

9th September 2017



Dear Sir,

RE: WBC Local Plan. Preferred Development Option Reg 18 Consultation.

Following my attendance at both the Lymm and Stretton consultation meetings I wish to formally document my objections / comments as follows:-

Consultation

The public consultations appear to have been very poorly advertised. In fact I have seen no official advertisement of these sessions at all. I also feel that the timing of these sessions to take place during the summer holiday time to be very poorly thought out.

The information given to me when asking the same questions at both of the sessions I attended conflicted greatly. As an example; the advisor I spoke to in Lymm informed me that the infrastructure needs to be in place before the houses are built. In Stretton I was informed that the infrastructure improvements would be rolled out after the houses have been built. How are the general public able to form an opinion of the plan if your advisors seem to not know themselves what is happening?

Housing Requirement

I strongly believe that the requirement for housing should be re-assessed. Since these calculations were performed there has

been a decision made that we will be leaving the EU.

There has also been confirmation that Warrington will not have a HS2 stop. I believe that both of these decisions would have a reducing effect on housing requirements.

I am also dismayed at the amount of green-belt land that WBC are proposing to build upon. The reasoning for this is unclear. The National Planning Policy framework states that established Green Belt boundaries can only be changed in 'exceptional circumstances'. What reason do you have to qualify for this criteria? This land has great agricultural and environmental benefit as well as providing a fantastic local amenity and wildlife habitat.

South Warrington appears to be disproportionately impacted by the housing plans. WBC therefore appear to have used the average density of housing in these areas for their calculations. This is not a typical area. It is also a more expensive area to live and would be unaffordable for the majority of Warrington's population. Calculating the space required using a more realistic density figure would further reduce the quantity of greenbelt land required.

Transport

Warrington's roads are currently at breaking point. Solutions to the constant traffic chaos are required now. Waiting 15, 20 or even 5 years is ridiculous. Public favour would be increased by resolving real issues for real people in the short-term.

Even with improved transport links the increased air pollution that many thousands more cars would bring to Warrington would be intolerable. Warrington is already ranked the 2nd highest for air pollution levels in the North West according to the 2016 study by the World Health Organisation. This high pollution already causes many health issues for Warrington's already stretched health.

services to deal with.

TRANS PENNINE TRAIL (TPT)

The TPT is a real local asset. It both attracts and is used by many. The trail also forms part of the National Cycle Route.

When we moved to this area a substantial requirement for us was the availability of public green space in the locality of our property. We are keen walkers and also have two pet labradors who require significant opportunity to exercise.

The trail and also the disused rail line area currently owned by ADS also provide habitat for many species of wildlife in the area such as bats, badgers and foxes.

The TPT is not wide enough in its current state to be repurposed as any sort of transport route. The considerable work required to clear out and widen the area would bring

significant blight to existing properties in the area; giving many home owners no choice but to continue to live in an area that they no longer love. A political nightmare that would give particular advantage to any leader promising to scrap these plans.

Other Infrastructure

Why do WBC consider it acceptable to put this additional burden on to Warringtons already overstretched and under resourced infrastructure? Schooling, public transport, community healthcare services and hospital care are all currently crippled by public demand. I understand that the hospital are being left to decentralise their services in order to meet the proposed population growth. How can that be OK?

NHS Dentists are another concern; in addition to GP surgeries. There are zero NHS dentist availability and a national shortage of G.P.s. Why are you proposing to significantly add to this burden?

I'm sure, given the lack of publicity concerning this preferred development option that you were not anticipating the level of public response you are receiving. I'm sure you'll agree that there are some serious lessons to be learned from this exercise. Not least of all the impressive under-estimation of your residents love, passion and concern of their homes, lifestyles and neighbourhoods.

Finally, and not least of all, a serious review of the representation of your residents needs to be undertaken. Both Latchford East and Latchford West residents have been left high and dry during this consultation as our Parish Councillors have conflicts of interests in relation to their roles within WBC. Local surgeries have been cancelled without notice; phone calls ignored and inability to leave messages as there's no active voicemail facility and emails unresponded to for days on end. Why are such conflicting interests and practical inefficiencies allowed to exist? Who is failing to monitor performance in these areas?

I sincerely hope that you listen to the strength of feeling that is no doubt evident in the responses received at this time. Maybe if there weren't so many gaps, blanks and holes within the PDO the public wouldn't have to fill these areas in themselves!

Yours faithfully.

