



Dear Sirs

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

The Public consultation was without adequate advertising and held throughout peak holiday season – in fact if I the lady down the road had not knocked on my door or had not been on Facebook, I would have known nothing about this – and the proposed new road in question runs next to my property!

The Public consultations have been 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. This has also included the use of outdated and unclear maps when presenting plans at the public consultations and made so confusing that nobody really understands it properly.

Conflicting answers have been given to the same questions asked at the Lymm and Stretton public consultation meetings. If representatives are unable to get the councils message across consistently, what hope does the public have to digest and comprehend the limited information being supplied – which again goes to my point above regarding unclear maps!

The Council have mislead 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. This is unreasonable of the council to base calculation of the housing requirement on figures produced and needs to be looked at again:

- o pre Brexit announcement
- o when it was believed that the HS2 line would require a stop in Warrington
- o recent Government announcement of revised housing requirement calculation methodology.

There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses – the

Fiddlers Ferry land option should be explored thoroughly as this is a huge area for regeneration and there would potentially enough area to meet a reduced housing requirement, therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve existing green belt land – the implications not only for local residents, but for the wildlife that live there is catastrophic.

The majority of the proposed housing to be located in the least densely populated and more expensive areas of the town. This makes no sense at all as most of the residents will most likely commute to work which then leads to traffic issues. In 2016, a World Health Organisation stated that Warrington was recorded as 2nd in having the highest pollution levels in the North West. This has a massive impact on our health and mortality. I moved from [REDACTED] to Warrington [REDACTED] years ago because of the greenbelt areas here and moved into our present house [REDACTED] years ago to maximise the fact that we have the TPT on our doorstep and to be closer to green areas – I might as well move back to [REDACTED] if your proposals go ahead – and I am sure I am not the only one feeling like this. I feel it all goes ahead, it will be regretted very much in the years to come and then it will be too late!

If there are 24,000 new dwellings (as you propose), that means up to 48,000 more cars (as most houses these days have at least 2 cars). This somehow seems to contradict your claim to take air pollution and the subsequent health implications seriously ! And whilst we benefit from our proximity to the motorway network around us, we all know what happens when Thelwall Viaduct is very busy! How will 48,000 more cars help?! Our roads are already at capacity! I do support the need for more infrastructure but feel that but feel that the costs outweigh the benefits in the routes that you propose, from increased pollution, noise, environmental destruction, falling house prices as well as CPO's for anyone in the way!! We need more affordable town centre dwellings and increased investment in our public transport system.

While it may appear convenient for the council to repurpose the railway embankment, there must be various considerations –

- o state of disrepair of the high level bridge
- o integrity, form and strength of the embankment
- o destruction of wildlife/protected species habitats
- o Heritage and preservation of local history e.g Knutsford Road bridge cited in the Unitary Development plan as being of significant local, architectural and historical interest.
- o Destruction of TPT amenity which is currently a well-used nature path utilised by walkers, runners and cyclists and part of the National Cycle Route Network.

I also feel that Warrington becoming a city will destroy neighbourhoods and

the community feel which attracts and retains residents in the areas around Warrington. We are so lucky to live in a beautiful place like Warrington – being close to cities but still having the lovely villages that surround it, together with the greenbelt areas – do you really want to destroy this?

Another worry is what about schools, dentists, doctors and of course Warrington Hospital – which is already overstretched. When we moved here [REDACTED] years ago, we could not get into any local doctors because they were full and so had to go to Stretton Medical Centre – what will happen with 24,000 new residents?

I absolutely love where I live and I want to stay here and bring my children up here and I feel that you need to review your plan, taking into account all the points mentioned above and remember that once all this has been done, there's no going back – we want to welcome new people here not send the original residents moving somewhere else – we want to be proud of where we live!

Your sincerely

[REDACTED]

