[redacted]

Dear Sir / Madam

I am writing to convey my absolute objection to the Preferred Development Option

The housing need stated in the PDO is significantly larger at 839pa than WBC's own revised figure of 679-739pa which was published in May 2017. It appears that Warrington Council's figures on based on the aspirations to become a city and not on actual data or requirements. At the moment there are not enough people to fill these proposed houses and yet you are determined to take the Green Belt for them. Warrington is surround by two great cities, currently Warrington is not even a great town. It has no Town Centre anymore, no culture, it's grid locked, ugly and the schools receive some of the lowest funding in the county, maybe it's time to concentrate on being a great town.

On the subject od city status the Warrington Guardian recently had a vote on their website to see how many people thought Warrington should become a city, over 1,500 readers voted, 85% of voters said Warrington should not become a city, I think the council should be listening to the people who voted for them. In South Warrington, you are not just talking about development, you are fundamentally trying to change our way of life. We live on the edge of rural Cheshire and and enjoy our green landscapes, our country pubs, village halls and small churches, our beautiful villages with our country traditions like Walking Days, Rose Queens, Bawming, Cider Festivals, hey rolling and scarecrow competitions to name but a few. We consider ourself part of Cheshire and to be drawn into a city is absolutely heart breaking.

I would like to see more brownfield sites occupied to stop the development on the beautiful green belt. In publishing the plan to developers in 2016, WBC have not taken into account the latest Government advice on housing development. The latest whitepaper on 'fixing the broken housing market', currently out for its second consultation, sets the calculations local governments should use for Housing Need. They use ONS figures which are more realistic and take into account falling net migration. This would then put the requirement at between 14 and 17k homes, with the larger figure being an absolute maximum (as it is set by a 40% increase on the previous adopted plan). These housing numbers would more than likely fit on existing brownfield sites.

I would also like to refer to the [redacted] (Government Inspector) report into WBC's Local Plan Core Strategy in 2014. In this report the housing need to 2027 was calculated at 500dpa . . .all of which could be met by brownfield sites. I quote "....Warrington should supply 500dpa. Therefore the plan, subject to all the proposed main modifications is consistent with meeting the full housing needs of Warrington over the plan period, having regard to the considerations that I have addressed above".

WBC appear to want the development of the greenbelt at all costs, rather than demonstrating any exceptional circumstance. The PDO explores the option which appears to gives the developer maximum profit, the reasoning perhaps to get private enterprise to pay for any infrastructure required to 'unlock' land. This is likely why the plan is 20 years, yet WBC want to release all the land from greenbelt immediately rather than in any phased manner. This will hand over control to the developer who will 'land bank' and build according to their program for maximum profit. The destruction of the greenbelt will see Warrington merge with Runcorn and Widnes and on the South developed all the way to the motorway removing most of Warrington's green lung, this seems ludicrous considering the amount of new traffic that is planned for the roads.

I have grave concerns about the amount of power that Peel Holdings seem to have over the council and their influence on the PDP. Peel have announced their ambitions to create Port Warrington as part of the Atlantic gateway. Much more traffic on the Manchester Ship Canal will have Warrington continually gridlocked and Warrington becoming inaccessible to those of us in South Warrington. In order for Peel to put more traffic on the canal more roads will have to build in Warrington. With Peel having deep pockets it is not difficult to assume that the PDP is influenced by Peel. Getting planning for houses will means more infrastructure is required. Peel have not care for the people of Warrington, their bridges currently are a disgrace and the land by Morissons is an eyesore, it has taken years of campaigning by our local councillors to get them to agree to even paint the bridges, we cannot trust them to develop in our town.

All these house are going to increase traffic in an already grid locked town. [redacted] In the 2016 World Health Organisation Report on air quality Salford (another of Peel's ports) was named the worst place in the North West for breaching safety levels for air pollution, the second worst was warrington. I fail to see how how cutting down trees and paving over fields is going to help this situation.

North Warrington, in fact the town Centre is becoming inaccessible to a lot of us in the south, we now chose to use Northwich and Runcorn as although they are further away it does take less time to travel to them. We also tend to use the M6, M56 as a ring road as this is the quickest way to get to North Warrington, I am concerned that the PDP does not include any proposals to improve the motorway network, which is also currently very congested. It's certainly not going to improve with 24,000 more houses and more worryingly mass employment centres which are sure to bring HGVs and are no doubt strategically placed to use the motorways. Even more traffic on this section of motorways will completely shut down access to Warrington for a lot of people.

The public transport schemes described within the PDO are all bus routes and will obviously use the current road network adding further burden. The routes given within the south of town are not deliverable due to the levels of congestion around the canal crossings and that no improvement will be made to the network until year 15, again making Warrington inaccessible to us. How will people in the South commute for work or pleasure?

I am also concerned about existing facilities, it's all well and good saying that the new development will include a recreation centre but what about existing ones? Our only two libraries in the South are already threatened with closure and Broomfeilds recreation Centre is a tatty horrible resource which has not been updated in 40 years, whist North Warrington is about to get another fabulous site in Sankey. If another is built will existing facilities be completely ignored.

Finally, I am completely shocked by WBC's total lack of sensitivity regarding the consultation. It would appear that there was initially a deliberate ploy to have a consultation of which only a limited number had knowledge and therefore restrict the number of replies. WBC failed to follow Government and their own guidance/promises on consultations. In addition, there have been comments from the council about 'scaremongering' by some residents, this behaviour is disgraceful!

Warrington really could be a great town, however the Mersey and Manchester Ship Canal which once made Warrington a great place is not strangling the town. If the government need more houses maybe our neighbours should be considered for the huge development like Wigan and St. Helens. I am not against development whether it be in the North or South but I feel this plane is ill considered and has the power to change the lifestyle forever of many small rural Cheshire villages, and not for the better.

Your Faithfully [redacted]