

These are answers to the questions posed on the online form. Have submitted online form several times but had no confirmation.

Q1 - The council appears to have overstated the need for new homes. Data use appears to be selective. I understand that Under the Government's proposed new methodology, it has been calculated that 914 new homes per year, which totals 18,280 over 20 years. 4,900 fewer than the 24,000 currently proposed. Please also consider and explain how the council is able to forecast growth for the next 20 years especially as we are facing the greatest period of economic uncertainty perhaps ever known with Brexit. Should the council be considering a plan for the next 10 years rather than the next 20 year in order to take account of this uncertainty? There is a consensus that the impact of Brexit will weaken economic growth. This raises significant concerns over the whether and how the use of data/information prepared prior to the Brexit referendum can be correct and justifiably be used as a source of reliable data. This needs to be answered. I believe that the governments figures are generally based on 10 year growth and therefore, must be adjusted downwards if the base figures are to be used to support a 20 year plan. Has this been taken into account?

The PDO document is technical and difficult to read but I note that many of the numbers are quoted as "fact" without supporting documents and calculation. The numbers in the report therefore, need to be fully justified. It is also not clear, how and whether the impact of the May 2017 addendum to the SHMA has been taken into account. This suggested that between 738 and 679 homes per annum are required. The PDO is assuming a figure of 839 homes which appears to be a overstatement and a failure to take into account current information. This also brings into question how an assessment of the Economic Developments Needs have been calculated since the figure of 839 has also been used in this assessment.

The council must consider whether the number of new houses has been correctly calculated and if not, should ensure that the reduced number still justifies the options for development and whether the impact on greenbelt land can be minimised and the development accommodated within brownfield sites. The council have failed to sufficiently justify the use of Greenbelt land for development. The public inspectors noted in 2014 that there was no need to develop on greenbelt land . The council therefore, needs to justify what has changed between now and 2014 to alter this view.

The PDO Option 2 is based on the aspiration of the council exec. to develop Warrington into a city. There is no evidence that the residents share this aspiration or that the development of Warrington into a city will yield economic or social benefits. The housing assessment is based on a assumption that the town will experience economic growth. Has the council accounted for what will happen and how the development would be funded should that economic growth not occur?

I note that earlier consultations have yielded small numbers of responses and therefore cannot be statistically accurate. Indeed the levels are so small that they would indicate that the council's process for seeking and ensuring public awareness of the consultation was flawed. In addition, it

should be noted that a number of the respondents were developers with a clear business self interest in promoting the development rather than being concerned with an overall assessment of the merits. Therefore, WBC should not have proceeded on the basis that the Preferred Development Option (PDO) had received sufficient consultation and instead sought to widen and strengthen the level of responses and breadth of engagement with the plans.

Q2 The PDO assumes that the housing needs identified are justified by the economic baseline case and affordability. It can not be assumed that Warrington will experience above average economic growth with justifying how and where the employment opportunities will come from. In addition, it can not be assumed that all persons working in Warrington will want to live in Warrington or that businesses will want to base themselves in Warrington when other neighboring options might also be available. This is why the government requires councils to collaborate with neighboring authorities. Warrington therefore, needs to ensure that its plans are in partnership and consistent with the plans of other authorities so that excessive economic growth or housing need is not assumed. I see no evidence that this has been done.

Where is the evidence that major businesses are looking to relocate to Warrington? Major retailers and service companies eg Marks and Spencer and Talk Talk have exited from Warrington therefore, any economic growth forecasts also need to take into account the cost and need associated with maintaining status quo.

It also must be borne in mind that the northern powerhouse initiative will certainly take some time to come into fruition. Government time and priorities will be firmly focused on Brexit for the next few years. The plans need to be consistent with reality.

Q3 - Please refer to question 1 answer as well.

The call for development sites was not a robust or providentially reliable way of assessing this need. Developers like greenbelt development as they offer clean land to build on without the need to demolish buildings or "clean up the land". Therefore there has been a bias towards what can be built on and what will yield profit rather than what should be built on taking into account the value of greenbelt land.

The national planning policy framework states at para 87. "As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances." Given my answers to previous questions eg about the questions over the number of development houses needed and questions over degree of economic growth, there is no evidence that the very special circumstances have not been made out.

Q4 - Where is the evidence that Warrington want to become a city. I agree that development is required to meet housing need and that economic growth is a agreeable ambition but development

and growth forecasts must be based on good data and take account of the democratic rights and opinions of the people in Warrington. Please refer to my comments in question 1 about the lack of robust initial consultation.

Q5- What is the justification for concentrating growth in the south of the region. I refer also to my answers regarding the extend of economic growth which can be sustained in Warrington.

Q6 - What is the justification of growth in the south of the region and how will this contribute to affordable housing.

Q7- For reasons stated above.

Q8 - Justification needed for economic growth figures.

Q9 - Impact of flood risk needs to be properly addressed.

Q10 - I refer to my comments above about economic growth and assessment of need, development should only go ahead if needed. Traffic impact needs to be properly considered.

Q11 –

Q12 - The outlying areas eg Lymm do not have sufficient infrastructure to cope with development eg doctors are full and not fit to serve event the existing numbers of residents. I would like to see provision increased to meet existing and additional needs (if development goes ahead). Traffic in the village is also dangerous. There are insufficient pedestrian crossings over busy routes eg A56 even now - area from Cherry Lane towards Altrincham on A56 - there is no predestrian crossing. Children from houses on the opposite side and in or around the shell petrol station garage need to cross this road to get to school (this would include housing on some of the sites which the council proposes to build on). Also people visiting the dam and using crouchley lane car park can not cross safely to use village. The route is already busy and cars travel too fast. Increased development will lead to increased traffic and increase the dangers to pedestrians crossing the roads.

Crouchley lane is a narrow road. Traffic and parking on the road is problematic at weekends and when the rugby club is in use. I refer the council to the concerns raised by residents when the planning application was made by the rugby club for additional houses on the site. The concerns raised by residents at this time remain live given the proposals for additional developments.
(Application Number:

2016/28521)

Q16 - Provision for more doctors surgeries and attracting GPs to warrington.