

Dear Sir

Warrington Borough Council Local Plan. Preferred Development Option Regulation 18 Consultation

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

- Public consultation without adequate advertising and held throughout peak holiday season.
- Public consultations being held prior to the infrastructure feasibility study results being completed and published. 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.
- Use of outdated and unclear maps when presenting plans at the public consultations the map presented to me at the consultation omitted to show the proposed “strategic” High level link from Thelwall to Latchford
- Conflicting answers have been given to the same questions asked at the Lymm and Stretton public consultation meetings. If representatives are unable to get the councils message across consistently, what hope does the public have to digest and comprehend the limited information being supplied?
- 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.
- Unreasonable of the council to base calculation of the housing requirement on figures produced:
 - pre Brexit announcement
 - when it was believed that the HS2 line would require a stop in Warrington
 - recent Government announcement of revised housing requirement calculation methodology.
- 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,
- 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?
- There are cabinet office guidelines laid down that public bodies have a responsibility to widely engage all interested parties in any development consultation process, however the Trans Pennine Trail have confirmed that they were not contacted over the PDO by yourselves but instead were informed by a member of the public. This is clearly a breach of your responsibility and highlights that the process has not been conducted

properly. For that reason alone the PDO should be suspended or scrapped and a more inclusive process initiated with ALL interested parties.

- While it may appear convenient for the council to repurpose the railway embankment considerations do not appear to be addressed what are your thoughts about the following
 - - state of disrepair of the high level bridge
 - integrity, form and strength of the embankment
 - destruction of wildlife/protected species habitats
 - 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
 - There are several colonies of bats living on and around the TPT and the high level Bridge spanning the ship canal , how are you going to protect these within the PDO.
 - There is mains gas pipe running over the Ship canal on the Latchford high level bridge, has the cost of tunnelling under the ship canal to rehouse this gas link been costed into the proposals ?
- Considerable blight to surrounding houses and neighbourhoods and destroy the community feel which attracts and retains residents in the areas around Warrington.
- The consultation and online documents do not adequately explain what happens with the 'strategic transport route' once it reaches the bridge at Wash Lane.
- The 'strategic bus route' over Cantilever Bridge does not consider inadequate weight limit of that bridge. Who will pay for the essential upgrading, ongoing maintenance and basic caretaking of this bridge?
- 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?
- Representative at the Stretton consultation said that Warrington Hospital is fully involved however they appear to have now been sent away to decide how best to fragment services. Increased population will place a significant burden on an already over-stretched and under-resourced service.
- Following on from this the proposed provision of one new secondary school for does not address the potential requirement of schooling provision in the new conurbation. Furthermore Two existing schools would be impacted by the proposed High Level by-pass further undermining school provision in Warrington.
- Can you confirm what feasibility studies have been undertaken to access the increased flood risk of the PDO, Warrington is already a high risk area and the Environment Agency issued flood warnings as recently as last week in Three areas of Town. The removal of Moore Nature reserve which naturally absorbs millions of gallons of rain run off as well and the increased run off from 24,000 dwellings and associated businesses will increase the flooding problem not just in Warrington but also higher up stream on the Mersey during the inevitable high spring and autumn tides. What work has been done in the PDO to identify and calculate the increased risk and consequent cost.
- It is suggested that a large scale programme of Tree planting will be undertaken to mitigate the increased rain run off from the new developments , has the council conducted credible studies to determine the number of and what type of trees that will need to be planted and can confirm that these plantations will be fully established and matured prior to an development to mitigate the environmental impact of such a huge development.

- Could you confirm if a company called ARUP has been used by the council in the preparation of the PDO ? If so what was the due diligence undertaken by the council to ensure there was not conflict of interest as it is being widely reported that this company has got strong links with parties involved in the development phase of the PDO. Is this correct ?, or can you hopefully confirm that this is not the case ?

I Look forward to your response on the above points.

