



The 20 year period of the plan seems excessive and various factors (e.g. effect of Brexit) may mean that this leads to, for example, the unnecessary destruction of greenbelt. A shorter time period would remove the perceived requirement to put Warrington's natural environment in jeopardy.

It would also allow time to see if various other factors come into play before destroying green belt etc. These factors include the change in methodology (Consultation section 2.10) and the potential redevelopment of Fiddlers Ferry (section 4.13)

Section 2.26 would appear to show that a 20 year plan is excessive

Section 2.7 I do not feel that it is acceptable for us to damage our environment and put additional strain on our infrastructure to function as a dormitory town for the Liverpool City Region.

Section 2.28 Green Belt Assessment. Regrettably the link to Arup's document was not working

Section 4.6 the pipe dream of becoming a city is joined with the pipe dream of solving infrastructure problems

5.51 When are these discussions ,with Parish Councils, going to take place – is there a schedule? – will be tricky as most don't meet again until September

5.22 It is disturbing that the reality of the Peel Hall development, objected to by most residents and environmental organisations seems to be regarded as a fait accompli

Figure 9 The areas of green belt scheduled for destruction just show the actual areas to be built on. The figure does not show the additional areas to be destroyed for roads and other infrastructure. Presumably the people living in the developments will be coming and going- adding to already congested routes.