





Re: Preferred Development Options

To the Planning Policy Team,

Thank you for holding the Park Royal consultation. I am writing to express my concern over the proposals raised by Warrington's local development plan.

 I fully understand the need for house-building projects and the attendant infrastructure that that requires. However, following the public consultation I do not feel the proposals satisfactorily address this problem. Please send me, in writing, the evidence that you have considered the following points:

- Affordable housing: the residential areas around Parr's Wood in Grappenhall were built on undeveloped land  used to use for keeping horses. They are very nice houses but in no way 'affordable' for the majority of local first-time buyers. I'd like to have assurances that the mooted future developments, if they must take place, are not to the benefit of private developers only. What will be the percentage of housing association to private profit (you can be approximate). Following the Parr's Wood development, and the plans for this proposed development where exactly do you place the Maginot line between green space that is allowed to stay, and land that can be sold off?
- The amount of housing. The 24,000 figure. Where does this come from? It is not stipulated by government.
- Increased traffic: 24,000 extra homes places a burden on local infrastructure that is already under strain (Warrington gridlocked for hours on Aug 17th 2017). I was told by one of your team in person that the strategic route crossing the canal by the old railway bridge was an ugly rumour yet it is clearly outlined on pdfs on your website documents. Self-evidently this is because some form of new transport link will be required. Why the obsfucation? And what precisely are the new link road options?
- Lifestyle: childhood obesity rates continue to grow, lifestyles are increasingly sedantry and the weight of evidence (no pun intended) points to encouraging Warrington residents to become more active, not only for physical benefits, but mental too. The proposed development delivers more housing/cars/roads but not more green space. How do you plan to mitigate that?
- Warrington's air quality: according to the World Health Organisation Warrington was named as in the top 40 and second in the north west as urban areas breaching safe air pollution levels in the UK. In 2016 Cllr Maureen McLaughlin, as executive board member for public health and wellbeing, said this: "Warrington Borough Council takes its responsibility for the health and wellbeing of its residents extremely seriously. We remain determined to tackle the causes of ill health in the borough and that includes air pollution." Please send the impact study on pollution levels caused by the preferred plan.

- Wildlife and protected species: bats, kites, badgers live in the affected areas. Will the council engage with wildlife groups? What will the council do to protect local wildlife and their habitats?
- Flooding: the area around the A50 is affected by flooding as evidenced by the pumping systems installed in current dwellings. This was not highlighted in the presentations at the consultation. What steps are being taken to address the impact construction work and more housing will have on the new builds themselves but also the surrounding areas?
- CAV/technology developments. What kind of forecasting/modelling has been initiated in estimating future infrastructure needs? I would like my borough council to be leaders and early adopters of technologies that will look to decrease congestion such as smart lanes, pedestrianisation, driverless cars, and increased cycling networks. Have these issues been considered as new transport links are planned?
- Town centre/brownfield sites: I would like your reassurance that brownfield sites will be *fully* maximised and the town centre is focussed on as a prime area for residential and housing development before green space, wildlife and rural areas are sacrificed. Entire units on Bridge Street lay empty and have been for some time, the Academy building is empty, the enormous M&S store is now empty. Please can you set out and respond with your imaginative solutions and efforts to convert such areas to appealing places to live?
- Another comment from one of your team at the consultation: "No one wants to live in high-rises." I would like you to send me the evidence as the basis for this assessment. I'm sure it's understandable that no one wants to live in a high-rise like Grenfell but that does not describe the kind of urban living solutions seen in Stockholm, Copenhagen, or, closer to home, Manchester. Please send me a reassurance that building affordable urban living 'upwards' rather than always 'outwards' is not dismissed by your team out of hand by what seems like assumed opinion.
- Outside interests: I wonder if you could clarify how many members of the department live in or close to the areas actually affected by your preferred options?
- Community engagement: I would also appreciate your outlining of the future steps you plan to take to more effectively communicate the local development preferred plans? Perhaps a more active approach both on the doorstep and on social media to better engage the whole range of people detrimentally affected by the plans.

I look forward to your reply.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]