

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir,

Wanington 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 was held without adequate advertising and held throughout peak holiday season. The process has not been inclusive due because of the lack of Access e.g. What facilities could the visually impaired use to view the maps at Lynnn or the Park Royal? Where could the physically disabled sit while waiting? How could the deaf communicate their concerns? What alternatives were there for the elderly, disabled and others without access or ability to use technology?

- The consultations were held before the feasibility study results were 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.

- Throughout the consultation outdated and unclear maps were used.

- Members of the council were misled resulting in misleading the public to believe that the volume of housing required is something set by Government when it is WBC who have calculated the volume requirement.

- Whilst I do appreciate that additional housing is needed, it is unreasonable of the council to base that calculation of the housing requirement on figures produced using outdated information. There has been a lack of attention paid to the recent Government announcement of a revised housing requirement.
- There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses. Potentially enough to meet the reduced housing requirement. Therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve existing green belt land.
- The White Paper 'Fixing our broken housing market', 7 Feb 2017, paragraphs 1.24 & 1.25 calls for making as much use as possible of brownfield land and to limit the pressure on the countryside
- Most of the proposed housing is to be located in the least densely populated and more expensive areas of the town. These would be expensive properties and provide the highest council tax.
- A 2016 study by the World Health Organisation Warrington was recorded as having the 2nd highest air pollution levels in the North West. This has a direct impact on health and mortality. Why would anyone want to further increase this?
- The proximity of the M6 and M56 to the proposed housing development would increase the already horrific traffic problem in the area. When there are difficulties on either motorway the area becomes gridlocked. This is frequent. Even on a normal day the area is at a standstill.
- The TPT, is a facility used by people from all over the region and wider. Does it even belong to WBC? Destruction of this amenity, a well loved nature path utilised by walkers, runners and cyclists and part of the National Cycle Route Network would create a major loss of a facility which contributes to the well being of the area.
- The blight to surrounding houses and neighbourhoods would destroy the community feel which currently attracts and retains residents in the area.
- The PDO document attempts to justify why Option 1 has been discounted and why Option 2 is the preferred. Where are options 3, 4 or 5?
- There is a national shortage of general practitioners, indeed many people currently living in South Warrington travel to the North to access theirs. There is no plan to address this. Where are the proposed plans to action increasing community care? The hospital already has difficulties coping with the present population, how would hospital based facilities cope with an increased population?
- The local schools have limited availability for extra pupils, has provision been made to extend the facility when there are only 2 high schools in the area and the primary schools have little capacity.

I hope that you take the points raised in my letter into consideration during the consultation period.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]