

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

(select one option only)

Figures and assumptions are stated to be based upon the SEP for Cheshire and Warrington. This was produced in 2014 prior to the UK decision to exit the European Union and this document is due to be refreshed and updated in response to new challenges and priorities. The government methodology has also been revised since the figures proposed in the plan were produced and I am unsure of the impact of this has. Furthermore there is a significant leap from the original plan proposing 500 homes per year to the now proposed figures. It is unclear what the proposals are for the employment space and what type of premises. Given current investment and scope within in Enterprise Zones, the Science corridor and sites such as Daresbury sci-tech the additional requirements on the scale proposed are unclear.

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

The plans appear unsympathetic to the areas around Warrington particularly where there is greenspace. The Government whitepaper emphasises that greenbelt should be protected and brownfield prioritised. It is unclear the extent to which brownfield has been considered and is in/out of scope for development. Also whether brownfield is not considered on a cost basis with greenbelt/green spaces being a more attractive development option avoiding land remediation costs. The numbers proposed would completely change the character of surrounding villages with boundaries becoming blurred. The physical geography of Warrington with the Ship Canal and the Mersey make it a potentially cost ineffective proposal to support the number of homes proposed with the level of infrastructure required. The Government white paper states that councils should work with neighbouring councils to consider housing needs being better met before looking to use greenbelt.

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

As previously stated this is unsympathetic to the character of the surrounding villages and a strain upon infrastructure. A potential new high level crossing identified in the plan over the ship canal where the current old railway bridge stands would transport significantly more volumes of traffic into an already problematic area. The Western link is proposed to deal with existing problems therefore it is difficult to see how a new road carrying additional traffic from the proposed homes and employment sites would be beneficial. It is stated that the infrastructure is needed to release the Greenbelt however the location for homes would present a couple of scenarios. Either that the residents of these homes would locate their for the motorway connections to Manchester and Liverpool in which case the additional road infrastructure into Warrington would not be needed or if these residents were to travel by road it will be into a congested area and the infrastructure it joins up with inadequate. It is difficult to assess what would be the beneficial impact upon Warrington and existing Warrington residents compared to the loss of green belt and other green spaces.

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

I understand the need to respond to the Government policy to build more homes however not on the scale proposed and am not supportive of City Status when this brings no tangible benefits to the residents of Warrington. Existing regeneration and investment in Warrington Town Centre is welcomed but this needs to be completed and in place to ensure Warrington can attract people and businesses and to be a desirable place to live and work. The scale of building proposed for the "Garden City Suburb" is unacceptable with the high level strategic road potential contradicting a desire to improve air quality by increasing pollution and commitment to health of warrington residents by destroying a very popular and well used trail along a significant stretch of the transpennine trail which provides a safe off road walking and cycling route and being part of a 200 mile stretch coast to coast trail. The homes this could potentially effect will force families out and even based on current values in Grappenhall will not buy an equivalent home elsewhere in Grappenhall. This forces people to move further out of the area impacting upon work commutes and proximity to schools attended by our children.

The plan does not seem to be forward looking or innovative and should seek to exploit opportunities to encourage

alternatives to car journeys into Warrington and low carbon alternatives such as cycleways and tramways. The proposed scale for "Garden City Suburb" is completely disproportionate to the number of homes already in the area which would have substantial environmental impacts through destruction of countryside, habitat and recreational space. A country park centrally located is a poor substitute for the current widespread and diverse network of woodland, pathways and fields.

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

To reiterate previous comments the proposals for South Warrington are completely unsympathetic to the area and the human factor and wellbeing of existing residents does not appear to factor. In particular if the proposed high level crossing were to go ahead there are potentially hundreds of existing homes would need to be demolished and there are many homes that will be in close proximity of a busy road causing noise and air pollution putting families health at risk. Families will be either trapped in the area or forced to move further afield to cheaper areas or take on greater financial commitments and strain in order to stay in the area but away from the negative impacts of the proposed development.

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

The underlying assumptions need to be revisited in line with new methodologies, potential impacts from Brexit and a refreshed SEP.

More innovative and low carbon and active transport solutions also need to be considered rather than a focus upon road and bus transport network in order to ease congestion into Warrington and provide better links from the proposed suburb areas to central rail infrastructure.

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

To reiterate previous comments the proposed scale is disproportionate to the existing make up of homes in the area. It is also unclear what type of housing is proposed and how this has been considered and how land and homes in the area which can command a premium can meet affordable homes criteria. There are many in Grappenhall as an example that cannot afford to move on to bigger homes within the area. The proposed transport and bus routes would require a significant amount of restructuring to overcome access issues particular for buses to regularly use some of the routes identified.

There is an unacceptable loss of greenspace and greenbelt and recreation areas particularly if there is to be any repurposing of the transpennine trail and railway bridge.

There is a significant number of homes in my area of Grappenhall that would be impacted significantly by any repurposing of the transpennine trail and many families have recently moved in to the area investing in their homes and the benefits of this will be lost in loss of value to homes and unable to move to an equivalent home elsewhere in the immediate area.

There are potential huge environmental impacts in relation to flooding where land that currently drains away water is built upon, waste disposal, pollution, loss of habitat and wildlife, loss of agricultural land provision.

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

The type of employment land and its strategic link to other initiatives and business/science parks is not clear. Also if future more automated warehousing space is to be accommodated this will not address and grow employment.

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

More innovative transport options that don't centre around road usage by cars and buses.

A more sympathetic assessment of the character of the areas where development is proposed and the impact of in some areas doubling the number of homes - a more proportionate approach should be considered.

Consideration of the type of houses that are needed - provision for an older population, affordable homes for those looking for the next move and bigger family homes, affordable starter homes (if people could afford to move into a bigger family home they would be vacating affordable first time homes). Also consideration for innovative low carbon

homes and waste disposal solutions.

Move away from city status aspirations and the required development to support this and a focus on the development that can meet growth aspirations while delivering real benefits to existing residents and their wellbeing rather than negative impacts and displacement of homes.

Greater exploitation of brownfield sites and unoccupied homes and unused/underused sites.

More sympathetic consideration of environmental impacts, preservation of habitats, wildlife and agriculture.