

[REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern.

With regards to the PDO you have devised for Warrington and its surrounding towns and villages. I find I need to ask a few questions and to add my thoughts.

Whilst I understand there is, and will be, a need for further housing in Warrington, I can't understand why in these plans, you seem to have put most of the Urban sprawl to the south of Warrington. Especially to the south side of the Manchester Ship Canal. The current PDO shows just how much everything is all one sided. Why is there limited new building to the north of Warrington? Given the surrounding Green Belt areas surrounding the M62 corridor? Surely, there should be an equal amount of building in and around Warrington?

Also, how can you have considered the upheaval of so many families with the placement of one road, and find any justification of the displacement of, so many families? I am talking about the proposed strategic road that crosses the A50 and joins the Trans Pennine Trail at Thelwall before crossing the Ship Canal at Grappenhall/Latchford. At the meeting in Lymm your representative couldn't even say whether this route would be a single road, a dual carriageway or even a bus route. And you wonder why people are upset? More recently the level of disinformation seems to have increased, as in a recent statement from the Council, that this was added for illustrative purposes only. However, this proposed route is marked on multiple maps and diagrams in your Proposed Development Option. If this is not to be used surely you should consider removing this from any future plan, thus reducing the blight you have placed on all the properties adjacent to this 'Proposed' route.

This road, given its route would take in the part of the embankment that borders the most houses, and if (and it no doubt will) the embankment needs widening or removing to increase the incline to the bridge, a lot of houses would fall under the need for a compulsory purchase order, or, that their value would decrease given its proximity to the said new road. But you find this perfectly acceptable? How many of these families have the means to buy a new house? Given that most of the new build houses will either be more expensive or more likely not have been built, as the infrastructure would need to be in place before the building could begin, i.e. the new road. This route will also remove a highly valuable wildlife corridor, and a huge area of land used by people to walk in the countryside, it will also destroy a huge swathe of that countryside.

The people of Weaste Lane will also suffer under the proposed route of this road. All the houses that run anywhere near the proposed route now in limbo, unsure and unable as to whether they can sell, or stay in their own homes.

The route that the proposed road will take, will destroy a wildlife corridor and haven, a popular stretch of the Trans Pennine Trail, and destroy an old crossing of the Bridgewater Canal. For what? Easy access to a high-level approach to the railway bridge? The destruction of a major part of the community. The destruction of a wildlife habitat and a busy walking, cycling, running route.

The continuation of the Embankment in Latchford? Surely this should be utilised as a linear park and extension of the Trans Pennine Trail? Freeing up the land on the former Beers site for new Canal side

buildings? Also, the widening and strengthening of the Cantilever Bridge in Latchford could accommodate the need for a high-level bridge, taking out the need of the new Strategic Route. As the land was purchased for this use decades ago and never actioned on.

This road, given its possible route from joining at the A50 would eventually reach Warrington at Bridge Foot, an area that you already admit is beyond its capacity, and are planning the Western Link road to bypass. So why would you find it acceptable to filter traffic from the two main A roads, onto a road that reaches the same place? Surely a bypass would cross Warrington, to join up at the Western Linkway? Cutting out the bottleneck of Bridge Foot? Also, given the extra traffic from the new Garden City that this route would create would only compound the problems?

Also, why has this plan fixed most of these new build houses to the south of Warrington. Now, most of the road holdups occur during peak hours and increasing the amount of traffic coming from the South of Warrington, would seem to just add to the ongoing problems, including pollution levels caused by the addition road traffic. Warrington already suffers from increased levels of air pollution.

Can you also explain as to why you said in the factsheets handed out at the Lymm meeting, that you had entered into agreements between local communities, local interest groups and local businesses, and yet, no one in my area had any notification of said meetings, or knew of these plans beforehand? Also, these meetings were held in the main weeks where most of the people who needed to be there, were on their holidays or were working in the limited times you held them. Can you also advise me as to why, the plans are accessible online, though not the easiest to find? And given that a lot of people with limited access or no access to the internet would have no notice at all of these plans?

Can you also explain as to why, no meetings were held in Grappenhall, Thelwall or Latchford, when this road and the new Garden City Suburb will directly affect them? And why they were also held when the Local Councillors were unavailable.

Warrington Borough Council has shown a blatant disregard for the people they are supposed to represent who live in these areas.

You say that the Green Belt areas to the South of Warrington are the poorest performing areas? Can you explain as to how you've come to that conclusion? How can the land to the North of Warrington be deemed less desirable for building on? Or better performing for that matter? Also, the limited infrastructure that you have added to these plans would not be in place alongside these buildings. Meaning the already oversubscribed health and education needs of these areas would become unsustainable. Local families are already facing difficulty in getting their children enrolled into the schools that their siblings attend. How will this be covered in the short to mid-term?

How much provision has been made for affordable housing in these plans? Or assisted living for an ageing population? Can you say whether these houses in the Garden City or South-East Extension will be open for first time buyers, or lower income families, as we know how high the housing cost is to the South of Warrington!

Why have you chosen to use so much of the Green Belt? Given that brown sites are supposed to be prioritised? Or is it that Developers and Land Owners have more say in the production of these plans, than the population of Warrington and its surrounding areas?

What provisions will you have in place to stop the use of any more Green Belt land? You have opened so much already, and in the call to open the Green Belt you admit you received more than you need. Also, the current PDO for the Garden City has a 'SAFEGUARDED' area of land. That will be opened for development if needed. Given that this land is around two thirds as large as the proposed Garden City, that has the possibility of adding 4000+ more houses to the Grappenhall / Thelwall area. What provisions are being made for the increase in traffic and population here?? Why, given the size of

Warrington, are you continuing to plan more houses in this area? Increasing congestion, increasing the need for more infrastructure building, increasing the pollution threats etc.

There are already plans in Grappenhall, Thelwall and Walton for building work that is being considered. Why then are these houses not included in the 24000 that you say are needed? Also, given that these plans were created from data provided pre-Brexit, how has that figure now changed? And, how much funding will be lost as we withdraw from the EU and any money that was forthcoming from them, now will not arrive? Will we, as Warrington residents be forced to pay by increases in Council and Business Rates?

Also with the huge increase of population, the need for waste disposal will increase. Where do you intend for all this waste to go? Water reclamation, sewerage? What plans are in place for this? Especially as the decrease in open land to soak up rainfall will increase the chance of flooding. So, have you also included the climate change data? That winters in the UK are more likely to become wetter? The fields and areas around the Trans Pennine Trail are already prone to flooding and surface water.

You also say in the FAQ sheet that you communicated and consulted with the general public, (again when did you do this?) elected councillors, and parish councils. Yes, they knew of these plans, but they did not know the extent as to how far they would go. Also, the time frame given to comment on these proposals was drastically reduced by the poor notification by you.

This PDO seem to intent on getting Warrington city status, why? We are a town, we do not have the large population, the area needed for a City Centre. Incoming businesses will need an improved infrastructure, but how much of these businesses will be low paid? Increasing the need for more affordable housing. Post Brexit, how many businesses could Warrington hope to gain? Given the proximity of the major cities of Manchester and Liverpool?

How many of the business units in Warrington are already underutilised? Building new units, instead of renovating, reusing or rebuilding?

Warrington will soon see an increase in traffic again, as the fallout from the avoidance of the tolls on the MERSEY GATEWAY bridges will take effect, also there will be an increase in the traffic using the M6 viaduct at Thelwall, which is 50 years old, and will probably soon need remedial work, if not rebuilding.

Have you got a current up to date road network assessment? Or are they still pending? And to this mix you want to add 9000+ houses, (not including those already given planning permission in these areas). That's 18000 more cars on the road by 2037, just from the South of Warrington building schemes.

How do you intend to reduce the increase in air pollution, the effect on wildlife, as in loss of habitat? If Compulsory Purchase Orders are made, how do you intend to help those families whose current house price will not cover the cost of another one? And given that a mortgage may be required, how do you suppose those people who could not, or cannot get access to a mortgage, buy a new or different property? Will you as a Council 'help' them by picking up the shortfall??

The urban regeneration of Warrington, should be the priority of the WBC. Whilst the new building of the market will be a good thing, now, Bridge Street is mostly devoid of shops, and is mostly taken up by takeaways and empty premises. The older properties are either empty or underused. The rents are too high and businesses are being driven out of the town centre. The building of the new areas in Warrington Town Centre are nice and modern, but what plans for the regeneration of Bridge Street upper and lower have you got? Could some of the upper floors of these building not be opened to apartment use? Again, reducing the need for so much Green Belt land to be utilised. Any Town or City, grows from its centre and spreads outwards, so why are you doing this in reverse?

According to reports, Warrington Hospital is to be moved, if this happens then surely the land that becomes available, will ease the need for the release of so much Green Belt, and this land is in Central Warrington, easing the traffic trying to enter Warrington from the Motorway Network.

Bridge Foot is at a standstill every day from 3 pm, you have traffic lights on islands that cause tailbacks because they just don't allow traffic flow, and all this stems from the three roads that lead to the island. Knutsford Road, Wilderspool Causeway and Chester Road. But, you are prepared to add a fourth road into the mix?? Or have that road merge onto Knutsford Road, which will still increase the amount of traffic converging at Bridge Foot. Surely, this is an area you should be concentrating on.

Also, the so called 'Garden City' will envelop the villages of Stretton and Appleton, and encroach on Grappenhall. One of the ideals of the green belt was to prevent the urbanisation and encapsulation of towns and villages. You're failing big time on this. Every single one of the main parties in their manifestos agreed that the redevelopment of brownfield sites would be prioritised, and yet you seem to prioritise the use of green belt areas, especially to the south of Warrington. Can you explain this? Can you explain why the South of Warrington is bearing the brunt of the new builds? Surely the future use of the Fiddlers Ferry land after its decommission would end the 'necessity' of green belt use. Have you entered any discussion with the current owners? What about the land that used to be the Park Side Colliery has this been considered with its easy access to the motorway network?

I find the Councils actions to be disconcerting, disheartening and you have not taken into consideration the emotions running high in our villages and surrounding areas, totally betraying the population of Warrington. And at the current meetings you are holding in Warrington, none of the information regarding the proposed Strategic Route is consistent. You have been poor in the notification of possible plans, I expect better in the next round of planning permits.

Yours.

