

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern

Ref:- Preferred Development Option Consultation

We object to the above Preferred Development Option (PDO). It appears to be a wildly inflated proposal to satisfy a WBC whim. The recent revised national formula, which estimates 5000 fewer homes are needed, should now be used to inform a totally revised proposal and feed into the final plan.

The consultation process has been inadequate with complete lack of engagement with the electorate that it will affect, until the recent flurry of publicity and public meetings; some set up only after additional pressure had been brought to bear. The choice of consultation period over summer holidays appears to have been chosen to reduce the likelihood of responses which shows a complete disregard for the public. The limited time allowed for consultation means that it is impossible for the average resident to fully check and consider the data in the PDO and respond as they would have liked.

The PDO presented suggests that developers, with their vested interest and therefore skewed perspective, have had far more say than any of the council tax payers. This has resulted in a costly plan option that no resident can support. The detail behind the development of the option has been lacking so the figures quoted cannot be tested easily by readers of the PDO. There is no economic rationale for the exaggerated numbers suggested in the option to go for the 'top' rather than the 'just right' requirement. There is now far too many economic uncertainties due to the ongoing, and likely to be protracted, Brexit negotiations that have led to slower economic growth than hoped. This surely will impact on Warrington's ability to attract business investment and makes somewhat of a nonsense of this inflated option. Indeed there are already many industrial units in the town that are unoccupied. Efforts to fill these should surely be made within the PDO rather than suggesting more employment land is needed.

We are uninspired by the idea of a 'garden city'. Warrington has a town and suburbs, and outlying villages, some of which are fairly rural and should remain so.

Countryside is essential to the well being of the population and infill between suburbs and villages takes away this benefit and robs the communities of their unique identity. The site identified for the 'garden city' means that Warrington town will suddenly expand to the M6/M56 borders, decimating green belt and resulting in less 'green lung' space for the population. The town centre itself requires substantial improvements with near derelict blocks, for instance at Bridge Foot the entrance to the town from the south, being a poor welcome to prospective visitors including those who may have wanted to invest businesses.

We have focused on south of the town as this is nearer to ourselves and have not had time to consider the implications elsewhere in the plan. In particular with regards to the Lymm area, we were told by WBC employees that the areas of green belt identified will not all be required to provide the estimated 500 homes within the village boundaries in the PDO, but are 'expressions of interest' from landowners and developers. The revised formula suggests that 5000 less houses are needed than predicted by the PDO, so there consequently should be less impact on Lymm as fewer houses, if any, will be needed. The WBC should work with the local Parish Council to identify the least destructive way to introduce these, if indeed the number required can be substantiated and is not part of inflated figures for the town as a whole. Certainly the infrastructure must be considered urgently. The local schools are already over subscribed and it is difficult to get first choice of primary school, and even difficult within families to get younger children into the same school as their siblings. Doctors appointments can take up 2 weeks in either of the 2 practices that currently cover the village. Without more facilities for parking within the village and more adequate public transport, any additional homes with 2 cars each will not help village shops to survive as people who can, will travel to places where parking is not an issue. The village car parks are currently rationed by charging but this does not support the shops in the long run.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.