

Dear Sir,

We are responding to the consultation on the above development option.

1. [REDACTED] The former railway embankment runs along the bottom of our garden. Part of the PDO considers a new road running along this embankment. The road is proposed to be a dual carriageway road. The embankment would need to be widened to accommodate this and consequently it is likely that our home would be subject to compulsory purchase. Had we known about this PDO rather than learning about it at such a late hour we would probably not have spent the near £40000 on upgrades to our home that we have just done.
2. The alternative proposal for this road is that the embankment be removed and a low level road be constructed. If this proposal was implemented then presumably a low level bridge would be required to cross the ship canal and this would need to be an opening bridge resulting in similar traffic flow problems we currently encounter with the Knutsford Road swing bridge. This is before the additional estimated 20000 per day vehicles are added to the mix.
3. Either road proposal for the embankment will have serious environmental impacts. We would lose part of the Trans Pennine Trail and the habitats this provides for flora and fauna. The air, noise and visual pollution residents would suffer during the course of this work will be horrendous. WBC air quality data shows that in 2013 4.8% of mortalities was due to particulates pollution slightly in excess (4.6%) of the North West average and accounting for 95 premature deaths. The 2016 Air Quality Detailed Assessment Report states that NO2 annual mean objectives for relevant receptors outside of current Air Quality Management Assessment areas have areas of concern including Knutsford Road and Latchford Village, the nearest locations to where we live. Monitoring site #7 shows that from 2012 to 2015 the NO2 air concentrations were above acceptable levels for 3 of those 4 years; 45 micrograms per cu.m in 2012, 45 in 2013 and 42 in 2015. As you are aware NO2 in the air is linked to health problems in asthmatics and other suffering respiratory illnesses including premature death. The Annual Average Daily Traffic figure for Knutsford road is 18706 of which 16852 are cars. If air quality is already a problem how will nearly doubling the traffic flow in the area improve matters?
4. The embankment is there because of the former railway that operated along it. If improved transport capacity is deemed necessary why not run a tram light railway along it. This could be extended to the town centre to terminate at the bus terminal opposite central station. It could be extended the opposite way to link into Altrincham station and hence provide a tram link to Manchester, the airport, and beyond to Bury and Rochdale.
5. The PDO proposes house building at the rate of 1113 houses p.a. over 20 years (para. 5.35, page 42). This equates to 22230 properties over this period + a 5% contingency of 1113 + 847 backlog amounting to 24220 houses. How reliable are these estimates which are well in excess of what the council deemed necessary its 2014 Local Plan before it was quashed in the High Court following objections from developers? Has the potential impact of Brexit been factored into these new estimates?
To realise these numbers the PDO estimates that 15429 houses can be provided from current urban capacity resulting in 8791 needing to be built on green belt land. Around 6000 of these homes are planned to be built in South-East Warrington Why is SE Warrington having to bear the brunt of this new development? It appears that the area between Stockton Lane and the motorway will be turned into giant housing estates. Is this what the residents of SE Warrington want? From the meetings we have attended the answer is a resounding no. The PDO proposes a building density of 20 homes per hectare. This would necessitate 300 ha of green belt being sacrificed + a further 251 ha for employment land compared to the 130 ha of urban land. This density of building will result in homes of an executive standard being built and these will be outside the reach of those trying to get on the housing ladder. If the density was 30 homes per ha then 200 ha would be required reducing the loss of green belt by 33%. This could allow for a mix of housing types to be erected and help local people achieve their aspiration of home ownership. We should not forget those young people from South Warrington who have had to move north of the ship canal as they could no longer afford to live where they were raised even though they may have wished to do so.
6. The loss of green belt land is a serious concern to us. We chose to live in South Warrington because it is semi-rural but close to the town centre and its amenities and equally close to the full rural features of this area of Cheshire. Like

many who live here we have no aspiration to live in a city unlike it appears the borough council. We question just whom this PDO is intended to benefit.

The 2016 Green belt Assessment , GBA, conducted by Ove Arup & Partners Ltd on behalf of WBC found that the development of green belt land east of Barleycastle Trading Estate for employment allocation was vetoed by the UDP inspector in 2014. Will current proposals be any more successful? The current plan would seem to contravene paras. 79 and 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF, that outline the fundamental aim of the green belt and its 5 purposes one of which is "to assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment". The NPPF is very clear that local plans should only alter green belt boundaries in exceptional circumstances. The GBA report concluded in para 28 that permanence of green belt is of imperative importance. The Fiddlers Ferry area could well become available following decommissioning of the power station in a few years which would allow much of the proposed development to be achieved without this disastrous desecration of our green belt in SE Warrington.

7. The planned development would appear to be driven by employment needs rather than natural population growth. How confident are the planners that this level of employment will be realised and will be of a type that will meet the housing available. The Omega development and the proposed Amazon operation coming to the town are low wage occupations. Will such employment opportunities support the development growth proposed.

We understand that Warrington will continue to grow but we are far from convinced that the PDO as it currently stands meets the needs of it current residents.

[REDACTED]