

Warrington Borough Council
Planning Policy and Programmes
New Town House
Buttermarket Street
Warrington
Cheshire
WA1 2NH

5th September 2017

Dear Sir

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:

- It is unreasonable for the council to launch a public consultation without adequate advertising.
- It is unreasonable for the council to hold their poorly advertised public consultations throughout peak holiday season.
- It is unreasonable for the council to select a preferred development option and hold public consultation meetings prior to the infrastructure feasibility study results being 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.
- It is unreasonable for the council to use outdated maps when presenting plans at the public consultations.
- Conflicting answers have been given to the same questions I asked at both the Lymm and Stretton public consultation meetings. If your representatives are unable to get the councils message across consistently, what hope does the public have to digest and comprehend the information being supplied?
- It is unreasonable for the council to lead the public to believe that the volume of housing required is something that is out of their control when it is actually themselves who have stipulated this 'requirement'.
- It is unreasonable of the council to base their calculation of the housing requirement on figures produced pre Brexit announcement which will have a reducing impact on this calculation.
- It is further unreasonable of the council to base their calculation of the housing requirement on figures produced when it was believed that the HS2 line would require a stop in Warrington. Now that this is not the case, this would also have a reducing impact on this calculation.
- There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses. Potentially enough to meet a reduced housing requirement should this requirement be recalculated using current figures. Therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve existing green belt land.
- It is unreasonable for the majority of the proposed housing to be located in the least densely populated and more expensive areas of the town. Houses in this area are on average £120,000 more expensive than elsewhere in the town. Whilst housing in these areas will be unaffordable to those who need it most however will of course, bring in a considerably large amount of money into the council coffers by way of Council Tax.

- In a 2016 study by the World Health Organisation Warrington was recorded as having the 2nd highest air pollution levels in the North West. These levels contribute to 5% of the towns' mortality rate each year and are also proven to increase cases of heart disease and cancer. Why are the council looking to increase this risk by bringing at least another 24,000 cars into the area (assuming a minimum of 1 per household)?
- While it may appear convenient for the council to repurpose the area of disused railway now known as the Trans Pennine Trail, what thought has been given to:
 - The current state of disrepair of the high level bridge near Latchford Locks
 - The integrity of the disused line and degradation of its' form and strength following any required de-vegetation
 - The incumbent wildlife – foxes, badgers, bats and owls are among the species present along this area and face having their habitat destroyed
 - Heritage and preservation of history in the area e.g the Knutsford Road bridge is 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 not to mention being part of the National Cycle Route Network
- If the existing Trans Pennine Trail were to not be used as a road but was utilised as an extension to the existing tram route from Altrincham there is a concern that an increase in anti-social behaviour would be experienced by housing nearby transport stops and stations.
- Any development of the Trans Pennine Trail would bring considerable blight to surrounding houses and neighbourhoods and destroy the community feel which attracts resident to the areas within 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 onto Station Road does not appear to consider the inadequate weight limit of that bridge or that Peel Holdings are (and always have been) reticent to sufficiently maintain the bridge. Peel Holdings are notorious for being a profit hungry and money-grabbing organisation who I'm sure would love Warrington Borough Council to pay through the nose to assist them in performing the bare minimum restorative and maintenance care should they wish to utilise this crossing.
- The Preferred Development Option 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? Your representative at the Stretton consultation meeting suggested the detail is contained in other supporting documentation but why is this not in the PDO document along with options 1 and 2?
- Your representative at the Stretton consultation meeting stated that Warrington Hospital has been fully involved in the plans however they appear to have now been brushed aside to decide how best to fragment the service that they provide between their locations. This will surely place a significant burden on an already over stretched and under resources service.
- What consideration has been given to secondary care? There's a national shortage of general practitioners. How are the extra GP surgeries required to support this population growth going to be manned? Or will it be that existing GPs will move to them, therefore decreasing the capacity of existing surgeries to provide a service for existing residents? What about community carers, Hospital prevention team and mental health practitioners etc?

Yours faithfully

[Redacted Signature]

[Redacted Name]