

LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION

The sheer scale of this plan is most concerning, particularly when the future needs of the town cannot accurately be predicted and it would not be wise to assume that growth in the future will result in jobs similar to those in the present with advances in technology happening at such a pace.

I do wonder whether your repeated use of the term 'City' puts into perspective the real objectives of this plan and explains the massive scale of your proposal.

With the number of additional properties proposed the only certainty is that Warrington Town centre and surrounding areas would become gridlocked.

Around 5 years ago Warrington Council announced there was no need to build any further houses in the Appleton area for 15 years as demand was satisfied.

Then again in an article in the Warrington Guardian dated 25th June 2015, the Leader of the Council Terry O'Neil stated "we exceed our housing targets year on year". I would be interested to know how you reconcile these statements with your plan to build another 24,000 new properties.

The latest population figures for Warrington given by the Office of National Statistics in 2015 is 206,000, if you assume an average of 3 persons per household that would be an increase of 72,000 people which represents an increase of 35% on present numbers.

The latest population figures in December 2015 for Appleton, Appleton Thorn and Lymm totals 32,900. In this area you propose a further 7,774 new homes and again assuming 3 per household that would increase the population by 23,300 an increase of 71%.

During the New Town Development expansion of 1981-2001 the population growth at this time averaged 0.58% per year, increases nowhere near what is now being proposed, yet it was a huge expansion of Warrington overall and led to an enormous increase in traffic flowing into the town each day. 24,000 homes could easily result in a further 40-50,000 vehicles on the road and even with the changes you propose I do not believe the road system will be able to cope with that number the case has been made for.

In conclusion I do not believe that this level of building and the subsequent loss of green belt land, and any plans should be markedly downsized. I would also suggest you cease to use the term 'City' as your continual usage suggests obtaining this status is the driving force behind this plan along with the increased revenue from Council Tax from a further 24,000 homes.

[REDACTED]