

I would be grateful if you could consider the following points:-

There has already been a substantial area of greenbelt that has been lost. Lifting the area from greenbelt has no practicality of being reversed and the damage to the environment, the local area, the character of the area, and the benefit that Warrington as a whole derives from the greenbelt in it's current form would, in my view, present a strong case in isolation for the local plan being flawed and not sound.

Additionally, there is already disruption to key junctions and cross roads in the area which result in queues and pollution. Whilst I do not have any data on the pollution levels to hand, the damage is visible, the smell is noticeable and the disruption is already cause for concern. The junctions which would already appear to be severely problematic, consistently at rush hour, and additionally intermittently when there are issues associated with the motorway, diversions or events in the area generally, include:-

London Road/Stretton Road;

A56/London Road;

Wilderspool Causeway;

A56/Lumb Brook Road;

Bridge Lane/Lumb Brook Road;

B5356/A50; and

B5356/Barleycastle Lane.

In addition to the issues with congestion and pollution, the area is currently popular with walkers and cyclists. Frequently school groups/children are observed undertaking orienteering and Duke of Edinburgh type tasks. The increase in development will limit the opportunities for this.

Warrington is not a town that is isolated. It is surrounded by motorways and features 2 significant interchange junctions. The pollution must already be at concerning levels and, particularly in respect of the Appleton/Stretton/Grappenhall area there is presently at least some land that will afford some reprieve from the pollution, allowing the same to at the very least dilute slightly by the greenbelt and the open land, but should development, as proposed, be afforded in the area this open area the opportunity for the pollution to dilute, will be lost.

Additionally, due to the proximity to the motorways, the traffic in Warrington is frequently, on a weekly basis, substantially increased as a consequence of closures and delays associated with the motorways.

Too much greenbelt has already been lost in the Warrington area, and there must, at some stage, come a point where it is not sustainable to exclude more land from the greenbelt. I understand that the data driving the proposed requirement for additional housing and development is over 5 years out of date. There have been significant changes in the last 5 years, including reduced birth rate, less people movement driven by COVID-19, work from home arrangements, long distance learning and I respectfully ask that the data is re-assessed before taking the irreversible decision to commence the local plan and remove additional land from greenbelt.

Additionally, there is a significant amount of wildlife that does not thrive in urban areas, and has already been congested into what little remains of the greenbelt. I briefly list below the wildlife that is commonly sighted, in order of the most frequently sighted and fear that this will be lost should the local plan be allowed to proceed: buzzards, pheasant, heron, bats, fox, peregrine falcon, badgers, owls, kingfisher. Has any consideration has been given to these members of the community and the benefit that they afford to the current residents.

Finally, I cannot see a persuasive need for the additional housing on the basis of what appears to be old data. It is already evident from the developments that have taken place on former greenbelt that the housing is not consistent with what was proposed and, instead, represents a significant profitable opportunity for developers and others who may have a stake in the land, in homes England, or in the development companies. There very much appears to be alternative motivation for lifting the area from greenbelt, along these lines, than what is contained within the local plan.

I am very grateful for you considering my objections.

Kind regards

Alex McBride