

F

[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

Firstly, I would like to comment on the inadequate - or complete lack of any official communications around a - the plan and b the consultation period. If it had not been for community action I would have had no idea about the plan and proposals and been unable to exercise my right to respond. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I find this totally unacceptable and can not help but feel that WBC has completely failed in their civic duty and role as public servants. This feeling has been completely compounded when looking into the proposals and many seemingly conflict of interests with certain property companies involved. Aside from an inadequate consultation period being morally and ethically wrong, there are legal requirements and I can not help feel that this has been a tick box exercise on behalf of WBC designed to pass with minimal public response.

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

1. On a very basic level , this plan appears to profit driven with commercial interesstes and not with the intereste of current or future residents at its heart. There is no Government requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if long-term ONS statistics exist.

2. On a very personal level, we live in Warrington precisely as it is NOT a city and chose to live in a greener and more rural environment. What value can being a city bring to current residents and indeed future residents?

3. Public consultations have been held prior to the infrastructure feasibility study results being completed and published. The 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. I am aware of plans to build infrastructure to relive added traffic but can not help but feel that motorway network is already at capacity - the Thelwall viaduct and associate stretch of M6 is nationally notorious.

4. It is misleading of the council to let 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.

5. It is unreasonable of the council to base the calculations of the housing requirement on figures produced:

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

calculation methodology.

In addition, the financial implications of Brexit are unknown to all and it would be short sighted to start such extensive development works without clear national financial implications. Nobody wants to live in a building site - I have lived in an area of regeneration before that was halted by a recession and as such know only too well how recessions impact upon the building trade. WBC should produce a ten year plan, by which point we will be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impact from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). It would also allow for the decommissioning of Fiddlers Ferry and so the availability of an enormous brownfield site requiring regeneration.

6. There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses. Potentially enough to meet a reduced housing requirement. Therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve existing green belt land. The extent of the plan on greenbelt is aggressive and completely unnecessary. The greenbelt is an integral part of happy and healthy lifestyles, studies have shown the impact of listening to the sounds of nature on mental health - there are immeasurable implications.

7. I believe that the urban environment and town centre as it exists at the moment is not fit for purpose. As well as ensuring infrastructure is in place for any development, I fully believe that a full scale town centre regeneration would need to take place in order to attract residents and business to the area. However, this needs to be done sensitively and appropriately conserving the traditional histories character of the town and not by bulldozing and paying developers for soulless new builds.

8. The majority of the proposed housing to be located in the least densely populated and more expensive areas of the town. Unaffordability but high council tax implications - again profit driven.

9. A 2016 study by the World Health Organisation Warrington was recorded as having the 2nd highest air pollution levels in the North West. Impact on health and mortality. Why would the Council wish to increase this further? I certainly don't want my young family to grow up in a 'garden city' which negatively impacts upon health.

10. While it may appear convenient for the council to repurpose the railway embankment, there are many considerations:
state of disrepair of the high level bridge
integrity, form and strength of the embankment
destruction of wildlife/protected species habitats
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.
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 - this is a huge leisure resource for many local residents. My family use the TPT on a weekly basis for walks and bike riding - if this was lost it would mean more cars on the road to access similar surroundings which is completely counter productive.
Considerable blight to surrounding houses and neighbourhoods and destroy the

community feel which attracts and retains residents in the areas around Warrington.

11. I bought my house due to its semi rural locations. Whilst I may not be affected by a CPO - a new road would be visible from my house, the noise pollution would be significant and the value of my house would most certainly decrease. What plans are in place to compensate? financial value can not be placed on the value of a family home.

12. PDO 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?

13. There is no recognition of alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements.

- The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the OAN and affordable housing requirement.
- However the PDO is stated to be "Option 2" – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a "new city", it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town.
- The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The particular assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above the OAN and do not appear logical, consistent or robust.
- Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC, and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield boroughs and housing areas.
- All the economic initiatives highlighted under the EDNA such as Cheshire devolution and HS2/HS3 will, if they ever come to fruition, be needed just to provide jobs for the natural increase in the population, they are not a justification for even more housing.
- The projections used are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum. The Plan should be based on an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations.
- In addition, the housing requirement should be based on a calculation of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data underpinning the Government's September 2017 proposals for a nationally consistent approach.
- Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to Needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. There appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact lifestyles and working practices, an issue not unique to Warrington. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required, let alone where it should be.

14. In addition to all of these points, I wonder how the social and emotional impact of these proposals; and the ensuing planning on residents will be taken into account. I for one, have already endured high levels of stress and anxiety surrounding the uncertainty of my immediate wider neighbourhood.

I could go on.

I look forward to hearing your response to my concerns.

Kind Regards

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the sender's name or signature.