



Hi,

Please be aware of my thoughts as below:

Option 2 of the PDO seems to be based on a desire to build Warrington into a city, this isn't for the benefit or the need of the town. In advance of any PDO decisions, this should be independently assessed and agreed by the local population.

Environment and health considerations – we need to ensure our air quality meets current regulations and stays at the right level to keep the health of our population and particularly our children well. Building on more green space, along with additional traffic and extra roads will cause issues in this key regard. The additional population of the town would need to have access to medical facilities. Warrington hospital is already struggling to meet Govt targets, and there doesn't seem to be any plan for how this will be dealt with. The proposed link road through Thelwall and Grappenhall will also take away a much used trail, which at the present time encourages walking, jogging, cycling etc - where will this go that is in easy distance (the proposed country park is much further out for many – and puts more local cars on the road, making the situation even worse)?

Calculation of housing need – I believe this should be reassessed based on the May 2017 addendum rather than out of date figures. Also using the standard housing needs calculation it comes in at nearly 5,000 less houses than stated in the PDO, and pays no attention to probable changes to need based on Brexit, technology changes, changes in employment and availability of sites. Govt only supports increasing over the standard calculation formulae numbers if WBC can show they can increase employment and jobs in the area. However the main additional industrial and warehousing in the PDO will create low level roles, not suitable for purchasing one of the proposed new housing stock, and will not have a high level of employee numbers per unit. WBC needs to create better paid employment opportunities rather than allowing construction of warehouse estates

A 20 year plan is not needed by Govt., it is acceptable to have a 10 year plan for which there are sufficient brown field sites now, and over time others will naturally be created as industry and businesses move, and so negate the need to use green belt sites at this stage. There is no evidence that Warrington will have the economic growth to sustain and justify the number set out as needed in the document and it is important not to plan ahead based on the unknown.

Greenbelt land was classified as such to form the natural boundaries between towns and villages, to prevent urban sprawl, and provide habitat for wildlife. Only in exceptional circumstances can it be reclassified and I cannot see where those circumstances have been justified. It is so important to maintain the separate identity of each of the South Warrington areas (Grappenhall, Thelwall, Appleton, Appleton Thorn, Stretton) and not

have them all put together as one whole as all intervening land is used and so the character irreversibly eroded. The Prime minister declared only several months ago that retaining the greenbelt was "paramount" and I would agree that this should ONLY be considered as a very last resort, and be the WBC's preferred option.

The regeneration in the north of the town and the town centre are not mentioned in the plan. It is vital that Warrington as a whole is considered, what is being done to improve life for those North of the Manchester Ship canal?

Traffic is a major issue already in Warrington, and these plans with the preferred option do not look to help alleviate this. Additional housing will bring more vehicles onto the roads. The routes through the town centre are constantly congested, there are no easy ways to help with this. The new proposed link road from the Motorways (whilst very little information has been made available about this) will only encourage more traffic to use our local roads as a way around the over used local motorways, to the detriment of local residents, schools and population.

The local consultation has not adequately given the Warrington residents opportunities to be fully informed and involved. There is a common law duty of fairness and any residents will be potentially worse off they should be contacted by letter / telephone, e consultation was over the summer holiday period with many missing their "local" meeting due to be away. Within the actual consultation meetings, the information given was poor, the maps were illegible, the information given by the planning officers at the meetings was conflicting, , there has been no or very limited paper access, no data collection at the meetings, and no notes taken of comments / questions

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

A black rectangular redaction box covering contact information, likely an email address or phone number.