



To whom it may concern,

Re: Warrington Borough Council Local Plan. Preferred Development Option Regulation 18 Consultation

I wish to object to the current Preferred Development Option for the following reasons:

- The public consultation progressed without adequate advertising and was held throughout peak holiday season. There needed to be a better advertised process to provide full public awareness.
- The public consultations have been held prior to the completion and presentation of the infrastructure feasibility study results. Council representatives have been unable to answer whether the feasibility study is taking place on all five reported options or just the preferred development option. More clarity is needed here before moving forward on any of the preferred development options.
- The use of outdated and unclear maps when plans have been presented at the public consultations has not allowed the public to see the true reality of the PDO.
- There has been conflicting answers given to the same questions at the Lymm and Stretton public consultation meetings. If representatives are unable to get the council's message across consistently, what hope does the public have to digest and comprehend what limited information is being supplied?
- The council have misled the public in stating that the volume of housing requirement had been set by Government. Our understanding now is that Warrington Borough Council has calculated the volume required. Furthermore, the foundation of the PDO calculation has not factored in the following considerations:
 - The pre-Brexit announcement
 - HS2 requiring a stop in Warrington
 - The recent Government announcement of revised housing requirement calculation methodology (May 2017)

With these considerations in mind, I believe that the volume of housing requirement has been grossly over exaggerated and therefore should be re-assessed alongside an alternative PDO.

- There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses. Potentially enough to meet a reduced housing requirement. Therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve

existing greenbelt land. Especially if you take into account the Fiddler's Ferry site which will be decommissioned in the next 10 years.

- The majority of the proposed housing is to be located in the least densely populated and more expensive areas of the town. This will provide less affordable housing but does provide the council with higher council tax revenue.
- The 2016 study by the World Health Organisation recorded Warrington having the second highest air pollution levels in the North West. With the addition of housing comes the addition of cars and this will only add to pollution levels. The current PDO does not address how the council will manage the additional traffic and pollution levels added with the increase of housing. Before agreeing to go ahead on the PDO, a clear strategy should be set by WBC in a addressing and controlling pollution levels.
- While it may appear convenient for the council to repurpose the railway embankment, what has not been taken into consideration is:
 - The state of disrepair of the high level bridge
 - The integrity, form and strength of the embankment
 - The destruction of wildlife/protected species habitats
- Heritage and preservation of local history e.g. Knutsford Road bridge cited in the Unitary Development plan as being of significant local, architectural and historical interest. Destruction of the Trans Pennine Trail amenity which is currently a well-used nature path utilised by walkers, runners and cyclists and part of the National Cycle Route Network.
- Considerable blight to surrounding houses and neighbourhoods, destroying the community feel which attracts and retains residents in the areas around Warrington.
- The consultation and online documents do not adequately explain what happens with the 'strategic transport route' once it reaches the bridge at Wash Lane.
- The 'strategic bus route' over Cantilever Bridge does not consider inadequate weight limit of that bridge. Who will pay for the essential upgrading, ongoing maintenance and basic caretaking of this bridge?
- PDO document attempts to justify why Option 1 has been discounted and why Option 2 is the preferred. No mention of options 3, 4 or 5.
- Representative at the Stretton consultation said that Warrington Hospital is fully involved however they appear to have now been sent away to decide how best to fragment services. Increased population will place a significant burden on an already over-stretched and under-resourced service.

I look forward to your response and confirmation that my legitimate objections have been properly considered and addressed in any subsequent plan(s).

Kindest regards

