



24 September 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to express my concerns over the proposals raised by Warrington's local development plan. There are a number of areas that cause particular concern and which I believe have not been adequately considered by WBC.

1. **Ecological impact**- Have you consulted the woodland and wildlife trusts to assess the impact on the local wildlife? Are you going preserve as much of the woodland as you possibly can? Plant trees to compensate for the trees cut down? Will this plan involve the compulsory purchase of farmland and someone's livelihood?
2. **Road infrastructure**- It appears the current plans are based on Inaccurate urban statistics that were applied to suburban areas with little public transport infrastructure - 0.4 cars per household? Are you sure? These projections are fundamentally flawed, given that you propose to put an employment development area adjacent to the M56/M6 network. I invite you to look at the traffic that spills out of Birchwood at 5pm to gain for a more accurate picture of how it will impact and cause to further pollute the area.
3. **TPT** – I find it completely unacceptable that WBC believe it appropriate to develop the Trans-Pennine Trail into a road. My family and all of our friends use this facility every weekend, for walking and cycling. It is an essential part of community life and one that forms part of a wider country concern. To simply bulldoze the trail in favour of a dual carriageway, without any consideration for the impact on people's lives, as well as the impact on wildlife is simply ill considered.
4. **"New City"** - Do the residents of Warrington actually want it to become a city? Have you actually asked a single resident the question? Are these figures purely conjectured? The benefits appear to be a massive golden handshake for the council with little regard for the existing residents. Are you able to confirm where the aspirations for Warrington to be considered as "New City" lie? Having raised the issue with local residents this doesn't appear to be something over which there has been any consultation, or for that matter any desire to be achieved.
5. **Housing** - The proposed housing figure of 24,000. It's unclear where this figure has been taken from and appears vastly over inflated, certainly in light of current economic environment. It also does not appear to be a one stipulated by government either? The National Planning Policy

Framework indicates that established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”. You indicate on your recently issued document that you believe that these are “exceptional circumstances”, however your reasoning is certainly not clear. There appears to be a lack of willingness to consider Brown Belt land for development, in favour of destroying Green Belt, why?

The main criticism from the last consultation was a lack of cohesive planning. WBC should consider, very carefully, whether the benefits to the local economy and community outweigh the negative impacts outlined above. This development is too big and it is based on the assumption of significant economic growth, which is difficult to predict, particularly since we have not fully emerged out of the previous recession.

Once again I object strongly to the scale of the Local Plan and feel that at the present time there have been too many significant factors not given full and reasonable consideration, both in terms of environmental impact, as well as those on the current local population.

In addition I would wish to add that the apparent covert actions taken by WBC in relation to these plans and the consultation with local residents, has been extremely poorly managed.

I look forward to receiving your reply in due course.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.