



Dear Sir / Madam

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

- **Concerns over calculation of land needed for new housing and employment over the next 20 years.**
 - Volume of housing projected in the plan currently exceeds that of the government target – are these aspirations deliverable and realistic?
 - Housing completions in Warrington over the last 10 years have generally been in the range of 500-700. The new local plan proposes a housing figure of 1,113 dwellings per year.
 - In light of economic uncertainty following Brexit are these projections still relevant?
 - Does the Local Plan demonstrate that the jobs and infrastructure, can and will be provided to support the proposed housing figure?
 - On what grounds are these increases justified? We understand that Warrington has strong economic growth aspirations but how will these be realised?
 - I would like transparency on the Council's duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. Many residents in South Warrington commute to workplaces outside of the town so arguably the housing need could/may be met elsewhere e.g. Cheshire East, Trafford, St Helens, Halton etc.
 - I would also like to understand why it is deemed appropriate to develop the majority of housing in one particular area (ie WA4).

- **Specific concerns over transport and infrastructure in the Preferred Development option, including potential use of the Trans Pennine Trail as strategic transport route**
 - Have transport impacts been properly assessed?
 - What level of transport modelling has been completed at this stage in relation to the new 'strategic road / public transport route' - has only been modelled in strategic modelling software (i.e. SATURN)?
 - What future technologies considerations have been taken into account in the planning for infrastructure? - Have the implications of changes in car ownership, Connected and Autonomous vehicles (CAV) technology implications and the subsequent need/type of infrastructure(s) likely to be required? (how has this been factored into the transport modelling?)
 - Have the Highways England strategic modellers been involved in the transport modelling and agreed the scenarios / parameters being considered in the modelling? Are they satisfied with the modelling outputs and the potential impacts on the 'Strategic Route Network' / M56
 - What air quality impacts (any Air Quality Management Zones in the vicinity?) and noise implications have been considered at this time?

- The overall housing need figure needs to be reviewed due to the Government's consultation. If less housing is needed, or different types of dwelling are needed, the overall housing figure could be reduced, and thus loss of Green Belt can be mitigated.
 - Planning Policy advocates a Town Centres First approach to development. The local authority should seek to first develop in urban areas and brownfield land, with Green Belt only being released under exceptional circumstances.
 - Large proportion of the proposed house building to be located in the least densely populated and more expensive areas of the town. Density projections are relatively low and affordability likely to be an issue. Do these proposed dwellings take account of societal changes e.g. increase in single person living, aging population etc?
 - How will the Council protect existing neighbourhoods and villages? – this is encouraging Urban Sprawl
- **Other Issues**
 - Is this really deliverable and have the infrastructure needs been properly assessed. Eg impact on Schools?, 1 additional high school for such a development? Impact of the NHS and Warrington Hospital
 - Concerns over funding
 - No details on funding routes for infrastructure requirements which will be significant
 - No details on funding routes for schools and health care provisions
 - Calls for sites map on page 11 of the concept document – coverage appears to be patchy. Does the council have confirmation from landowners of other parcels of land that they will be made available?
 - Is a holistic approach to masterplanning evident? Or will we end up with a piecemeal development that fails to deliver infrastructure?
 - Grappenhall Heys development was severely criticised in the Urban Task Force reports for this very issue.
 - Where is the up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment on the supporting documents page? There are a number of main rivers in the area.
 - Has the Environment Agency been involved in preparation of the concept document?
 - For completeness the topography and watercourse map on p18 of concept doc should also show Flood Zone 2 and areas a risk of surface water flooding.
 - The Local Plan and concept documents use the word 'sustainable' many times. Yet there doesn't appear to be any demonstration of how sustainable development will be ensured. For example there doesn't appear to be a strong commitment to public/active transport.
 - **Concerns over the consultation process**
 - Many residents only became aware of the Local Plan and preferred development option following grassroots local residents campaign
 - Lack of advertising, holiday period, not held in are affecting local residents
 - Inconsistent information provided across meetings
 - Public consultations being held prior to the infrastructure feasibility study results being completed and published. Council representatives have been

unable to answer whether the feasibility study is taking place on all 5 reported options or just the preferred development option.

Yours Sincerely

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

Resident