers should make a strong argument against The development of South Warrington.

7. If any greenbelt requires redesignation after all available brownfield sites including Fiddlers Ferry have been developed then surely this redesignation should take place in North Warrington north of the M 62 and close to the already existing retail areas and employment areas that exist along that motorway corridor.

8. The tollbridge is to be created over the Mersey would also mitigate against the development of South Warrington, more traffic will inevitably be forced through the centre of Warrington (toll-free) and out of the Thelwall viaduct. This would make travel to Liverpool and Central and North Manchester even more problematic than it is today from South Warrington.

9. I would support a development plan for Warrington that saw investment in the existing infrastructure and some visionary investment in modes of transport other than road and car. Surely this is the opportunity with The redevelopment of substantial areas of Brownfield sites both along the banks of the Mersey in Manchester ship canal and in central Warrington to think about enabling transport via, tram, light railway and use of the water courses available. There is a golden opportunity to develop a far more integrated and passenger friendly future for Warrington. Sadly I see no such ambition in the plan that is being presented as the preferred development option.

I have tried to summarise my thoughts as to why I cannot support the current local plan preferred development option. I'm sure you will take these in the constructive manner they are intended.

Yours sincerely,

