

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Figures are greatly exaggerated

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no need for the amount of housing you have stated.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

absolutely not

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have no interest in Grappenhall and surrounding areas becoming a Garden City. Warrington should be left as a town

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You seem determined to turn Warrington into a city

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

If it means access by the possibility of a road using the TPT and railway then yes I am concerned

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not see the need for a garden city suburb. You will destroy what is a beautiful area

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

again, you will spoil a beautiful area

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Your proposed employment land will destroy the beautiful character of the area. It will cause more traffic pollution, it will completely change what is a beautiful area with beautiful greenbelt used by so many

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

You intend to significantly add to the population of Warrington without talk of a new hospital. The current one can't cope with the present population

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

STRONGLY OBJECT. Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

STRONGLY OBJECT. Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to the objection letter sent via email to [REDACTED]

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don't build on our beautiful green belt countryside,

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

As a resident of Burtonwood for over 50 years, myself and my family work in Warrington ,we have seen a massive increase in congestion on the roads in Burtonwood especially the main road in which I live, causing increased difficulty getting off our driveway especially at peak periods and crossing the road to get to the bus stop is almost impossible additional housing will only exacerbate the existing problem increasing congestion, pollution and causing further damage to the state of the roads. Getting into Warrington from Burtonwood taking any route had seen an unbelievable increase in traffic due to housing, motorways, warehouses and an unreasonable amount of businesses using HGV who make getting in and out of Warrington difficult they park on roads obstructing traffic making an impossible situation more impossible. I understand that we all need houses and work however our road networks are not fit for purpose and that is certainly true of Burtonwood the road in which I live on used to be a village county road which at times has turned into more of a motorway with large vehicles and speeding traffic. Additionally building extra houses in Burtonwood without additional improvements in infrastructure is a mistake, I therefore strongly object to the proposals.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington have over the years seen more of its fair share of building new housing, other areas of the country need to take their share. Land can always be found it doesn't mean it has to be used, especially the use of ever reducing green belt.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Already explained previously

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is ever expanding with less emphasis on the infrastructure of out lying areas such as Burtonwood which appears always to be ignored, or health, education and leisure facilities also transport and shopping not everyone drives. More people more pressure on existing services.

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Need to take a stinger approach to their disregard and disrespect for other people's land/property. More land needs to be available to meet their needs.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can not agree with councils proposal for the number of houses that they deem necessary. I understand the need for more housing but not on the proposed scale and the impact this will have on the infrastructure of our town.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I appreciate that there is limited land available without the use of green belt but I don't agree with the amount of green belt being taken.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much green belt is being taken.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand the need to create more housing and employment just not the quantity.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We don't want to be a city, any plans for an urban garden area wouldn't be necessary if the green belt wasn't being marked for development.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can not see how, even with the proposed new road on the TPT, how the diabolical traffic situation that Warrington already has will be eased.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses being built with out thought to the infrastructure.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is not a city, it is a town with surrounding villages and communities which have no desire to become swallowed up in an urban sprawl.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As per my previous comment, the need for a Garden City Suburb would not be necessary if the proposed plans did not involve building on the green belt areas.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree some new area for employment should be considered just not on the suggested scale.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Better provision for public transport to ease the congestion on the roads. The option maybe for a tram system linking to the existing Manchester system. I feel this would be a much better proposal than building more roads, if there was an efficient alternative hopefully the number of cars on the road could be reduced.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We are custodians of the land. We do not have the right to destroy large swathes of land that has been decreed as Greenbelt. The main purpose of greenbelt land is to protect the area around larger urban areas from urban sprawl and to maintain the designated area for forestry, agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife. Please reconsider your proposals and find more suitable brownfield sites in which to build more houses. Please leave the Green Belt alone, and allow us to breathe clean air as well as continue to look after our wildlife.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that by relaxing the current protection on the land and altering the existing boundaries to accommodate the housing needs outlined, the quality of life within the borough will sadly be blighted by the proposals. Wellbeing will suffer and in the future the cost from a mental health point of view will spiral due to the lack of free open spaces that are currently protected. I think as a council you are making a rod for your back...

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No I do not as I feel it hasn't been thought through properly. I cannot comprehend how these plans and proposals have been worked out. I cannot even contemplate how awful the locality will look if the Green Belt is covered by at best unattractive modern houses with no character. Surely you wish to entice people to the area and not frighten them off due to there being not enough open spaces for them to thrive or bring up their children in. Not forgetting the wildlife that enhance our lands. Would you want to buy a home where all life has been obliterated. I think your proposals need to be adapted to ensure that urban sprawl doesn't encroach on protected land: by making that land smaller it isn't going to address the very real issues of wellbeing and sense of community pride. Plus where is the infrastructure for such mass building?

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree to the plan objectives as feel housing needs do need to be addressed, but feel more suitable land needs to be found to accommodate these proposals.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As outlined under national planning framework requirements, Green Belt can only released under 'very special circumstances'. I fail to see how the different spacial options will improve the quality of community facilities for existing and current residents within the populace.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The 20 year vision of growth in Warrington that includes The city centre (town),the waterfront, the garden city suburb and the south West urban extension, has proposed that land will need to be released from the Green Belt to deliver approximately 9,000 new homes and 252 hectares for employment. How have these figures been derived and where has this idea come from that Warrington is a City? It's a town in the Northwest of the UK. A definition of a city is that it is created by charter and usually contains a cathedral.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I still think that by listening to those who will be directly affected is paramount in creating a sense of community and involvement. I know that the ethics of WBC are heavily committed to ensuring that their

constituents are taken into consideration, so please don't do something that you may regret. Once the Green Belt is gone, we cannot replace as easily or re-site the wildlife that rely on it for shelter, food and sustenance.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously mentioned, how come Warrington is identifying itself as a City? To accommodate the proposed scale of growth, and to expand on the existing infrastructure and widen the employment options. Looking at the trajectories as outlined on the future plans, I still do not see how such major development will enhance the lives of residents and those who frequent the town centre. I do agree that several areas within the town centre need to be improved upon, such as improving transport links and incorporating the historically important heritage of the rich, industrial past of Warrington with the modern ideal that is being strived for.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, using up precious green good belt to build a garden city is incomprehensible.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Depending upon the decision as to where the final location is of the western link and if a new Road does run over the Ship Canal then the proposal for new housing may need to be reconsidered.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes, look at what is actually available without impinging on what shouldn't be attainable. Enjoy being what you are and not look for ways to radically alter your identity as a town.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes, however you need to address the core reasons for wishing to improve employment issues. This country as a whole needs to look at manufacturing and the skills that are required to make the rest of the world want to trade with us, as it would traditionally have been. Encouraging this is paramount.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The need for permanent sites needs to be addressed. Green belt though shouldn't be in the equation. Although the current three sites identified as unauthorised are in the Green Belt I suggest finding and identifying areas that can either be purchased by travellers and Gypsies themselves to accommodate their needs.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would need to visit these suggested areas to make an opinion.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The desires and needs of the people and the diversity of your constituents. The existing infrastructure and how best to improve on what is already here. To get back to basics with those who elected you and to actually listen to the viewpoint of the majority. Not to pander to Central Government and to not allow greed to cloud your vision of how Warrington is represented.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are some areas, such as the land in Chapel Road Penketh that have erroneously been included in the Green Belt and therefore should be removed from it and designated building land as has all the land surrounding it.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Given the growth in Warrington, the objectives are inevitable.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I want Burtonwood to continue as a village with plenty of green fields and woodland. It is a good place to rear children who can enjoy countryside in their everyday life and places like this are in danger of disappearing.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The whole area of Warrington is already experiencing too much traffic and inadequate road systems from previous new builds and to continue doing more building will make problems very serious. The whole idea needs an urgent re-think.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I consider people's quality of life has not been given enough consideration.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It will cause chaos in some areas and ruin other well established areas by overcrowding.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough thought gone into it regarding affect on residents

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Mainly that in some cases the effect on locals will be having to cope with inconvenient changes that they do not want

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much green belt and brown fields to be used

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not want to be a city particularly as I would have chosen somewhere else to live.If we do not have any choice in this then all the more reason to protect our green areas before more and more developments creep in.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It will hopefully make the town look better

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It worries me that all will not be as it is promoted

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have not seen that

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again more thought needs to be given and proper advertised talks and proposals discussed with the people. Many people knew nothing about all of this and some still do not.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Providing that adequate roads are built.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I say no because the experiences I have had have been unpleasant with lots of disgusting mess left when they do leave so I am not happy about them being encouraged

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

seems to be reasonable

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Protection for the ordinary people from being not personally informed about changes that will affect them so much. Be approachable and open and honest about any proposals and discuss them by letter to all homes and then ADVERTISE meetings locally and prominently in all areas in plenty of time for people to talk about it all before meetings and not 2 hours before as happened in Burtonwood.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not support the way that Warrington BC has worked out the need for new homes and employment land over the next 20 years. Aspirations for growth are incredibly ambitious and seem to stem from desires for the Borough to gain City status. The desires for the Warrington to make a transition from New Town into a New City have very little public support and it would be useful to understand where this concept has originated from. Whilst the ambitious levels of growth proposed are in accordance with the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan, they are significantly over and above the more realistic baseline economic forecasts for the Warrington Borough. Whilst it is understood that there is significant private sector interest in the area, this level of growth cannot be sustainable for the region as whole and would raise concerns that this threatens the ability for other authorities to achieve their own growth goals. The levels of employment growth proposed has also resulted in a higher than previously suggested requirements for new homes. This means that Warrington is having to make some very difficult, and potentially unfounded decisions, about the allocation of large quantities of greenfield land for housing, with some very significant Green Belt releases proposed.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not agree that Warrington BC has appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt. The level of employment growth proposed for the borough is unsustainable for the region as a whole (as outlined above) and I therefore believe that this has resulted in inflated projections relating to the need for employment and housing land, with Green belt releases being more significant than actually required. For this same reason, I also do not agree that there is a need to include Safeguarded Land within the Warrington Local Plan, and would suggest the deletion of this in its entirety from the plan. The future of Fiddlers Ferry is currently unknown, but if this large brownfield site becomes available within the plan period, this could be an additional reason why there is no need to safeguard land beyond this. Furthermore, the area

of Safeguarded Land proposed as part of the South Warrington Garden City is particularly unjustified because the release of this land is based on the provision of a link road and new Manchester Ship Canal crossing which is currently nothing more than an arbitrary line on a plan based on a single consultant's 'Vision' for the area. There has not been any feasibility work undertaken to understand if the proposals for this link are viable, cost-effective or even deliver the traffic relief that it suggests (particularly given that the traffic model hasn't been completed). It is unclear as to whether a business case could be established to justify any funding bids, what the overall costs would be and importantly whether the benefits arising from a proposed new road link would out-weigh the potential impact on the residential amenities of existing residents particularly in the Thelwall and Latchford areas.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not agree with objective W1 which seeks to enable the transition of Warrington from a New Town to a New City. Very little information has been provided as to why this is desirable and what the benefits of this would be to existing residents. The appeal of Warrington is its size. It is already large enough to offer attractive employment, retail and recreational opportunities. Those who want to experience a busier 'City lifestyle' or access sub-regional shopping and leisure opportunities can easily travel to Manchester, Chester and Liverpool. I can only support objective W2 where Green Belt releases are properly justified. I understand that Warrington does need to plan for its future and allocate sufficient sites to meet employment and housing needs, but have concerns about the level of growth proposed and therefore the extent of Green Belt releases. I support objective W3 which seeks to strengthen the role of Warrington town centre as an employment, retail, leisure and cultural hub, but any growth and investment in this area should be appropriate to Warrington as a Town and not a City. I support objective W4 in so far as it seeks to reduce the need to travel and encourage active lifestyles. I support objective W5 which seeks to secure high quality design which reinforces the character and local distinctiveness of Warrington's urban area, its countryside and its unique pattern of green spaces. I support objective W6 which seeks to ensure that development makes a positive contribution to improving Warrington's Air Quality.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe that the Council should have consulted with residents about the different spatial options prior to publishing the preferred options document to enable more discussion about and a better understanding of all the options, especially given the potential for them to have a significant impact on the lives of existing residents. At para 4.65 it is concluded that option 2 performed best against the strategic plan objectives. I would welcome sight of information which demonstrates for the proposed South Warrington Garden City Suburb: 1. How such significant growth in one area can make a positive contribution to improving Warrington's Air Quality. 2. How the proposed link road and proposed new crossing over the Manchester Ship Canal makes a positive contribution to improving Warrington's Air Quality. From what I can

ascertain, the proposed link road would take additional traffic through the existing residential areas of Thelwall and deliver this to Latchford, an already highly congested area.³ How development of such a scale in this location will be able to reinforce the character and local distinctiveness of the area and its unique pattern of green spaces.⁴ How the delivery of new employment uses as an extension to the existing Appleton Thorn/ Barley Castle Estates (which are most likely to offer low-skilled distribution/ warehouse type jobs) meet the needs of the existing and proposed local population thereby reducing the need to travel (objective 4).⁵ How the proposed link road encourages active lifestyles when it potentially results in the loss of a valuable and well-used recreation resource; the Trans Pennine Trail. I do not consider that option 2 does any of these things. Furthermore, the absence of a traffic model does not allow a number of these conclusions to be reached. I would request that residents are re-consulted once this becomes available.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a town and not a city and development should be of an appropriate scale to support its position in the sub-regional hierarchy. There has been significant expansion of the out-of-centre Junction Retail Park and this should not be at the expense of investment in the edge-of-centre Riverside Retail Park which serves residents to the south of the City Centre. Loss of retail in this location would result in an increased need to travel. Its allocation for residential uses is disappointing and whilst I fully support town centre living, it would be useful to understand what other options have been explored to save the loss of this important shopping offer.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The proposals around Warrington's Waterfront are also ambitious, although I welcome residential development in this location, which is in close proximity to the town (not City) centre and the public transport network. I also welcome the regeneration of this brownfield site. The port development does, however, have potential to generate considerable traffic and in the absence of a traffic model, would request that residents are re-consulted on these proposals once this becomes available. I understand that the Warrington Waterfront development is very much dependent on the new 'Western Link' which is subject to separate consultation. I would be interested to learn more about the implications of the proposed Western Link on the road networks through Penketh and Cuerdley, particularly in light of the increased traffic that is likely to be generated by those seeking to avoid paying tolls on the Mersey Gateway/ Silver Jubilee Bridge.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

First and foremost, Warrington is not a City and nor do its residents want it to be! Second, I support the planned approach to new homes as fully understand that this is the best way to deliver the services and infrastructure required to support the growing population. I welcome provision for new school, doctors' surgeries and the local centre. However, whilst I am not against the concept of new homes and am in full agreement that new houses do need to be built in this area to meet the needs of future generations, there is some concern amongst residents about whether the existing road network can accommodate the level of growth proposed. The traffic model does not yet appear to have been completed so conclusions in this regard cannot be reached. I would also like to express my concerns about the amount of land allocated for housing and question why the Council feels it needs to safeguard land for beyond the plan period given the already aspirational level of growth assumed and the very likely release of land around Fiddlers Ferry (which has not currently been taken into account). I raise very specific concerns about the area of Safeguarded Land proposed as part of the South Warrington Garden City and believe that this is particularly unjustified because the release of this land is based on the provision of a link road and new Manchester Ship Canal crossing which is currently nothing more than an arbitrary line on a plan based on a single consultant's 'Vision' for the area. There has not been any feasibility work undertaken to understand if the proposals for this link are viable, cost-effective or even deliver the traffic relief that it suggests (particularly given that the traffic model hasn't been completed). It is unclear as to whether a business case could be established to justify any funding bids, what the overall costs would be and importantly whether the benefits arising from a proposed new road link would outweigh the potential impact on the residential amenities of existing residents particularly in the Thelwall and Latchford areas. The proposed link road would take additional traffic through the existing residential areas of Thelwall and deliver this to Latchford, an already highly congested area. It would result in the loss of a valuable and well-used recreation resource; the Trans Pennine Trail having a negative impact on the active lifestyles of the existing local population. It is also extremely unclear as to how the Council will look to acquire the land to

enable to link road and crossing to be implemented “ the project ahead is huge, even just in terms of exploring feasibility alone, and the Council should not be looking to add this proposal to the Local Plan before it is known if, how and when this can be delivered. I would suggest that this area of safeguarded land be removed from the Local Plan along with the proposed link road and new canal crossing and this be revisited as part of the next review only if more is known about the feasibility and deliverability of this route. With regard to the delivery of new employment uses as an extension to the existing Appleton Thorn/ Barley Castle Estates (which are most likely to offer low-skilled distribution/ warehouse type jobs), I would question if this is really the correct location for such development. It is unclear how the likely jobs created by these proposals will meet the needs of the existing and proposed local population. I believed that additional employment land in this area will attract workers from much further afield thereby leading to increased traffic on already congested roads. Without sight of the traffic model, and in the absence of any information around what the market is likely to deliver in this location, it is difficult to fully appreciate the complexity of the issues presented by expanding this employment offer. I also have some concerns that this proposal is being branded a 'Garden City' when it is doing no more than retaining existing greenery and woodland, which would be difficult to develop in any case. The country park concept is welcomed, but more effort should be made to provide a substantial green buffer to existing walkways and cycleways to retain existing pedestrian routes etc. in addition to this. This is particularly relevant to the walkway from the Grappenhall Cricket Club to Grappenhall Heys and the walled garden. This is an important recreational area and although I support new housing development in this area, I hope that the Local Plan moving forward will include strict policies around the requirement for integral open space over and beyond that included on the vision drawing at figure 7 of the Preferred Development Option document.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Very little information has been provided about development in outlying settlements so it is difficult to pass comment on these proposals at this stage.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The housing and employment land requirements are ambitious. If the Council are to meet their requirements in terms of their duty to cooperate, Warrington could in all likelihood end up taking a share of neighbouring authorities housing land supply. Therefore, the proposed initial Green Belt release and the safeguarded areas should be increased to reflect this. The proposed safeguarded land should be included within the proposed Green Belt release and additional land identified as safeguarded.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Additional Green Belt release should be included in the Garden City Suburb. Green Belt release should occur on both sides of the M6 motorway. This will facilitate the delivery of the proposed 500 dwellings in and around Lymm. The proposed Safeguarded Land should be released within earlier timescales i.e within the first phases of the development of the Garden City Suburb.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Additional Green Belt land should be released around Lymm to accommodate the proposed 500 dwellings.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand that you have based this figure on data from 2012, and then made adjustments which serve to increase the figure, whereas there is more recent data available that would have resulted in a lower starting point. Also, the Brexit vote is likely to have changed the housing needs of the UK and should have been taken into account. I am a mathematician by background and given the number of assumptions that needed to be made, I find it hard to understand using such a specific figure for the number of houses needed p.a., when surely a range would best represent the results of the projections. It seems as though you have taken the number at the top of the range and multiplied it by the number of years to result in the highest possible figure. Also, this all appears to be based on the assumption that Warrington can become a city. I do not believe that the residents want this or have been consulted on it. I would have thought that a city could grow from a thriving, successful town with good infrastructure, which does not describe Warrington - life is already intolerable for many residents, especially in South Warrington, with traffic problems, lack of healthcare, and with a nighttime economy that has moved from Warrington to Stockton Heath, bringing with it all the associated problems like noise, broken glass, anti-social behaviour and traffic/parking problems. Stockton Heath already cannot cope with this and is not a good place to try to bring up a family. These proposals will only make life worse in Stockton Heath. If you take away the aspiration to become a city, then what is the housing need for Warrington?

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I read the Urban Capacity Assessment Update but it does not seem to explain how the 15,429 figure has been reached - what kind of properties and how much space these take up. As a resident of a large city (London) for 10 years, I am very used to living in flats rather than houses in central and even suburban areas, and obviously more of these can be built in a smaller area than houses. Do your figures assume that existing properties are used as houses, or that you build higher and fit in more living space in the central locations?

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Because I do not believe you have justified the need for so many houses, and therefore you have not justified releasing the green belt on which to build them. Also I have not been convinced that you are making the most efficient use of existing brown field sites. To release this much green belt land you must need unassailable, wholly convincing arguments, but this all seems to be based on aspirations and aggressive assumptions.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree with W3, W4, W5, and W6, but not with W1 and W2, which seem to contradict the later objectives. I think W3 needs to be tackled first before even considering destroying the green belt areas which make living in a busy industrial town tolerable. Air quality in Warrington is already amongst the worst areas in the country and the proposals will only make this worse, with the addition of so many cars and new options for avoiding the motorways by cutting through Warrington. I think you need an additional objective, to ensure that district centres are places that people want to live (as well as the town centre).

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Overriding objective seems to be to deliver the New City, but this seems the wrong way to go about it. Surely deal with the current problems preventing Warrington from being a successful town, and Stockton Heath from being a successful village, first. Releasing so much green belt land is only going to reduce the attractiveness of the area further, and building adjacent to the town centre (but actually not very near) will make traffic problems much worse. Stockton Heath has already had its character changed to a huge extent as a result of decisions made by WBC and is already no longer the delightful village it is sometimes described as, and used to be about 15 years ago.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Seem to have selectively ignored some factors like impact on highways/traffic - I agree that incremental expansion in Stockton Heath should be avoided due to traffic problems, and lack of schools and GPs. But I fail to see how a garden city suburb around Grappenhall Heys/Appleton Thorn won't have the exact same impact

on Stockton Heath - it is the route to Warrington and also still likely to be a destination for residents of the new garden suburb, and it is already suffering from too much traffic, exacerbated when there are problems on the motorways, so additional houses in the south will only make matters worse. The proposed Western link won't help. This garden city suburb would also need improvements at the motorway junctions, which do not appear to be factored into the plan.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I question whether these are needs, as they appear more aspirational. South Warrington already puts up with a lot of problems - huge amounts of traffic (exacerbated when there is the slightest problem on any motorway, or swing bridge opening), parking problems (by your own home), associated air quality issues, and nighttime economy issues like noise and broken glass. This Preferred Development Option puts all the new development in South Warrington, which will surely make things worse. House prices are currently higher in south Warrington - people choose to live here because of the easier access to green spaces and attractive housing stock. Removing the green spaces and adding a lot of new houses is likely to reduce the attractiveness of the area to a lot of people, including current residents, many of whom already feel the area is on the decline, which can only lead to a decrease in house prices across the board. Still, though, the houses are unlikely to be cheap enough to assist first time buyers, given the general area and the proposed density of houses.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is not much detail. I think it will come down to good design and much improved transport links. I would hope that, to maximise residential development, you have incorporated flats/apartments, as these are a feature of any large town or city and would relieve pressure on developing the green belt. Overall, Warrington needs to be made far more attractive to higher end retailers and restaurants if it is to be viewed as a desirable place to live, and so I would hope that you would look to successful inner city developments, such as those in Birmingham or Manchester, for inspiration.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, the document seems short on details. In high level, this seems like a good option as traffic would not need to pass through South Warrington, and the area seems underused currently. Also, is one new primary school enough? There is already increased demand from that general area with developments near the Walton swing bridge, the development opposite Morrisons, and increasing numbers of families choosing to live in the Gainsborough Rd/Chester Rd area and using Stockton Heath as their district centre.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I like the cycle routes and potential country parks, but other than that I am extremely worried about the effect of so many new houses on the roads and air quality of South Warrington, at the same time that so much green space is built on. It looks like traffic will be using the A49 and A56, which already have long queues at key times of the day, and this will only make this worse. Is it envisaged that the residents of the new garden city suburb have everything that they need and do not need to travel? If so then this would be a standalone town. If not, it will only increase pressure on Stockton Heath, whose nighttime economy has already outgrown its location and is an unattractive place at nighttime for a lot of residents. Where would these additional visitors to Stockton Heath park? There also appears to be a lot of uncertainty around density of dwellings and therefore how much green belt land is needed - it comes across as though you are optimistically understating the amount of land required, and that either you will decide further down the line to release more green belt land than shown in your figures, or you will increase the density of the houses. Why can't you include more realistic and certain figures, when discussing an issue of such importance?

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Without the Western Link, this would seem to put the existing Ship Canal crossings under even more pressure and traffic through Stockton Heath will be even worse. I am concerned that this option ruins one of the few true unspoilt villages around Warrington. And which high school is it proposed will serve this area? There is not one in close proximity so this will increase traffic through Stockton Heath to either Bridgewater or the new Garden City suburb.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

500 new homes sounds a lot for a village the size of Lymm; again, similar to south Warrington, people currently pay a premium for green spaces and attractive houses, and utilising the green belt to build such a large number of new homes is likely to decrease the attractiveness of Lymm. Hard to comment in detail when you have not provided any detail in the plan, or consulted with parish councils. Overall, the Preferred Development Option seems to single out the more pleasant areas of South Warrington for excessive development - surely this can't have a positive outcome?

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again I am concerned about the impact on Stockton Heath of traffic to the proposed employment land at J9 M56. Residents of the proposed Waterfront development could work at J9 M56, while residents of the garden city suburb could work in Warrington town centre or in the Waterfront development - my point is that more non-central employment locations and more non-central residential developments will increase traffic across Warrington (and in the South on the A49 and A56) and the plan does not appear to propose any solutions to that.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, appears that South Warrington loses green belt land and bears the brunt of the proposals

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Consideration of whether Stockton Heath, which is mentioned several times in the document as a district centre, and which will suffer under any of the proposals from increased traffic, is currently serving its residents well. I don't believe it is - I think during the daytime it is not very busy as its high street is mostly made up of charity shops, estate agents and cheap clothes shops, and at night it caters to people travelling in by minibus (who used to go out in Warrington). Many families are disillusioned with Stockton Heath and many move out as several aspects of it mean it is not a pleasant place to bring up a family. I think your Preferred Development Option Document recognises that Warrington Town Centre needs investment, but assumes that Stockton Heath is working well as it is and will continue to serve an increased number of residents. I think if something isn't done soon to consider the long term future of Stockton Heath (regardless of the Local Development Plan), then its reputation and amenity will deteriorate further until it is in the same state that Warrington town centre has been in for the last 10 or more years.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why does Warrington have to apply for City Status ? As a long term resident of Warrington South , it was from choice that we preferred to live in this area as it was always Cheshire before the boundarys were changed . It was always more rural and property was always at a premium. Warrington was always ' Town ' with a town infrastructure! We on South Warrington have seen massive developments already with several new housing estates. People are prepared to pay more for their property to reap the benefit of living in the countryside ! Indeed the builders target purchasers for that reason . If we stay a town can we just not concentrate on improving what we already have ! Indeed , Warrington as a shopping centre does nothing to attract visitors! or residents ! If you can manage to beat the traffic you have terrible problems parking , particularly disabled parking ! The majority of shop units in the town centre are empty ! and all buildings seem to be in a bad state of repair . Quite depressing for any visitor . It seems that preference has been given for all out of town centre shopping! Perhaps it would be a better to build all the new housing in what is currently the town centre ! Please reconsider and leave the green belt green and leave Warrington as a town !

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I consider that you should use Warrington existing town centre for new homes as you certainly are not keeping it as a shopping centre!

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington should remain a town and improve/ .look after what we already have ! improvements are necessary to transport routes across town and the close proximity of the motorways .

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have you already decided that Warrington is a city ?

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

People are not going to be attracted to a 'Waterfront ' development if they can't get there easily , and there is nothing else to entertain them

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why there ? Why not change the existing town centre (all run down and half empty) to a town garden suburb

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I chose to live in south warring precisely for the fact that there were green / rural places

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why .

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Gypsy and travellers already have fixed sites South Warrington

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The well being of all residents

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The infrastructure of Lymm cannot stand an influx of houses as suggested in the plan

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You are taking green belt land without further consideration of brown belt land available.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You do not know for certain the numbers and kinds of jobs projected.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

plan is too developer led rather than residents views.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

the number of new homes proposed cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is a technical document, not lending itself to understanding by the voters of Warrington. The assumption that Warrington needs to grow significantly in the next 20 underlines your approach: growth that needs to be driven by economic prosperity. Currently the town has capacity to increase its economic activity via use of underused commercial premises - make efforts to attract employment via this BEFORE assuming that to build more will make more. Haven't you learned from the debacle in the town centre, when new/bigger shops were built only to replace those existing ones and lead to a depressed and depressing appearance and atmosphere in the town outside the Golden Square.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am concerned that you have not the ability to undertake this calculation with any likelihood of accuracy. Warrington's existing built up areas are not fully utilised, or supported by good transport networks that allow people to access areas of this town other than where they live for work or leisure. South Warrington to Gemini or Chapelford is a very hard journey, especially without a car in which to enjoy the permanent congestion.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

the green belt areas of Warrington are its saving grace. Decades of 'regeneration' in the town centre has robbed the town of much of its cultural and historic reference. The tudor buld on Church Street that boast about is Cromwellian connections - only to be allowed to surrounded by a supermarket car park. This is one of dozens of examples of where the baby has gone out with bathwater over decade. The Green Belt (links to the north Cheshire Countryside) does not provide spectacular countryside, but it does present Warrington as a pleasant, airy and clean place to be. Sacrificing green belt to make 'managed green spaces and linking pathways' will lead to a significant reduction in this asset. AND the 'managed spaces' will leave a permanent

maintenance obligation either for housing developers (which usually lose interest in a few years) or the Council which will soon bemoan the expense of maintenance. Green belt, used in the main a COMMERCIAL agricultural land, is maintained to a standard suitable for its use, and provide a please pastoral environment for the whole town. Leave the Green Belt alone.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This consultation is not user friendly. Jargon to confuse and get you own way.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is not a city. Its tried for City Status on a number of occasion and has been unsuccessful . Stop deluding yourself. Accept that being a proud northern town with a heritage to cherish and a future to build is good

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

The waterfront is an asset that has been overlooked long enough. Any development is to be encouraged.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

We are not a city, so can't have a City Suburb. South Warrington is a thriving suburb of Warrington already. It contributes to the success and status of the town at present. It attracts positive responses from visitors and residents alike. Don't mess with it.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe that the PDO for Warrington East utilises unnecessary green belt and the proposal of the use of the Trans Penine trail as a link road would be destructive to an area which is sought after for its beauty and wildlife. The residents throughout East Warrington stand to lose out significantly financially due to their residences either being demolished or de-valued by changing landscape and scenery. The environmental impact especially along the Trans Penine trail would be immense due to wildlife which lives along it. I don't believe that the emotional impact of such drastic plans have been considered especially for the more elderly residents who would be susceptible to stress and associated conditions.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The supposed jobs which would be created would not necessarily benefit Warrington residents as they may go to commuters from other areas. There are no provisions for local NHS services to be expended or developed - Warrington hospital is already struggling both financially and to meet patient demands. There are no provisions for increased Cancer services for example which an increasing population would demand. Current oncology patients have to travel to Liverpool or Manchester for many treatments which the NHS Cancer Plan expects a patient to travel no further than 30 minutes for their treatment. How will this be addressed?

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously commented, i believe it to be ill thought out for environmental factors. I have no desire for the suburbs of South East Warrington to become a Garden City Suburb - i do not see what benefit it would bring to myself or the other residents.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not want Grappenhall Lodge to be a permanent site for travelling communities. They have shown in the past to take no care of their surroundings and leave the area in a mess.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The impact on the current residents both financially, medically and emotionally

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

My comments as a resident of Burtonwood are as follows,1 The consultation meeting at Burtonwood Catholic Club on 16th September was poorly Publicised and most people new nothing about it, Why was this?2 Burtonwood village is very poorly maintained, many of the footpaths are reduced to narrow single file due to decades of neglect allowing the undergrowth to spread across the footpaths.3 Many of the footpaths are uneven with many patch repairs.4 The roads are also poorly maintained with gutters full of weeds and grass verges growing onto the roads,Again caused by years and years of further neglect.5 Traffic in Burtonwood as increased alarmingly since Omega was built.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The number of homes proposed is far in excess of what Burtonwood village can absorb, lack of school places ,shops , No parking facilities There are no footlpaths or cycle tracks to allow safe access to Omega and Westbrook. This as been on the agenda fo many years and still not materialised.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As stated previously Burtonwood cannot absorb so much expansion, Wild life habitat will also be destroyed, has any research been done on the affects on wild life?

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously stated

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As stated previously

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Green belt around Burtonwood should not be built on. There are no facilities in Burtonwood for the people that reside there at the moment as it is. Burtonwood is supposed to be a rural village and should remain that way. There are plenty of brown belt land for the government to choose from.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The proposed 500 homes for Lymm is untenable. There is already a lack of infrastructure for the current residents. Full schools, full Doctor surgeries, roads cannot cope with the existing traffic and there is insufficient parking available. It will add to the pollution of standing traffic occurring now and be damaging to the environment. The character of Lymm will be damaged forever if this development is allowed.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is a mismatch between homes projection and population projections. High housing numbers are based on policy decision by Warrington Council linked to Devloution bid, which is outdated. I do not want Warrington to be a city, I wouldn't want to live in a city and would most certainly move if it were to become one.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, too much land is being allocated from the Green Belt. More Brown Filed sites should be used where there is less impact on the environment. The erosion of Green Belt is leading to urban sprawl.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses and also inappropriately and unfairly targeted in the South of Warrington. Is this because the Council expects to receive higher revenues from Council Tax payers from there??

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The current plan is too developer/landowner led at the expense of residents' views.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As stated earlier, there is going to be, under the current Preferred Development Option, too much development and also too much of it in the South of Warrington. Lymm has already had its fair share of development and couldn't cope with the strain of an additional 500 new homes on its already full to capacity infrastructure.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses. Nobody wants to be part of Warrington Garden City Suburb. No one bought a property here thinking it was going to turn into a city with tens of thousands more homes.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many homes. Infrastructure can't cope with current levels of population. Would damage the existing settlement and change it forever.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many homes, leading to urban sprawl. Erosion of Green Belt and damaging to the environment. The Plan would damage the character of the Villages. Existing infrastructure can't cope with current population levels let alone thousands more.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You can't be certain of what jobs will be created in the future so how can you determine what land is needed?
If more logistics, then few jobs for high land use.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have not been made aware of this, there has been a distinct lack of consultation with the affected population.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again I have not received any information in this regard.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I strongly object to these building plans. Born in South Warrington, I don't believe these houses will benefit an already crowded area. School doctors dentists and Warrington hospitals are already at breaking point. Taken proposed resolutions to this are a joke. There are no more jobs on this side of Warrington and will result in people travelling further. I suggest you build where the jobs are! NOT SOUTH WARRINGTON

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Council is rushing through this without giving the people of Warrington any say in the matter. The social & environmental impacts of our area area is unimaginable. We have to live here now.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The people of Warrington need full disclosure & total transparency of any Council plans to change Warrington beyond recognition.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Council has not given the environmental & social issues involved in the demolition of the Green Belt around Warrington any consideration at all. The loss of Greenbelt, ancient woodland & local heritage is criminal & immoral.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unnecessary, immoral, detrimental impact on environment & hugely negative impact on people's lives.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too huge an impact on every location

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

We live in Warrington now . How about thinking about us - the current population & our children ? We love our environment & hate the roads now.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

You've ignored Warrington's local heritage & its local distinctiveness. It's history & individuality will be lost for ever .

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The roads & bridges can not cope now & any more traffic will just add to more gridlocked roads.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Loss of individuality & local distinctiveness & heritage.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

It should be scrapped

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

It should be scrapped. Unattractive urban quantity over quality

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I live in [REDACTED], Burtonwood and strongly object to buildings being placed to the front and rear of my property. The height and position of any properties would be visually intrusive and the loss of personal amenity would be detrimental to local residents. There would be a significant increase in the number of traffic which is a serious cause for concern so close to Burtonwood Primary School. The land in question is home to numerous wildlife such as birds, frogs, toads, newts and hedgehogs and would have a devastating effect on their population. The locations to the front and rear of [REDACTED] are prone to flooding and subsidence which would cause major problems for any buildings placed there. The reason I chose to live on [REDACTED] is because of the green belt to the front and rear and the tranquillity of the area, to build on this land would completely change our way of life.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

To build on green belt is wrong and will change the whole feel of Burtonwood village.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not think green belt should be built on under any circumstances. There is no point classing the land as green belt if you can just change it whenever it suit you.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Burtonwood is a small village, by building more houses here it will destroy the quiet village feel.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is absolutely bursting to breaking point! And don't believe that any more 'affordable' housing would in any way prosper this town! Yes it is a large town but most definitely not in need of any more developments. I think the proposal for South Warrington is an absolute disgrace, we have some of the most beautiful countryside in the whole of Cheshire and to even consider planting yet more unsightly concrete blocks to this stunning scenery would be an absolute travesty!!

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Absolutely not! This land should be enjoyed by generations to come....i know I would be much rather be living in an area of natural beauty not a concrete jungle

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough time given to read proposals

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Use the abandoned Appleton thorn/Harley site!!

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No time given to read proposal

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think more are need

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes, when my husband and I came to live here ■ years ago, we thought that Burtonwood was a lovely place to live in, now that the green belt is disappearing with all the storage buildings going up, we don't need any more houses being built there are enough!

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Because as I explained there are enough houses and we need to save the green belt!

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not agree with the New City aspirations; I do not believe any Green Belt should be released; I am opposed the number of new homes being suggested

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am opposed to the Garden City Suburb option

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am opposed to the Garden City Suburb because the development would forever change a rural area me and my family currently enjoy and should be preserved for future generations. The GCS would alter the semi-rural character of Grappenhall. I believe the scheme is favoured by property developers, whose interest is financial, not the local community.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is an error at paragraph 5.14 which states the City Centre master plan had been approved by Executive Board in December 2017.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe that Port Warrington would increase traffic/freight adding to congestion and pollution

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am opposed to the Garden City Suburb in it's entirety. I believe it would have a devastating impact on the semi-rural feel and sense of community in Grappenhall. I believe the development would lead to increased traffic; I do not believe housing in this area would be affordable; I believe the development would forever harm the environment and is opposed by local residents. I have children who should have the right to access green spaces in the future - I think this change will drive families to live elsewhere. It should not go ahead.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not believe there would be affordable housing

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am opposed to the continued large-scale development when there remains scope to bring town centre sites back into commercial/employment use

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Links to transport schemes should be made clearer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Could utilise brownfield sites rather than green spaces

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why destroy so much green belt land other suitable locations for development

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There isn't & wont be enough infrastructure to cope with the additional development

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough thought or options with regards to alternative traffic routes

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why this level of development infrastructure can't cope with current levels of housing / traffic movement

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The town centre can't cope with the current volumes of traffic so with the additional volumes no hope

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Should be adopted

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Shouldn't be adopted

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Ridiculous idea

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Ridiculous

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are currently significant employment areas within the warrington boundaries

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not proceed

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel there are more brownfield areas that can be built on before you start building on green belt

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I firmly wish to object to Peel Holdings Proposal to build on the fields in Croft .The effect on the village would be catastrophic leading to a loss of its true nature . The effect on the environment and its wild life would be devastating .Also there are many existing traffic problems and they would be multiplied during and after completion of the work. During building the noise pollution would be on a huge scale and would last for many years.The services for the village are already under strain and would require much attention which would again be disruptive to village life .There is also a problem with existing services such as schools , nurseries and Doctors .Also there are no shops, banks or garages etc.In this modern , fast moving noisy life there is even a greater need to preserve the Green Belt . It is necessary for the well-being and good health of the people . I wish to establish a very emphatic NO to the building proposal for Croft .

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Every effort should be made to preserve the nature of the village of Croft.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I'm concern is amenities and services to support new housing

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

But need to consider improving traffic measures as warrington gets gride locked

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Schools and how increasing numbers of children will be accommodated for education provision locally

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The greenbelt land in south Warrington is extremely important to myself and my family as residents of South Warrington and regular walkers through the green areas that are proposed to be affected. South Warrington will not be the same enjoyable semi-rural place to live and will be far too overcrowded, putting extreme pressures on already overstretched local schools and services. As residents in Appleton we have had nothing through the post from WBC outlining these new Local Plan Objectives; all the information we have had has been gathered from other local residents who have formed an objection group on social media and are doing a great job fighting to keep our much loved green belt land. Money isn't everything...people are!

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has not been enough information provided by WBC to residents, and not enough consultation with residents.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no indication of where to find such documents. I am a resident in Warrington and have had absolutely zero information about any such plans from WBC.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough consideration of existing brownfield sites, and other derelict sites for redevelopment

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are many more brown belt options that can and should be utilised before eating up more and more of what makes Warrington and Cheshire a great place to live - the countryside!

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Entering Warrington from the South is gridlocked already due to the need to cross the Manchester Ship canal - the excessive overdevelopment of land to the South of Warrington will only cause the reputation of Warrington traffic to go from bad to worse. I have only recently moved to the area and already struggle with access to local services, the infrastructure just isn't there or easily accessible to the south to support this proposal

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I really support this - Warrington is uniquely located across many waterways and no feature is made of these currently, indeed quite the opposite when you look at the tired state of many of the bridges. People love to live near water, and this development would add great value to Warrington

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Entering Warrington from the South is gridlocked already due to the need to cross the Manchester Ship canal - the excessive overdevelopment of the South is only going to exacerbate this. Warrington traffic is already a joke to people in the North West, don't make this worse. The greenbelt of land around Warrington is what makes it a desirable place to be - take this away and you take away from the whole of Warrington, not just the people that live in WA4.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

According to Mid Mersey SMHA updated in May 2017 only half of the houses you want are needed and Green Belt land does not need to be touched

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are large Brown field sites likely to be released within the 20 year period of the plan which have not been taken into account e.g. Fiddlers Ferry is nearing its end and Warrington Hospital is planning to move to a new site.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Your preferred option for a Garden City Suburb of 7000+ houses in South East Warrington and an urban extension of 1831 houses in Walton would mean all of the fields in Higher Walton and Appleton could be built on and many in Grappenhall and Stretton

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't think you have considered brown field sites rather have only considered Green belt. Practically all of Warrington's Green Belt could be preserved by scaling back on the planned housing and employment numbers and better use of Brown Field sites

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Your preferred option is for a Garden City Suburb and urban extension of Walton. This would mean all of the fields in Higher Walton and Appleton could be built on and many in Grappenhall and Stretton. The National Planning Policy Framework says Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. It is not clear what you believe these exceptional circumstances are. Your preferred option would also completely change the character of the area and destroy its history and heritage. Smaller settlements currently separated by fields will just become a sprawling mass. An inability to enjoy the countryside would be greatly missed and that's before even thinking about traffic congestion and lack of a detailed traffic survey in the plan

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see previous answers but the Garden city option would mean all of the fields in Higher Walton and Appleton could be built on and many in Grappenhall and Stretton, completely changing the character of the area, creating one big sprawling urban mass rather than smaller settlements separated by fields

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This would mean all of the fields in Higher Walton and Appleton could be built on. No adverse impact on Stockton Heath is mentioned in the plan of extra housing in Appleton and Higher Walton affecting the amount of traffic generated. Already roads are frequently at a standstill, especially if there is disruption on the local motorways or if the bridges swing. Last week it took me 45 minutes to get from Stretton to Stockton Heath along London Road because of accidents on the M6 and M56. There doesn't seem to be any account taken of the geography of Warrington in the plan with the Mersey, Ship Canal and Bridgewater canals.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Better use of Brown field sites

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The principal reasons for objecting to the PDO are:1. The flawed vision for making Warrington a city2. The inadequacy of the Consultation process3. The miscalculation of the Housing needs4. The lack of exceptional circumstances for reclassifying the Green Belt

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

more consultation time and transparency of figures and dealings with developers are required

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of houses and employment land within built up areas should be calculated based on the maximum numbers possible to remove the need for release of green belt. The figures should therefore be reviewed on this basis.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan is flawed as it is based on the Council's desire for City status hand in hand with the developers requirements and it does not reflect the needs of the town. The figures have therefore been manipulated on this basis. There should therefore be a review and the lowest possible multipliers should be applied. If the number of proposed houses is reduced then the requirement for employment land will be reduced.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I strongly disagree with the objectives as it is based on a misguided attempt by the council to have city status. If the council wants to go for this then a separate consultation should be carried out as I don't believe it will be

supported by the majority of Warrington's residents. The objectives of the plan should be to develop but retain as much of the character of the area as possible.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The spatial objectives do not reflect the needs of the town and are based on flawed growth data which will not stand up to scrutiny.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree with the options to develop the urban areas as these can fully meet the Towns needs for many decades if managed correctly. I disagree with the option to release green belt as the requirement for this is based on flawed information.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I disagree with the preferred development option as it is based on flawed growth figures and there is no need for it to cover a 20 year period. The period should be reduced to 10 to 15 years which will allow for factors like Brexit to be considered.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree with the development of the town centre but this will have to be supported by heavy investment in infrastructure particularly the surrounding roads. The council should review the figures and ensure that the

maximum use is made of the land available. There should also be a strong emphasis on affordable/social housing in this area as it is close to public transport hubs

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The brownfield land in the waterfront should be developed but there should be no release of green belt as if a more sensible approach is applied to development figures then there will be no need for the extra land

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I disagree with the development of the garden suburb as it is predominantly on green belt and if the housing figures were recalculated to sensibly reflect the needs of the town then there is no need for the additional homes. In addition the council has not demonstrated an exceptional need for release of the green belt. The plan does not take account of environmental issues in particular air quality, which is already poor in surrounding areas like Stockton Heath, nor the fact that the surrounding road network is unable to support anymore traffic. The council also has an obligation to retain the unique heritage and character of the individual settlements, which will be destroyed by the new development.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The council has not and i believe can not prove an exceptional need for the release of green belt in which case this development can't be justified

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This relies on the release of greenbelt and can therefore not be justified as the council can't prove an exceptional need for this. Any development in these areas should be only within existing urban areas

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of required employment land is linked to the amount of new houses and as the new house figure is flawed then so is the employment figure

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The current illegal sites should remain illegal and the council should take steps to enforce the law. There should be no reward for ignoring planning legislation

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The local plan should only cover 10 to 15 years and should include a proviso that if additional brownfield sites like Fiddlers ferry become available then they will be immediately included in the plan and any greenbelt/greenfield sites should be removed from the plan. The greenbelt boundaries should remain as they are

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

In view of the changing economic market due to Brexit and the hurdles people have to go through in order to obtain a mortgage that trying to predict the need for housing and employment land over the next 20 years has no precedent. I am aware the Government have stated the need for these decisions but I feel 20 years is far too long a period of time to predict population and economic needs. The effect of this plan significantly affects how people already in the area can move home for employment reasons and how others can downsize if they wish to. By trying to work out the need for homes and employment land Warrington and other areas have effectively prevented movement within the country.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The need to mix homes and employment land within existing built up areas I believe is generally a better idea because people would need to travel less to get to work and also for social purposes. In view of how many people would be able to walk or travel shorter distances either in their own vehicles or by public transport this could reduce pollution and the need for so many car parks. It could reduce congestion on local roads. Many people on a low income find travel expenses, such as expenses to run a car or to use public transport an important consideration when choosing where to live and work. I believe people generally care for their local environment better which should improve built up areas.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt land is extremely important both for farming purposes and the employment of farmers and their workers. The need to reduce the distance which food produced on farming land travels to reach the consumer should be an important consideration. Plus the need to maintain a greener environment in order to reduce carbon dioxide production, encourage flora and fauna. There appears to be an extremely large amount of green belt land being sacrificed which I feel is unnecessary.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe any local plan objectives should closely involve the local population who are already residing in the area. These people deserve to be shown respect and have a say in the development of their local area. Most people are aware of the need for change, however their opinions have not been taken into consideration.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Planning such large developments is rarely popular with people who already reside or work in an area. Often these people do not benefit from them. They chose to live in the environment they are in and were happy with the facilities. To later have new homes, roads and employment areas imposed on them especially when they may have lived in a quiet area which is to be developed 'traps' them making selling of their property more difficult. Producing a garden city area is less beneficial to many than being able to look out of their home at trees and small areas of grassland.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Smaller developments spread over a larger area would surely be better accepted by people.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The assumptions made on the total number of new dwellings needed are completely wrong. There is no way that Warrington will attract anything like the numbers proposed. Warrington is being by-passed by HS2, for example, which will lead to it's existing population decreasing.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The take up of any green belt land for housing development is criminal when there are so much brown field sites available.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You should be safeguarding all Green Belt land, and even extending it. There is adequate land already available for the limited needs of Warrington and district for the next 20+ years.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You should be safeguarding what there is, not increasing demand on an infrastructure that cannot even support what already exists. Poor traffic management has lead to an already gridlocked system.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The whole basis is flawed.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous comments.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This area should be supported.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Although your options are reasonable, they greatly magnify the need.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

So long as it doesn't encroach on Green Belt.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Justification for the assumptions you have made in arriving at the numbers of new development. They are grossly exaggerated.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe a lot of the data used is both misleading and inaccurate

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's loaded towards South Warrington and the rationale is inept. It would appear that the Housing is a red herring. The proposed ringroad (which in essence is a bypass) is the key to providing Hgv traffic and in the absence of a proper traffic assessment allows the Council the opportunity to get this through under the radar.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Council's Agenda is clear despite its thin veil of democracy. Let's be open and honest. All I need to refer to is the Westmorland Gazette!!!! Greed is fronting this Local Plan that will ruin our green for our children.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

What a shambles? City status. The Council's objectives at best misplaced.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Coucillors who have lead this inadequate consultation and put forward this option need to seriously consider the damage this has done to their Party and the total lose in Public faithThere are much more realistic options that would best serve Warrington and provide a more sustainable future with better use of brown field sitesHowever their option is driven by a select few of third party interests

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to last comment

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington has a proud history in providing quality Housing and the proposed Local Plan will do nothing in providing much needed affordable housing for our children Circa 10000 houses in South Warrington is absolutely the wrong Strategic decision and the Officers involved in advising members need to be brought to task as if this is their advise then it is misguided and they are not in touch with the residents of Warrington whom I would remind Councillors act for!!!!

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes simply No This is frankly an Officers ego gone wild and if you did a simple consultation I guess 85o/o no vote

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A good idea so long as the tail does not wag the dogTransport !!!

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously stated totally ridiculous and not deliverable Developers will take the rich pickings and run leaving Council with egg on faces Well those councillors and Officers left to make excuses for its failure as I doubt if any of the encumbrances will be around!!!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Very concerned about its impact on existing residents and the environment

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As with the rest of the proposal lots of inaccuracies and poor Strategic thinking

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Of course I do agree with employment land but let's be honest look at the mess that exists and now the Council want to ruin new locations It would be laughable if it wasn't! So serious

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Council have failed for years to deal with this matter and are basically taking the easy way out

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not at this moment

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Rethink and appoint an executive team that has the knowledge and expertise to deliver a resident friendly Local Plan whilst providing excellent opportunities for sustainable development

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

- your calculations are unclear as to how you have reached the numbers you have- numbers appear to be based on figures from 5 years ago and it is probably much lower than calculated now

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

#NAME?

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

#NAME?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously stated, the calculations are unclear as to whether or not this is actually a NEED. We are happy to live in Warrington as a town with rural suburbs. We do not wish to live in a city and do not want Warrington to become a city. It would be better for Warrington to focus on the redevelopment of brownfield sites rather than build over green belt land.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is a huge development with large numbers of additional people and traffic in an area that is already struggling to cope with the traffic it has currently. It is building on Green belt land when there are other areas, that would benefit from redevelopment which are not addressed in the plans.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not understand how you have come to identify how much land is required to be built on for employment land. It does not seem clear what kind of premises these will be. Have you taken into consideration the impact of Brexit on the economy? Have you taken into consideration the impact of technology on the spaces required? Will more people work from home, require larger workspace or smaller?

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

They should not be encouraged and why should the people living in the surrounding areas have to deal with the implications of having land set aside near where they live (potentially lowering their house value and increasing crime).

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It seems very high, as a town built around water ways unrealistic too, our whole town infrastructure cannot cope as it is, it is going to blight so many people's lives. Living in Warrington while all this change is going on is also going to be horrendous

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

What a question? Don't want to lose the character of our town and villages, please don't destroy our green belt, our air pollution is already very bad, this will make it worse and affect people's health.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am not sure whose objectives these are, Warrington already gets grid locked if there is an incident on any of our local

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am shocked that the proposal is for so many new houses and why South Warrington seems to have been the focus over other areas of the town with Green Belt being put at risk. I don't see the necessity for Warrington to aim to become a city, with Manchester and Liverpool so close. Why are so many houses being planned when the Mid Mersey SMHA projection in May 2017 indicate that only half this number are actually needed?

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't think sufficient thought has been given to the infrastructure required for so many houses and increased population in this area. How will the schools (already at capacity), doctors surgeries, and access roads cope with the increased numbers using them? This side of Warrington is already heavily congested.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't understand what the 'exceptional circumstances' (National Planning Policy Framework) are for the Council to release Green Belt land for housing. I don't think this has been properly explained to residents.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have lived in Stockton Heath and Appleton for nearly [REDACTED] years and have chosen the area for its access to countryside for my children and have been amazed at the wildlife in the area so close to housing. The new housing and destruction of the Green Belt will also destroy a great deal of the environment for this wildlife. I have not heard of a plan to carry out an environmental and ecological impact survey before the Local Plan goes ahead. It's clear that residents from all over Warrington access these green areas and it's not only south Warrington residents who benefit.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not quite sure what this means, if it's to do with the development of other areas and brownfield sites first then no, I don't think this has been considered in any detail before targeting green belt.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think this option needs far greater consultation and thought and as far as I know there is not a desire in this area for it to become a Garden City Suburb.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not had time to look at this aspect.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think there should definitely be an Environmental and Ecological Impact Survey included in the plan before any Green Belt is taken away. I assumed this was a necessity.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would like to raise concerns regarding the sites identified to the North and East of Warrington i.e. Culcheth, Croft, Winwick, Glazebury, Hollins Green. Much of the land proposed for development around these villages is good quality, well managed agricultural land which provides informal recreational space for both residents and visitors from other parts of Warrington. The greenbelt around these villages contributes to and maintains the farming traditions now lost throughout most of Warrington. It also provides valuable and increasingly scarce habitat for wildlife within Warrington. I appreciate this a development plan for housing and employment opportunities but I feel the importance of green space is being somewhat forgotten in the drive to meet targets. I have young children in primary school and I'm well aware that good quality primary, secondary and further education opportunities in this part of Warrington are already oversubscribed. The road network around these villages was never built to carry the number of vehicles it carries today, many are narrow and used as commuter routes to reach employment areas elsewhere in Warrington. Public transport options are extremely limited. I see these issues are already a concern as on Pg 25 the plan states - A dispersed development form raises significant concerns about the deliverability of the infrastructure required to support growth, including the delivery of new transport, education facilities, open space and recreational facilities. There is a significant risk that development will exacerbate existing congestion and infrastructure constraints in the main Warrington urban area. I believe the proposal to extend these villages with smaller pockets of development will have significant impact on the greenbelt directly and a severe indirect affect on surrounding roads and educational/recreational opportunities for Warrington residents. In other words the contribution the development of these outlying settlements will make to meeting the housing/employment targets is negligible compared to the scale of negative impact it will have on the existing villages.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not support the proposed plan given the current traffic congestion in the town and the fact that further plans to build housing will increase problems. There is already pressure on local facilities such as NHS and schools... Which need to be addressed. The link road is a knee jerk reaction not a solution to our problems. Opening up land for development which will not benefit residents.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The proposals bring increased pressure on local facilities... No mention as to how they will be developed... This needs to be addressed appropriately before any increase in housing proposed.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Brown belt land needs to be used before we release any land from our precious green belt

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't believe the plans are appropriate given the detrimental affect on the residents and the impact on the environment.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't believe the plan delivers appropriately given the impact on current residents and quality of the environment.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Location appears to be related to the needs of Peel Holdings rather than the residents of Warrington or local environmental needs.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO gives little consideration to the current issues within the town or the fact that the proposed plans to increase housing and reduce green belt land will only serve to further exacerbate the problems. The infrastructure of the town needs to be improved first and then an appropriate and clearly thought out plan proposed that allows for full consultation with residents and will enhance our town in the future.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Our town centre needs to serve the residents of Warrington effectively. A bypass would help reduce the impact of congestion caused by surrounding motorways and future issues caused by the Mersey Gateway. Easy access to an improved town centre could then be enabled thus encouraging more visitors and shoppers. The traffic issues the PDO will create won't encourage people into the town centre.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Without an appropriate infrastructure in place any development will bring more problems than it will solve. I do think there is potential to develop the water front but I don't think the PDO is it.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As my previous answer states... The PDO does not address the potential appropriately.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO addresses Peel Holdings needs not those of the residents. The proposed plan will cause further congestion put pressure on the current infrastructure and adversely impact on the quality of life and the environment in South West Warrington.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't believe the PDO addresses the needs of the town or its residents and therefore the plan is not appropriate.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Any such plan should make use of the brown belt land first.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

All aspects of the PDO need to be reconsidered.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

All aspects of the PDO need to be reconsidered.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Appropriate timing of consultations, open and clear communication with all those potentially affected by the PDO.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Statistics and data used by WBC is suspect. While there is nationally a need for more housing 24000 new homes in Warrington is a gross over estimate of the actual need Building excessive numbers of new houses in South Warrington does not equate with employment opportunities in Warrington. those in South Warrington have historically found employment in Manchester or Liverpool. Those affording inflated South Warrington house prices would not be receiving sufficient wages from Warrington. The 2011 census noted that 1 in 6 people in Warrington are over 65 years - there is no provision for homes / supported housing in these plans.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

At the consultation meetings there was confusion as to how WBC obtained any relevant data.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Green Belt is a boundary to prevent urban sprawl. To release or supposedly 'safeguard' the green belt indicates a lack of environmental acumen.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This plan appears to be purely speculator and land developer led - for profit by those who do not live in Warrington. There is no indication of public consideration and consultation was arranged when people were away during the summer and meetings were poorly advertised and conducted. There were no facilities for disabled access to any planning meeting - no chairs and maps displayed too high and therefore unreadable.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is interesting that there is no plan for North Warrington or proper town centre renewal. South Warrington - previously part of Cheshire when north of the Mersey ie Warrington was in Lancashire - would appear to be a leafy green area to be 'developed' purely for the benefit of WBC.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No information was forthcoming at 'consultation' meetings.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This PDO should be scrapped in its entirety. The PDO is glossily presented as a fait accompli by those who will benefit - NOT the residents of Warrington.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a TOWN not a city. The TOWN centre is run down and unattractive. By pretending it has pretensions to be a city is ludicrous. Old attractive buildings should be preserved and enhanced by sympathetic

building not concrete boxes or anything that destroys the skyline.Roads are in poor repair and traffic congestion must be addressed.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is Peel Holdings master plan to develop all land along the Manchester Ship Canal. As a major monied developer they would appear to influence decisions made by WBC.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is an extraordinary presumption that this would be needed by Warrington's future workforce.It would destroy vast green areas and recognised green belt.Houses in South Warrington are out of the price bracket for most Warrington employees. Each household having at least 2 cars would increase road congestion and concomitant air pollution.It is a bad idea.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

While there are traffic problems travelling south to north or north to south over the Mersey, the Ship Canal and the Bridgewater Canal in Warrington building a vast elevated road to straddle these, akin to the M6 Thelwall viaduct, would cause major disruption during prolonged building stages in already congested road systems.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As a Lymm resident for ■ years I have seen the smothering of all available pockets of green space often with inappropriate housing to the detriment of the rural environment. 500 additional houses in an area where educational, medical and parking facilities are already over-subscribed is a nonsense, The additional building traffic is unsustainable on poorly maintained, narrow roads. The type of housing has not been specified. With 1 in 6 of Warrington's population (2011 census) over 65 years provision for smaller, supported housing units for an ageing population is a glaring omission in the PDO.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Brownfield sites, North Warrington and the future decommissioning of Fiddlers Ferry should be first options.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

No comment

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This was not covered at the consultation meeting. Therefore unable to comment. Please provide more detail.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Proper environmental consultation - not just developers' ideas. Proper data relating to current air pollution in Warrington. Funding by developers NOT by Warrington ratepayers for future plans, Provision for adequate health needs for intended future residents - adequate hospital, medical facilities, clean air and open spaces. Provision for adequate health and social needs for an ageing population - housing, medical & social centres.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

These figures need to be recalculated to utilise the governments more standardised methodology.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No real mention has been made of the potential brownfield sites that are deemed for release - Fiddlers Ferry-Warrington Hospital site. It these are appropriately incorporated into the scheme then this would result in a significant reduction in Green Belt release.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Lymm is a village which has a unique character. The addition of 100 homes on SHLAA sites in addition to the proposal to situate 500 homes on Green Belt release land has to be considered extremely carefully. If any more homes were to be allocated to Lymm than the stated preferred option, it would undoubtedly decimate its village character. It is also key to consider the implications on the primary schools (at capacity), the health centre (at capacity), the retail centre (not even able to support a post office, or local bank, let alone the number of independent traders who fold after 1-2 years) and the roads, which have not been built to accommodate nearly 13000 current residents. Without the character of Lymm retaining its semi rural feel, it will become a semi-urban sprawl of 'nothing' within the next 20 years and be lost forever.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

local facilities would not be capable of supporting additional housing e.g. schooling, roads (current accident black spot at the junction of Lady Lane and St. Lewis school) which would be a major route from the estate being planned.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I was wondering how you came up with the number of 500 for new residencies in Lymm alone? Having looked into this it would be a 10% increase for a village which is already very full.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

In Lymm I fail to see how green belt cannot be used. Lymm is very full at the moment and a 10% increase in houses is not going to safeguard any land. It will probably give builders the idea that green belt can be built on.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not sure what these cover but if it's OK to build on green belt land then I do not agree with it.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are areas around Warrington with more potential for building new homes which are closer to the centre of Warrington, therefore bringing people into the area for work/jobs and accessibility of public transport.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

sounds like a great idea

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

please dont build on our green belt in lymm

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

To me it seems nonsensical releasing green belt land when there are so many brown field sites in and around Warrington. Eating further and further into the countryside and green belt is an irreversible process. Creating gardens does not compensate. Gardens should be used to improve brown belts sites.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As stated before, to me it seems nonsensical releasing green belt land when there are so many brown field sites in and around Warrington. Eating further and further into the countryside and green belt is an irreversible process. Creating gardens does not compensate. Gardens should be used to improve brown belts sites.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Lymm is a VILLAGE. A relatively sudden huge increase in resident numbers as planned will destroy Lymm's character both physically in appearance and in spirit. As demonstrated at events throughout the year Lymm is a thriving intimate local community which is well supported by its residents. Events such as Carols at the Cross and the May Queen festival are examples of village life that would be changed by a large influx of new residents. There is significant concern about capacity at schools and health centres. Parking is a terrible situation already. Please allow Lymm to maintain its intimate character. Congestion through the village and the arterial roads through lymm at peak times are a significant problem. Speed control measures have not helped.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have concerns over the 24,000 houses that you intend to build on our green belt land. I understand the need for growth in our town and community, but as I understand it the council are proposing to build way over the minimum number of houses which as I understand it would amount to 914 houses per annum over 15 years instead of the 1,113, over 20 years which the council are proposing. Taking into account that if the proposal were to run over the 15 year period the minimum amount of housing required would be 13,710 all which I understand could be built on brown field sites. Please leave our green belt land alone.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have worked it out with the maximum amount of housing needed instead of the minimum.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have worked out the amount of land required by your plan running over 20 years with maximum amount of homes to be built, revise your plans to the minimum amount of housing needed and there will be no need to encroach on green belt.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No I compliantly disagree do not see the need to use green belt land when there are enough brown belt sites to accommodate the minimum amount of houses needed.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have explained my reasons in the previous answers.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Would like to understand how you chose those options.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Already explained in previous answers.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Only concerned about the preferred option to use green belt.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes I am concerned about the encroaching of green belt land in the villages outlying Warrington town centre. We are in danger of loosing our villages and becoming one large sprawling city.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes in moderation away from suburban areas

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not sure what the suggested approach is?

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The need appears to rely on city status with unrealistic economic and population growth. Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC, and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield boroughs and housing areas

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan propose the use of green belt land which does not appear to be justified. It doesn't appear t make use of all brown field sites across the town before using green belt. The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The particular assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above the OAN and do not appear logical, consistent or robust.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Appears to be driven by the desire for city status. Not all of the plans appear to be clearly defined and when questioned during the consultation events, answers were very limited. It's very difficult to see what assessment has taken place.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least stated at outset that it was based on out-of-date estimates that had subsequently been shown to be significant overstatements). There is no recognition of alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. There appears to be no scoping exercise around the consultation and no steering group. No links have been forged with local groups to ensure understanding of the process. It's unclear how the length of time for the consultation process was decided. It has consulted over a holiday period meaning many residents have not been able to be as involved as the could be. The options suggested impact considerably on local residents and businesses. No collection of data took place at consultation events. Consultation generally has been very poor and there is little evidence of a clear communication strategy.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The particular assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above the OAN and do not appear logical, consistent or robust. Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC, and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield boroughs and housing areas. The projections used are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum. The Plan should be based on an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. There will be considerable environmental impact and loss of habitats. Healthcare in the town is already overstretched and the plan does not focus sufficiently on how this can be improved. Social care within the town is currently poor and the plan

does not deal with this issue sufficiently. Warrington south is already gridlocked with traffic, particularly if issues with the motorway. Stockton Heath and A49 cannot cope with current traffic levels let alone the increase when the tolls are introduced in Halton bridges. The plans will further exasperate this issue. I see little value in developing so much land around Grappenhall/Appleton Thorn/Stretton, and given the considerable health issues the town suffers from, I cannot see how this can help, given the increased levels of pollution the traffic will cause, alongside the loss of green space. NHS leaders in Cheshire and Merseyside have developed a Sustainability and Transformation Plan which means they have to save over £900 million by 2020. There will be very little money to grow services to meet the needs of Warrington's population as it is, let alone with further development. The Royal College of GPs said in 2015 that Warrington was one of the top ten places in England that has a shortfall in the numbers of GPs for the size of our current population. They said we already need a 57% increase in our GP numbers (55). There is a national shortage of GPs. It is not clear in the PDO how the additional GPs the population will need will be found.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The argument for city status has not been set out or agreed/consulted on by residents. Even referring to the town centre as the city centre in the question implies that this will be the outcome.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Building the numbers of houses and roads, as described by the PDO, is likely to bring thousands of extra cars in to the town every day. There is clear evidence that motor vehicles make a significant contribution to poorer air quality and congestion.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Building the numbers of houses and roads, as described by the PDO, is likely to bring thousands of extra cars in to the town every day. There is clear evidence that motor vehicles make a significant contribution to poorer air quality and congestion. In May 2016, the World Health Organisation said that Warrington is the second worst place in the North West for breaching air pollution safety levels. Increased traffic and reduced green space will only serve to exasperate this. Warrington already has a higher percentage of households with 2 or more vehicles (36%) than the rest of the North West (27%) or UK (30%).

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact lifestyles and working practices, an issue not unique to Warrington. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required, let alone where it should be. WBC should produce a ten year plan, by which point we will be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impact from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). It would also allow for the decommissioning of Fiddlers Ferry and so the availability of an enormous brownfield site requiring regeneration.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Council does not provide adequate description and explanation of the exceptional circumstances which must be demonstrated in order to justify release of land for development from the Green Belt, as required by the NPPF. The justifications in para. 4.40 of the document are insufficiently detailed and non-specific to the particular situation in south Warrington: indeed, suggestions that Green Belt release will form plan of a comprehensive plan...enable the creation of new sustainable communities...and unlock major development sites... could be included in virtually any submission for Green Belt release. Interestingly, the arguments AGAINST non-release of Green Belt land in South Warrington set out in para. 4.41 - severe congestion on Warrington's transport network, a risk of worsening air quality, increasing pressure on school places, health facilities, sports and leisure facilities and other community facilities... are precisely the reasons local residents are opposed to the scale of housing development proposed for South Warrington in the preferred option.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Much of the information is presented as factual but with no supporting evidence other than because you say so. There is as much documentation freely available to dispute the figures that you state Warrington will need. You have also falsely tried to imply the Government have decided on these figures when in fact it is WBC.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes - How did you calculate the figure in the first place? If circa 15000 properties can be built on Brownfield land then the whole plan should be revisited on this basis. The number you have calculated is not factual in the first instance and is unsupported. There is little desire from the public to become a city and therefore money should be invested in existing infrastructure into an already polluted and congested town. Rather than exacerbating the problems.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Greenbelt should be exactly that. There are plenty of Brownfield sites to develop and by nature more of these will become available over the next twenty years to therefore fulfil the requirements in an organic way. Its ironic you use the term safeguarded in this question.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington does not need to grow or develop at this rate. There are two cities on our doorstep should we seek Urban or City living. We could be an excellent town rather than a rubbish city with no soul, heritage or culture.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The assessment is an attack on Greenbelt land instead of regeneration of Brownfield sites. It is over ambitious yet no doubt lucrative for some!!

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No because Warrington's future development needs are inaccurate and unsupported.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The public do not want to live in a city and so therefore the city centre is also unwarranted. Manchester and Liverpool successfully fill the North West's city requirements and we could never compete so why try. Why not be a better town than our surrounding neighbours instead.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yet more traffic when we are already one of the worst ranking for air pollution.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Already sitting at the crossroads of two major motorways this is an area that needs less traffic not more. It also sits on Greenbelt land and therefore should be protected from development and be left for the residents who chose to live in a more rural location or to have access to the countryside to do just that. The destruction of the TPT is a well used amenity and again should be preserved. What are the reasons for discounting the other options?

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Further destruction of Greenbelt land, more traffic, pollution, congestion. Over development, loss of wildlife... The list goes on..

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Because the whole plan is linked together and A requires B so without a proper and fair consultation it is impossible to agree on any point.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

A proper consultation that considers the views of the residents. Not an underhanded divide and conquer approach with public announcements in the Westmorland Gazette

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

While I accept the need to project numbers of houses and employment needed I object to the lack of consultation opportunities offered to the public involved and the lack of information given.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do understand that there is a finite amount of land within Warrington's built up areas to allow an increase in both employment and homes however again I feel that there has been little consultation within areas of Warrington which have been highlighted for possible expansion.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No I feel that the amount of 'safeguarded' land/Green Belt has not been appropriately worked out. Any building works would almost decimate land used for leisure activities for all the family and have a detrimental effect on wildlife.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel as though they have almost been 'rubber stamped' without enough public consultation.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would agree that the expansion plans regarding transport links and being a 'hub' of the region's communication network does appear to be a positive action. However I feel that local issues appear to have been ignored in order to foster big business

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that not enough consideration of local issues has been given.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that the present town centre 'market' development is a very positive step, however its environs are shocking and that Bridge Street itself is a disgrace with empty boarded up shops and rough sleepers in doorways. It is not a safe nor pleasant place to be. How long will the future re-development take and where will the money come from.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan will involve an inappropriate use of precious green space, do we need extra housing to this extent? Will there be adequate social housing? Shops, schools and medical facilities?

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am unsure of what this definition actually means.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously stated I am very concerned about it's effect on local people and housing, wildlife, leisure activities and disruption to existing transport links.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Although this does not affect me directly it appears that local consultations have not been as thorough as they could be and local residents often unaware of any plans.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As long as it is appropriately sited and consultations with the local population is proven.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that there should be sites provided for travellers in consultation with the local populace. If facilities are provided they must populate an income from the travellers themselves. We have to pay our Council Tax.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Provided it is safe and secure and not harmful to the local population or wildlife.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that we have not been given sufficient time to read and understand the possible effects of the plan. We needed more local accessible events with non biased people to talk to.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I object to all proposals you have in relation to Warrington as a whole - [REDACTED] [REDACTED] where I live, Burtonwood where my parents live, Grappenhall in fact everywhere you wish to build either houses, roads, bridges, industrial estates et al. You have made myself and my family anxious, dismayed and very depressed about your plans to become a city and the amount of houses you wish to build. I don't know where to start or how to find the words - it has been very confusing to collate the information together and we have found it very difficult to understand your documents. It all seems very cloak and dagger and in fact, a done deal. I have not even had a letter through the post or someone call round to explain to me how where I live has been offered up for sale by the landowner which will effect the home we live in. I fully understand the need for more houses to be built and the infrastructure that that requires. However, following the public consultation which I feel is very vague anyway and indeed, very complicated; I do not feel the proposals satisfactorily address this problem. We did not even know that there was a public consultation! We are relying totally on what research we are doing in order to find out what on earth is happening. I feel myself and the public should be made aware of your evidence to support the gross amount of damage you wish to impose on our environment. Please send me, in writing, the evidence that you have considered the following points: Affordable housing. Warrington and surrounding areas is already cluttered with new build estates. Tiny houses which are overpriced shoe boxes. Small 4 bedroomed houses priced at over Â£500,000. Ugly warehouses springing up on beautiful Burtonwood land and surrounding areas which was once green belt land and that you have conveniently made brown belt and now industrial estates. I have heard many a tale at how working conditions at these places are terrible - Zero hour contracts and unpleasant working conditions. I would like to have assurances that the proposed 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 please? What green space is allowed to stay, and land that can be sold off? The amount of housing. The 24,000 figure. Where does this come from? I have read 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 August 17th 2017 and yesterday, 26th September 2017 to name only two). People have been 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. What precisely are the new link road options? Lifestyle: childhood obesity rates continue to grow, lifestyles are increasingly sedentary and evidence points to encouraging Warrington residents to become more active. Not only for physical benefits, but mental benefits 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, not to mention on the three roads into Burtonwood and of course, where I live in [REDACTED]. I believe 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? I have read an interesting point of Facebook to allude to:- 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 are empty and have been for some time. Please can you set out and respond with your solutions and efforts to convert such areas to appealing places to live? Can you not redevelop the massive amount of houses derelict before being greedy and obsessed with ruining our beautiful greenbelt land? I read another comment researching: 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. Surely you can 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 interest: I wonder if you could confirm 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. Do you realise what you are doing to people? Why should we find a beautiful place to live and be so unsettled, our homes losing value, our quality of life ruined. We do not believe this is for the greater good. Warrington is ALREADY a magnificent example of a prosperous TOWN. We do not want it to be a city, or have any involvement with Peel Greedy Holdings who are considered the 'mafia of Manchester'. We should have been made aware of this, not find out by Facebook posts, over-complicated legally written documents that hardly make any sense to the common people. Shame on you! Please, we beg you reconsider I look forward to your reply. Kind regards [REDACTED]

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have not explained to me where I can find this information to consider your question

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have not given me an acceptable amount of easy to read literature to answer the question

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

ALL FOR GREED, NOT REALLY FOR THE PEOPLE, BACK HANDERS AND CORRUPTION. We do not want these plans to go ahead

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, please tell me where and how I can collate the information necessary to answer the question

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

as previous

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

as per my long letter to you. Think of the wildlife, think of what the people paying your wages want

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

To compulsory purchase houses is disgusting. You want Peel to take over the world like a villain movie! One big bridge from Manchester to Liverpool next. I bet you do not live in these areas

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A silly suggestion, absolutely against it

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, listen to the people. I object to this plan

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't even know what your question means

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not agree with taking greenbelt land or greenbelt sneakily turned into brown belt/development land.
Renovate and rejuvenate existing, derelict eye soars

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The details of my thoughts are in the PDF attached

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See PDF

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See PDF attachedit is not appropriately worked out it is disproportionate

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See PDF

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See PDF attached

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I definetely disagree

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached PDF .

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This will create more jobs within the town which is needed

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Less housing ...possibly looking at alternative infrastructure other than using the trans pennine trail

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attached file

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not believe you have calculated correctly the need for homes and employment land based on the existing population of Warrington. I believe you are looking to expand beyond the real need which I believe is half what you estimate.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think that you have made the information about your figures and forecasts too complicated for the average person to really understand. There is plenty of brownfield land for homes and employment.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no need to release land from the green belt. You have over estimated the amount of houses required and therefore it is misinformation.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Your objectives are developer and business driven not community interests

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The main spatial options you should be assessing are the Town centre and areas of North Warrington which need regeneration

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no need whatsoever to have a garden city - you are just creating urban sprawl with no consideration for cultural or historical heritage ie villages etc.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You are repeating the questions. WArrington needs the Town Centre regenerating based on it's historical past ie trade and industry. There is no need for warehouse outlets which lend nothing to the culture or values of a Northern town

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no city centre - it is a town with an industrial heritage.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Perhaps one of the few decent options

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unnecessary and as already said just creating urban sprawl and destroying the countryside

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A total unnecessary option. Joining up Walton to Moore losing its identity. There is no need for development here

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Outlying settlements need to be assessed on individual basis. Small numbers of housing which do not impose on already developed areas. The infrastructures cannot cope

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Employment land should be on existing brownfield sites

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes completely re- consider it. This plan does not address the desperately needed regeneration of the town centre, based on it's cultural heritage. It also neglects North Warrington which is in need of regeneration. Building thousands of homes and taking green belt land is not the answer. This whole consultation has not been advertised widely enough and was done during holiday periods. The plans and this questionnaire are confusing and difficult to understand. Local people should have been contacted prior to this LPDO not just have it based on developers requests and business opinion. As a council you have neglected the very people you are supposed to represent and act for. WBC's record of planning and conservation is appalling and now you are going to wreak havoc in the green belt. I am totally opposed to this botched plan. You should re calculate housing needs based on real need for local people and develop the town for people to use and be proud of.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I completely disagree with your proposals regarding City status, the huge amount of homes you wish to build, the bridge and the amount of countryside you wish to decimate. I object to all proposals you have in relation to Warrington as a whole. We live [REDACTED], Great Sankey and I have not received any communication to let me know that the area and indeed the home we live in, is up for grabs to greedy property developers. You have deeply distressed us and my wife is absolutely devastated at your proposals. In fact, our [REDACTED] child has cried at the idea of you building on our beautiful countryside surrounding us. My parents in law live in Burtonwood, our friends in Grappenhall. Everywhere is under scrutiny where you wish to build either houses, roads, bridges, industrial estates etc. We had no idea about your plans until we saw posts on Facebook, we saw no communication or invitations to the consultations you have supposedly held. We had to scour Facebook to even find documents in relation to your plans. I looked on the council website and it is only recently that I have been able to download documents. Most of which unless you are a legal professional, you will not be able to understand. As worded by my wife, we fully understand the need for more houses to be built and the infrastructure that that requires. However, following the public consultation which I feel is very vague anyway and indeed, very complicated; I do not feel the proposals satisfactorily address this problem. We did not even know that there was a public consultation! We feel the public should be made aware of your evidence to support the gross amount of damage you wish to impose on our environment. Please send me, in writing, the evidence that you have considered the following points: Affordable housing. Warrington and surrounding areas is already cluttered with new build estates. They are not affordable housing. Small 4 bedroomed houses priced at over £500,000. Warehouses springing up on Burtonwood land and surrounding areas which was once green belt land and that you have conveniently made brown belt. We would like to have assurances that the proposed 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 please? What green space is allowed to stay, and land that can be sold off? The amount of housing. The 24,000 figure. Where does this come from? I have read 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 August 17th 2017 and yesterday, 26th September 2017 to name only two). People have been 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. What precisely are the new link road options? Lifestyle: childhood obesity rates continue to grow, lifestyles are increasingly sedentary and evidence points to encouraging Warrington residents to become more active. Not only for physical benefits, but mental benefits 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, not to mention on the three roads into Burtonwood and of course, where I live in

██████████ I believe 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? 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 are empty and have been for some time. Please can you set out and respond with your solutions and efforts to convert such areas to appealing places to live? Can you not redevelop the massive amount of houses derelict before being greedy and obsessed with ruining our beautiful greenbelt land? I read another comment researching: 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. Surely you can 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 interest: I wonder if you could confirm 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. To reiterate: we strongly oppose the Preferred Development Option of the Local Draft Plan 2017 currently proposed by Warrington Borough Council. We do not agree with Warrington Borough Council's aspirations and arguments for massive urban growth and/or a New City status. We believe that the proposed housing target calculation of 24,000 additional homes to be built over a 20-year period is not substantiated and does not reflect of the needs of Warrington and its people either in type, number or distribution. The suggested 'need' for increased acreage for employment sites is grossly over-exaggerated. The release of Green Belt land for the purposes of urban development and sprawl in any area of the town is unacceptable and unnecessary. Green Belt should remain Green Belt. Green fields, woodlands, natural habitats should not be destroyed. The proposed supporting infrastructure of roads and highways will be destructive, invasive and difficult to build. It will not alleviate congestion/pollution in the town. The consultation period has been badly timed over school/family holidays leaving people insufficient time to thoroughly consider the plans and thus depriving people of the opportunity to participate effectively. Warrington Borough Hospital is at present unable to serve the town's residents and no adequate provision for healthcare has been suggested in the plan. This plan does not constitute 'sustainable' development. Warrington, particularly the town centre, has already suffered far too much destruction of its historic buildings, distinctive identity, local culture and character by the building of shed shops, malls and huge car parks. Many of its local and town centre businesses have disappeared. The massive, un-sustainable growth proposed will result in the destruction of Warrington and its environs which we know and love. As my wife has said in a previous letter to you; do you realise what you are doing to people? Why should we find a beautiful place to live and be so unsettled, our homes losing value, our quality of life ruined. We do not believe this is for the greater good. Warrington is ALREADY a magnificent example of a prosperous TOWN. We do not want it to be a city, or have any involvement with Peel Holdings'. We should have been made aware of this, shame on you! Please, we beg you reconsider! look forward to your reply. Kind regards ██████████

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

My thoughts have previously been said

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not believe you have

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I completely object

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Completely disagree with you

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No to being a city

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Completely object

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Completely object

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Where is the literature to assist with this question

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not agree

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Main reasons for objections are: Traffic already congested particularly at Bridge Foot Doctors' surgeries already struggling to make appointments Hospital at full stretch Parking in the outlying villages of Culcheth, Stockton Heath and Lymm very stretched and people forced to park on the streets making life difficult for residents.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not feel that the number of houses match the employment opportunities for young people

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Feel that there is too much reliance on green belt land which of course is easier for the developers rather than choosing land that would be more difficult to build on

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much emphasis on development and expansion rather than improving the quality of life of existing residents and making Warrington a green and pleasant place to live in.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much emphasis on the South of the town which would be more attractive to future developers as they can attract more money for their houses.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Agree with making the waterfront an attractive feature of Warrington

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes very much in agreement with this idea

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses for the traffic and health infrastructure.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much impact on the present traffic infrastructure and parking in Stockton Heath and Lymm

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Employment opportunities for young people is important

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't feel as if all brown field sites have been properly explored. We should do everything we can to preserve green belt.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

If green belt is necessary then the locations chosen don't seem unreasonable

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't think the implications of this have been fully considered in terms of infra structure, especially roads and traffic.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am afraid you have not given me any notification or help in being able to answer this. I have lived in Burtonwood since [REDACTED] and seen acres of land changed from greenbelt to brown belt and now all these warehouses are appearing, clogging our roads and creating havoc. I should have received a brochure at least outlining your proposals. I have had to come with my husband to my daughters house and type this to you. Otherwise, I would have been none the wiser. This is shocking.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

With the help of my daughter who has access to the internet I can honestly say I strongly oppose the Preferred Development Option of the Local Draft Plan 2017 currently proposed by Warrington Borough Council. We do not agree with Warrington Borough Council's aspirations and arguments for massive urban growth and/or a New City status. We believe that the proposed housing target calculation of 24,000 additional homes to be built over a 20-year period is not substantiated and does not reflect of the needs of Warrington and its people either in type, number or distribution. The suggested 'need' for increased acreage for employment sites is grossly over-exaggerated. The release of Green Belt land for the purposes of urban development and sprawl in any area of the town is unacceptable and unnecessary. Green Belt should remain Green Belt. Green fields, woodlands, natural habitats should not be destroyed. The proposed supporting infrastructure of roads and highways will be destructive, invasive and difficult to build. It will not alleviate congestion/pollution in the town. The consultation period has been badly timed over school/family holidays leaving people insufficient time to thoroughly consider the plans and thus depriving people of the opportunity to participate effectively. I did not even know about any of this and could not even ask my daughter to take me to one of your so called consultations. Warrington Borough Hospital is at present unable to serve the town's residents and no adequate provision for healthcare has been suggested in the plan. This plan does not constitute 'sustainable' development. Warrington, particularly the town centre, has already suffered far too much destruction of its historic buildings, distinctive identity, local culture and character by the building of shed shops, malls and huge car parks. Many of its local and town centre businesses have disappeared. The massive, un-sustainable growth proposed will result in the destruction of Warrington and its environs which we know and love. Although my husband and I have had help in writing the above, please do not underestimate how much you have distressed us with these proposals. There is no reason to build on every bit of open space, there is nowhere for wildlife to go, horizons to view, hedgerows and wild flowers to smell. Burtonwood land has been decimated over the years. I wonder how many farmers really wanted to leave or where forced out. Please, please reconsider your many proposals. Renovate and rejuvenate existing waste land, contaminated land, empty buildings!

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Here are some more thoughts: 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. Conflicting answers have been given to the same questions asked at the Lymm and Stretton public consultation meetings. What about Burtonwood meetings? If representatives are unable to get the council's 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 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: There is enough Brownfield land in the area to build 15,000 houses. Potentially enough to meet a reduced housing requirement. Therefore allowing the council to protect and preserve existing green belt land. 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? Considerable blight to surrounding houses and neighbourhoods and destroy the community feel which attracts and retains residents in the areas around Warrington. What about secondary care? National shortage of general practitioners? Community carers? Hospital prevention teams? Mental health practitioners?

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As outlined in my previous text

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

as outlined in previous text

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Speak to the people! Make sure we all know what you intend to do!

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many homes. Traffic already bad Warrington but Warrington South is very bad. Two motorways, Thelwall viaduct. Swing bridges over the canal. Hard to get an appointment at doctors already. Schools full. Hospital not equipped. Green space needed.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think it is appalling the wY that this had been done. There is no consideration for existing residents. The area will be a disgrace

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no reason to develop in this way

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

People have been hoodwinked into believing the area was safe and now you are going to trample all over them

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

They are not in the interest of the local community

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's rubbish and not in the interests of the community

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

None of it can be justified

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is not looking at needs it is just a profit making exercise

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The town centre has already been ruined. That should be put right rather than future development

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

So much time and a great deal of money was spent on this a few years ago and nothing happened then. More is going to be wasted all in the interests of city status which warrington isn't

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's all wrong

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Same as before

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Same as before not in the interest of the whole community

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It doesn't justify it

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The whole thing should be dropped and the damage already done should be fixed

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don't understand what spatial options are

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities. In Warrington West particularly schools are overcrowded - my daughter was in a class of 30+ in primary school and GSHS is far too oversubscribed and huge enough already. Our facilities in Burtonwood are very poor - we are definitely the poor relation. Put things right for the council tax payers you already have before stretching our crumbling infrastructure with yet more people.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities. In Warrington West particularly schools are overcrowded - my daughter was in a class of 30+ in primary school and GSHS is far too oversubscribed and huge enough already. Our facilities in Burtonwood are very poor - we are definitely the poor relation. Put things right for the council tax payers you already have before stretching our crumbling infrastructure with yet more people.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why are we pushing for a city? We should focus on what we already have as a town and related villages.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Where is the infrastructure in the rest of the town to support it??? The proposed new road will put more pressure on m62 jn 8, which is bursting at the seams despite the ill thought out remediation works currently making our lives a misery

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington doesn't have the infrastructure to support that number of new houses and our green belt should be saved - we need to feed the increasing population and can't afford to lose valuable farmland or amenity facilities. In Warrington West particularly schools are overcrowded - my daughter was in a class of 30+ in primary school and GSHS is far too oversubscribed and huge enough already. Our facilities in Burtonwood are very poor - we are definitely the poor relation. Put things right for the council tax payers you already have before stretching our crumbling infrastructure with yet more people. Burtonwood cannot accommodate another 15 houses let alone 150 without major investment in roads, schools, footpaths and amenities

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Keep them away from Burtonwood - they cause mayhem whenever they turn up

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don't know enough to say

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

What've strained resources as it is .. I don't think Warrington should be further developed

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Road and services are already over strained ... we do not require any further development and removal of green spaces

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Our green spaces are slowly being eaten away and rather than living in a town with surrounded by green spaces we are becoming over populated and reducing green spaces are bad for family life , wellbeing and the environment

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

We need to protect our green spaces , resources are over stretched , roads are chaotic ... Warrington is a lovely town but further growth will affect the happiness and wellbeing of our families

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not think we need any further developments in the form of housibg

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not agree that we should be a city ... we are a town and should remain so

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We do not need additional housing in our town

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Lack of consultation and we have building in the town under utilised so why build more ... we need regeneration instead

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A clear review of objections

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think that Warrington borough council need to stop building massive warehouses requiring thousands of people to work in them resulting in more and more houses which are increasingly being built on valuable green belt. We don't want any more houses!!!! Surely no other borough council is expanding at the same rate as Warrington

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Although employment in the areas is necessary, surely the numbers of homes/ businesses we currently have is enough. Warrington is now a sprawling town, spreading into the suburbs and semi-rural areas.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please do not destroy our green belt. It is our children's inheritance. We do not want to live in a built up environment, if we did, we would have bought a home in a different area.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Whilst I agree that business is needed and people need to live somewhere, Warrington needs to stop over developing areas that cannot take the volume of traffic. Surely we have enough industry for any medium sized town.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

People need space around them, this is why I and my family chose to live in a semi-rural area. However, this is quickly being ruined by massively increasing traffic and associated congestion.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't feel like there has been any consideration for the residents thoughts. Any proposal/ consultation has been very poorly advertised with short notice, leading to poorly attended consultations and few people being made aware of the planned proposal- I assume to limit the number of objections!!!!

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, there are way too many homes and massive warehouses being built within the borough. We don't want these blots on the-landscapes/ eyesores

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Let's not forget, it's a town, not a city!!! However Warrington borough council seems to be hell-bent on getting city status. Development should be based around improving the derelict area of TOWN

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Garden City suburb??? If the council has their way, there will be no garden left for anyone

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

They are not clear, and will no doubt change in the next two years

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Everything seems geared towards making a New City which Warrington is not suited to.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It appears that the south of the borough is being targeted yet again. There will be the opportunity to make higher amounts of money from the area as it is always seen as more affluent.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Using so many Green field sites means that the agricultural land is lost, never to return. Where are all the crops needed to help feed all these new homes to come from if the land is built on?

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

How did the Executive Board manage to approve the plan in December 2017 (5.14) when it is only September now?

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are so many houses proposed in the south, that they cannot be called a suburb, but more like new towns. And please, drop the city idea.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much time has been spent on giving fancy names to huge developments.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

If the areas are unauthorised, how can they be part of the plan?

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This appears to be excessive for a town the size of Warrington and due to Brexit I feel this needs to be reviewed. Traffic is already horrendous in Warrington and the possibility of 16,000 more cars adding to the congestion is unthinkable not even a new crossing could deal with this traffic. The council need to consider the views of the town people and not just lining their own pockets. We DO NOT want to become a city, we live close enough to 2 cities. WBC are in enough debt and this would only add to this. The plans to convert the Trans Pennine into a dual carriageway would ruin the whole of South Warrington along with the wildlife and green belt without taking into consideration the homes of all the people on either side of this that would be devalued or even demolished

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think you have over estimated the numbers especially after Brexit

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No greenbelt should be released

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not had enough time to review

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I dont think you have assessed this correctly

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You are overstating the requirements in light of Brexit and you have not given enough time for the people to review this

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is being spoilt by all the development and you are killing the heart of the town. The traffic at bridge foot needs to be dealt with and there needs to be a road from centre park to bank quay as a matter of urgency and not in several years. The new red link will not improve the traffic from Centre Park as it will mean people going backwards out of their way to get on this road and most people I have spoken to said they will also becoming through Warrington as they won't pay the toll price to go over the Runcorn Bridge

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This plan will ruin the Greenbelt in the best part of Warrington. The houses will be overpriced due to the location which will mean that the young people from the south of the town will not be able to afford them and stay nearer to home

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

If this is to be warehouses then the earnings of these people will not be sufficient to purchase the new homes

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

They seem to be given more consideration than the residents

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The land proposed for this is too close to residential property

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please confirm all possible road links besides using the Trans Pennine

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are too many homes planned for the locality. Whilst I appreciate the need for people to live and work somewhere, Warrington Borough Council have massively increased the size of the town to the detriment of those currently living here.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses, too many warehouses. When will the council be satisfied that we have enough?

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, green belt is green belt and should not be built upon. You are considered increasing the size of a small rural village (Burtonwood) massively when there is already evidence that the infrastructure cannot cope with the current demands, let alone the prediction for twenty years time and hundreds more houses.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I strongly object to the plans to increase the number of warehouses/businesses and homes to the extent that Warrington are planning

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Everyone needs space around them however, it seems that some of us will have considerably less space than others if the current plans go ahead

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You should NOT be usin* green belt. This will be a legacy of ugly buildings/ development and homes across a massive area resulting in even more flooding and problems for future generations

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is massively over ambitious. This is a town and i have no desire to live in a 'city'. I appreciate that people need jobs and homes, but surely it's time to slow the building down not increase it

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes it's NOT A CITY!!!! I believe that derelict areas shouldn't be regenerated

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

ITS NOT A CITY!!!! Plus if Warrington Borough Council continues on their current path, I'm not sure there will be any garden left for anyone to enjoy

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

That's exactly as they should remain 'outlying settlements ' I have no desire to be merged with Westbrook. I live in a village and have done so for [REDACTED], however it's fast losing its village feel with monstrous warehouses on the doorstep and thousands upon thousands of lorries, vans and cars passing by my doorstep every day. When will you stop? You cannot feasibly consider expanding small villages by 20%- 50% without adversely affecting its special character. Not to mention the issues created by flooding as a direct result of more hard surfaces ie, house and warehouses roofing and roads.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The council has provided more than enough land with the omega site, causing no end of misery for local residents with excessive traffic congestion on once quiet country roads originally designed for no more than a horse and carriage, but now supporting huge articulated lorries etc

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don know what the plans are.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not aware of any such plans

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It should reflect the strength and depth of feelings of local residents who are already sick of the overpopulation and building going on in and around Warrington. It should consider the environment impacts ie flooding which is already a massive problem in and around Burtonwood in particular. And it should consider the lasting legacy of ugly buildings& over population which will be left for future generations to fix

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Your plans are based on the ambitions of the council, and do not seem consider an alternative view that Warrington hhs already grown enough. Because of its New Town status the town underwent considerable development which impacted considerably on the environment and resulted in massive loss of green belt in the South of the town. The current plans for a 'garden city' are not in the best interests of Warrington residents who will be losing, for all time, a beautiful part of their environment. I am sure most people do not wish to live in such a large 'city' and are concerned about the negative impact it would have on their surroundings and amenities. If they wanted to live in such a massive built up area, they would have lived in one of the surrounding cities. You are in danger of destroying the Warrington that people love.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have been away on holiday and have not had sufficient time to read and comment on all the detail, but have scanned enough to reinforce my view that the loss of the green belt land is excessive and will not benefit the town. Instead there should be much less development. The road networks around the south of Warrington are already frequently gridlocked, especially when there are problems on the motorway network and this development would make an already saturated major road network worse

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous comments. This development is completely out of proportion to the size of the town, and it is irresponsible to destroy so much beautiful green land which is part of our heritage, and also a enjoyed by the residents of the town. We do not need to 'grow' to this extent, it is the ambition of the council, but not in the best interests of the residents.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think you have incorrectly calculated this based on incorrect population statistics and also on employment levels

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes you have incorrectly calculated population levels. ONS figures are very different. Also you have not taken into consideration the use of the current Warrington hospital land which could be developed into houses or employment facilities after it is closed. What will happen to this land? My answer is based on the fact that you have related this question on Warrington's built up areas, which would not include Lymm.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No brown belt in Lymm has been considered - essentially all new developed (outside of SHLAA) is via greenbelt release and I think this is wrong. Lymm has had so much development in terms of housing and no infrastructure to support this. Lymm's strong and moderate greenbelt should be protected for as long as possible.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I appreciate as a nation we need more housing. Lymm is at capacity as it is re: infrastructure and to put forward development options for greenbelt release only is truly saddening. I fear for this community.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't want to live in a city and think Warrington would never truly be a city. If it was it would be a very poor one. There is so much brown belt post the Newtown work that this could and should accommodate development NOT greenbelt.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

My main comment is that it will destroy the villages of Thelwall and Grappenhall and this is a huge mistake.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

It will destroy Thelwall and Grappenhall beyond all recognition.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Development should be on brown belt or weak greenbelt - never ever on moderate or strong greenbelt. Putting housing anywhere near Lymm high would be very very dangerous given how busy Oughtrington lane is. The preferred option is based on incorrect population statistics - Check ONS for the correct numbers. This would suggest we are already at capacity! So the 500 preferred plan would warrant infrastructure/social needs development - primary School, reduction of Lymm High catchment, extra doctors surgery and review of transport infrastructure. It appears from your figures that you are proposing that Lymm takes 42% of all greenbelt release development of all outlying settlements. This seems completely unfair and disproportionate. I have also noticed that the outlying settlements will be development first during the 1-5 year and 6-10 year cycle of this 20 year plan. Why are these outlying areas having to release their greenbelt first? Development beyond 500 houses in Lymm would completely destroy the community. It is imperative that there is mixed housing proposed and that affordable housing is given a high priority, as is housing for the elderly and young people (including social housing). Lymm is being turned into an executive home hell and as a single mother of two children I am being priced out of the area. Given both my children have grown up here and attend the high school it's important that they live near their school.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Affordable housing, mixed developments for young, old , families the affluent and moderately off . Ensuring proper infrastructure is in place in the outlying settlements. Lymm has had no infrastructure investment despite much development since 2010 (post localism act), as such this should be considered in the development plan proposals.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Believe the needs estimated are too generous and ambitious. I think the borough council needs to give consideration to the lack of basic infrastructure that exists would be required to support these plans and give due consideration to maintaining the existing cultural dimension that makes Warrington unique. Careful consideration should be given to how the rural communities e.g. can be preserved and sympathetically developed. The proposed plans would ruin the existing community.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Explained previously, plans are too ambitious and scale of proposed development too great would detrimentally impact the rural communities such as Croft and Kenyon where infrastructure would struggle to cope. Proposed scale of expansion would not be sympathetic in-keeping with the existing village.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Fully aligned with the proposal

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unsure of proposal

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We need green space for the children to play and learn about the environment

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand that you have to build new business and homes but we also need to have green space for our children to learn and grow

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think you are being over optimistic about both housing and employment. The borough has plenty of brown field sites for affordable housing, which is the type needed borough wide not swanky X bedroom housing on greenbelt land.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt land should be safeguarded forever not just for the present plan, as we had when we built one for one on a plot

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

i think they are being over optimistic on the amount of housing we will need in the future. As most of the new jobs in our area seem to be warehouse type jobs not graduate jobs for Risley etc. So I think in the future we will need more affordable housing on brown field sites rather than executive houses on greenbelt land

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It seems to be more executive rather than affordable housing

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why build on a flood area?

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why build on a flood risk area?

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Seems to be executive housing rather than affordable, which any city really needs

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why build on greenbelt when there are plenty of brownfield sites to build affordable housing

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

New employment land should only be previous brown field sites

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

seems to be lead by the councils desire to become a city which I for one am not in agreement

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

haven't factored in that fiddlers ferry will have to be decommissioned at some pointalso that Warrington Hospital might be moving sites

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

this is a terrible question, green belt was made green belt because it wasn't to be built on now you change the goal posts, what about the National Planning Framework and exceptional circumstances

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

do you mean Table 5 " Local Plan Strategic Objectives? if so why not say so and give page reference. w1 To enable the transition of Warrington from a New Town to a New City through the ongoing, regeneration of Inner Warrington, the delivery of strategic and local infrastructure, the strengthening of existing neighbourhoods and the creation of new sustainable neighbourhoods whilst: delivering a minimum of 22,260 new homes (equating to 1,113 per year) between 2017 and 2037, and supporting Warrington's

ongoing economic success by providing 381 Hectares of employment land between 2017 and 2037. NO I DO NOT WANT TO LIVE IN A CITY, I VALUE OUR GREEN BELT AND DO NOT WANT TO LOOSE ITW2 To facilitate the sensitive release of Green Belt land to meet Warrington's long term housing and employment needs, whilst ensuring the revised Green Belt boundaries maintain the permanence of Warrington's Green Belt in the long term.W3 To strengthen and expand the role of Warrington Town Centre as a regional employment, retail,leisure, cultural and transport hub, whilst transforming the quality of the public realm and making the Town Centre a place where people want to live. YESW4 To provide new infrastructure to support Warrington's growth, reduce congestion and promote sustainable transport options, whilst reducing the need to travel and encouraging active lifestyles. YESW5 To secure high quality design which reinforces the character and local distinctiveness of Warrington's urban area, its countryside, its unique pattern of green spaces and its constituent settlements whilst protecting, enhancing and embracing the borough's built and natural assets. YESW6 To minimise the impact of development on the environment through the prudent use of resources and ensuring development is energy efficient, safe and resilient to climate change and makes a positive contribution to improving Warrington's air quality. YES

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

again reference what you are talking about, this is NOT clear. I think you are deliberately being obtuse

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think you are starting from the wrong premise so all assessments are useless.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

please see attached, I don't want to live in a city, its why I moved to Warrington ■ years ago and not Manchester or Liverpool for example.the Figures for the number of houses are too high, you have gone for quantity not quality,I don't mean cost but other factors, I looked at Appleton Thorns plan and this is written in a way that I had hoped the council would approach this rather than being led by developers and landowners who are after all in it to make a profit

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We have just lost M & S in golden square, its free to park at the Trafford Centre, The skyline is awful with the new car park. walking from the village hotel into town is scary- I feel very unsafe, the road alongside Go Outdoors is sad and tired, not a good reflection on our town for visitors arriving by train. Getting around by bike is a nightmare, cycle lanes just stop dead at the very places cyclists need protection from cars and trucks etc. Bridge foot roundabout is a nightmare, yes please make our town one to be proud of!

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't know these areas well enough to comment

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is not wanted, it eats into the green belt, it is developer and landowner led. Again the plan should echo the sentiments seen in Appleton Thorns plan for all the villages, I want them to keep their sense of community to be sensitively developed and for the roads to be sorted out FIRST of all.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Is this really an option? a school near a chemical factory? Roads that are already full to capacity, plus the ship canal and a swing bridge. The plan itself is full of ifs and no proper highway assessment has yet been done.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

again very vague, what exactly are we being asked to comment on?

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't know, obviously we need some growth but again at expense of green belt??

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am not qualified to give an answer on this question there should be another option besides yes or no. I do know that the Stockton Heath site is not great for users or neighbours, there is an industrial estate nearby why not have a waste/recycling site there instead?

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

the north has hubs but the south side of Warrington does not, why we all pay council tax

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You assume that residents of Lymm would want to be part of Warrington. Lymm is called a village by its residents. We don't want to be part of Warrington City. This is not where we've chosen to live.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Completely disagree with filling in green spaces or developing on green belt. The balance in Lymm is right just now, any more loss of green spaces will spoil this village. It's the reason we moved to lymm and invested here.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would like Lymm to remain a village.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unless you are a planner, or a degree in planning, it is difficult to say if your methodology is accurate and gives a fair estimate of the need. Assumptions in population increases are not stated. The effect of Brexit and possible reductions in population growth from Europe due to weaker pound are not considered. Data for increased demand for housing and job land appears limited to recent boom, whilst reductions since economic crash 2007/8 slowed growth nationally, not just Warrington. The residents of Warrington have not been consulted as to whether they want to live in a city. If they did, one would imagine they would move to neighbouring Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, or Chester? Further expansion outwards will increase need for more and longer car journeys and further congestion. Future growth required in Town Centre, more work and apartments and schools required there, so people live, work and socialise in one place. Continued growth on the periphery will attract wealth away from town centre, and reduce quality of life

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not considered going upwards, to accommodate more residential units in town centre, reducing need to build on existing greenbelt. Increasing population of town centre through higher landmark buildings would create more demand for retail, services in town centre, and help keep wealth there, instead of further decline. would also reduce need for more car journeys, as people can walk/ cycle to work if that was also in town centre, rather than creating executive suburbs next to motorways, so people find easier to drive elsewhere to find culture / shops and work. New roads such as the proposed south eastern strategic route, will reduce quality of life of existing residents through noise and air pollution and loss of existing green barriers/ spaces, for sake of potential new residents, who want to live in green countryside that's hugely diminished, through building their homes.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unless you are a qualified planner, with access to all the methodology and limitations and assumptions, it is impossible for a member of public to answer this. In this respect, this is not a public consultation. The current uncertainties over Brexit , weakened pound, reductions in net migration and release of new brownfield sites such as Fiddler's Ferry have not been included, which may all reduce the stated need for greenbelt building. More development of outlying villages should be allowed, where infrastructure already there, such as Glaze room (main line train route, close to East lands and A57, and high schools / sixth forms at Culcheth with under capacity), should be allowed to grow naturally and incrementally, rather than sacrificing the whole of the land surrounding Warrington within the motorway box to housing, (as is now the case in Westbrook and Birchwood). A function of greenbelt should be as a buffer to motorways and associated industrial parks, from existing housing, as noise and air pollution are high, which reduce quality of life of residents.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan is too exaggerated in scale. Existing Warrington residents have not been previously asked if they want to become a city. Part of the city objective of certain councillors/ council leaders smacks of personal vanity reasons, rather than a genuine desire to increase the quality of life of existing residents. Town centre improvements through more town houses/ apartments to encourage life in town centre 24/7 should be sought, but increased development on Greenfield sites is wrong and dangerous precedent, as it reduces the quality of life of residents already generally paying higher council taxes on the south and East suburbs of the town. Creating further concentrations of wealth through executive home building in Grappenhall, Stretton, Thelwall etc will further fragment the town and remove any incentives to improve the existing town centre, as people will be too far away to use it, and probably choose to drive to neighbouring attractions like Trafford centre/ established cultural centres of neighbouring cities, or countryside elsewhere, as they are closer due to the increased road access.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again need to have a planning degree to understand, so this isn't really a public consultation exercise. However, feel that it is not ambitious enough in existing town centre (north of the ship canal). By Removing Riverside retail park, it will reduce need for people living in the outlying suburbs and villages to go into the town centre at all. A higher mix of work, housing and cultural attractions needed in town centre. Much of which is only Two storey. A Barcelona approach needed, with units below and several floors of good quality apartment units in attractive buildings above. Need to attract students, younger people and creatives. There should be no empty floors above existing units. Danger of building more/ bigger roads to motorways is the increase in flow of people out of Warrington to work and socialise, and creation of rat run short cuts for existing congested motorways through the residential areas of the town, as they east_ west or North South.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is becoming too widely spread, and the scale this proposed development is far too large in the south east and south west, on existing agricultural greenbelt. The building of any new main roads/ ship canal crossings through greenbelt only serves the developers need to free up access to land they already own. It will also serve to increase future traffic congestion through the vast increase in population, resulting from the town councillors desire to manage a city, rather than improve the existing town, that most of the current residents wish it to remain. Warrington should be working with adjoining labour towns like Halton and St Helens to share further growth, not compete. The Northern Powerhouse was supposed to be collaboration of the northern towns and cities, not competition with them, and in the process destroying what little good there is left in these places?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Scale far too large. Redevelopment of town centre should be main priority, going upwards. Smaller incremental development of existing villages should be allowed, particularly where advantageous facilities such as rail/ schools already exist. Reducing the quality of life of existing residents through major new road building through existing residential areas (and further demolition) is criminal. Noise, loss of visual amenity through loss of trees and vegetation on proposed south eastern strategic route to M6/ M56 along the trans Pennine trail/ railway embankment is particularly wrong. If folk wanted to live on a main road, they would buy a cheaper house on one. But to create one, high above existing homes and gardens, through current residential neighbourhoods, and the blight that will cause through noise and air and light pollution, and construction disruption, by a council that is supposed to look after the interests of its citizens, not pandering to developers or themselves, reduces the confidence in the council's ability overall.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Town centre- Warrington is not a city. It doesn't have the cultural weight of a city, and it's residents enjoy Town life. With people choosing to live here because it is a town, and doesn't have the inner city issues associated with being a city. Under current HS2 plans, Warrington will loose it's frequent direct train link to London and Glasgow via West coast line avoidance, with the creation of the new HS2 viaduct along the Eastern fringe of the conurbation at Hollins green. How many cities don't have a frequent main line rail link to London?. Development of town centre should build upon (not replace) existing historical town layout. More

units downstairs and taller apartments above. But should not remove existing retail parks, as this will further reduce need for people in suburbs and villages to travel into Warrington town centre. Also need more businesses in town centre, not more commuter suburbs.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Keep route of existing Knutsford road as the main road route into town. This is wide and open, and varied, and gives a view of the river as you drive in. By building proposed new road along old disused railway line south east towards Latchford, you are driving more traffic through residential areas and potentially removing passing trade from existing high streets in Latchford and Grappenhall (Knutsford Road).

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Should not be built. Will only concentrate more wealth away from the Town Centre, with little connection to it. It will be catering for a new population with little connection / allegiance to the existing town, and its proximity to the motorways will only serve to encourage further commuting away from the town for work / social / shopping. Limited development of existing Grappenhall Heyes land where roads already built should be allowed, including re use of Grappenhall Hall School as a school again (strictly controlled redevelopment to preserve the character of this village). Further development of a Garden city in existing agricultural greenbelt will only serve to reduce the visual amenity of existing residents and increase traffic congestion.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Peel holdings should be paying for the majority of the new roads here, as they serve only to free up mostly their land for redevelopment for housing and the new port (container storage). Unfortunately, Warrington port looks likely to increase road congestion further, and will take up most of the capacity is the west coast line around Bank Quay, further interrupting Warrington's rail connection to capital cities. Also, provision of any new free crossings of the Mersey will attract more traffic off the motorway network and adjacent Mersey toll crossings in Halton, increasing traffic congestion in the town from more traffic cutting through to go elsewhere. It will also inevitably lead to more house building in greenbelt, further eroding green lung within the boroughs boundary and even more congestion.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Should allow more incremental increases, as demand here from existing residents growing up and having family increases, and their wish to remain local for family\ childcare reasons. Each case for developments should be on its own merits and for the developers to present the evidence for their case for development. In some cases, there are good existing road and rail connections and existing brownfield sites such as disused camps that could benefit from growth, such as in Glazebrook / Culcheth etc.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Large swathes of the borough next to the motorways have already been turned into huge warehouse depots with high numbers of automation, and very little job creation. Thought should be put into what kind of jobs are required in Warrington, rather than opting to fill all the employment land with relatively few low paid, low skill jobs. Therefore the current professionals can work in the town, rather than the daily brain drain commute occurring, with people invariably driving to neighbouring cities to work.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The existing sites in Greenbelt are illegal. The council's lack of commitment and resolve to deal effectively with the site in Grappenhall and Walton sets a precedent for future further encroachment through flouting of

planning rules and laws. It seems unfair that those who flout planning laws are rewarded/ protected, (and will be surrounded by landscaped amenity areas under the garden city proposals, whilst those citizens who play by rules, buy existing houses, pay taxes (like those adjacent to the proposed new South Eastern strategic main road route over the ship canal and embankment through Grappenhall are not afforded the same level of protection of their existing way of life by their council. Everyone wishing to develop land should go through the existing planning channels, irrespective of race/ ethnicity/ lifestyle.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Protection of future resources is wise. High grade Agricultural land, and land with visual amenity should also be given a resource value, as it benefits us all through nature and recreation. This does not appear to be considered in the mapping, only mineral. The town appears to have little mineral resource, and the mapping appears to show that inappropriate development shouldn't be occurring along the route of the disused, now green lung and visual amenity of the embankment through Grappenhall, even though it is being proposed together a new main road, therefore contradicting its own planning proposal, as this would be in the buffer/ mineral zone.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A vote by residents on whether they wish Warrington to become a city or not. As it appears this is the will of a number of councillors / vested interests only. Traffic model results would also be beneficial. Also a list of assumptions made when making the forecasts for future growth. Also review dates, CTO see if these plans need to be reined in at a future date, due to changes in circumstances, such as effect of Brexit etc. Also the effect on political ward boundaries of projected increases in population, as the south of the borough grows much larger_ views of the boundary commission, after they just changed Warrington.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe the brown belt sites that are available (and suggested in some areas) should be developed before any green belt is used.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough information has been given

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough information has been given

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

From my understanding there seems to have been little consideration made as to using brown field sites, such as fiddlers ferry, as opposed to building on green belt.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It seems that the infrastructure is already struggling I am unsure it could deal wityet more homes

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am concerned that too much development has been suggested I domt think Warrington should become a city.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unnecessary amount of homes
Already struggling infrastructure
Green belt needs to be protected

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is over exaggerated - as technology continues to grow employment land will shrink. The amount of new homes is too much - the infrastructure, hospitals etc can't take it.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The green belt in Warrington is too important. Not only to wildlife but also the quality of life of those who live in and around it. It should not be built on.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington does not need to be a city

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are too many sites which are too large

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses. Too much green belt being destroyed

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington does not need to be a city. It is a town with a proud heritage.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Utterly ridiculous and NOT needed. It will ruin the green belt and the lives of those who live near it. Any new residents will not use Warrington as a city but will be straight on the motorway to the Trafford centre in the same amount of time. It will destroy the community of Grappenhall and bring nothing to the town of Warrington

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

too much development

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not needed

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not thought through

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Hospitals? Police stations?

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Land should not be released from the Green Belt

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Land should not be released from the Green Belt

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Land should not be released from the Green Belt

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The document has not sufficiently made the case for the decision to opt for a higher figure of homes needed than indicated in the Government's methodology. While I recognise that the Government methodology relates to a minimum requirement, and the rationale for higher than average growth is predicated on the aspirations set out in the SEP, it is very difficult to understand how this has been translated into the numbers in the document. The document states that Warrington has consistently exceeded its own UDP targets (para 4.14). The inference is that the UDP targets were too low, with a retrospective application of the OAN used to calculate a deficit in the last two years of 847 homes. Information provided by the local Labour Party (Burton and Winwick Rose) indicates that the historical picture indicates an average of 920 homes per annum (albeit with significant variation) over the last 38 years, covering periods of both economic growth and recession. Using the national formula of 914 homes per annum (even including flexibility and addressing the backlog) would reduce the 20 year requirement to 20,041. Given the volatility of historic build patterns, it is difficult to understand why the deficit should be accepted as real, and not just a calculation. In the current economic climate, with the uncertainties posed by Brexit, we should perhaps be cautious about the growth assumptions, and perhaps plan for a shorter timescale, focusing on maximising use of urban sites, rather than planning for large scale intrusion into the green belt.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The calculation is appropriate, if the assumptions are correct - but I am unconvinced that the requirement is as high as indicated in the plan. I do not understand the safeguarding requirement. It appears from the document that this is land to be removed from the Green Belt definition for a 10 year period beyond the 20 years of the plan (i.e. from 2037 onwards). This is extremely concerning as presumably it will make it easier to build on this land in the future. It is not explained why this is needed

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's not so much that I disagree, but I don't understand the principles behind the New City objective and therefore don't support the inclusion of figures in objective 1. I think the document has not adequately explained the ambition for the New City / Garden City. It presupposes people know about this already. I would prefer Objective 2 to start with a focus on maintaining the permanence of the Green Belt, and refer to minimising release - given the importance of green belt to the concept of Garden Cities, I feel that the current objective 2 is at odds with the importance attached to Green Belt articulated in Warrington Means Business. I fully support the objective to improve the quality of the public realm.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Only insofar as the outcome relates to the Council's preferred growth figure of 1,113 homes per annum - it is not clear whether a different preferred option would emerge under the other two growth scenarios.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See response to previous question regarding assumptions about quantum. The document references General Area 9 and General Area 10 (para 4.69) but does not clarify where these are. The exclusion of the development of proposals for outlying settlements is of concern. This is likely to cause uncertainty in the short to medium term and it would be helpful to know when this information is to be available - and how it will be consulted on (it's not clear whether this will be part of the overall plan consultation or whether it will be separate). I am concerned that if this is separate from the wider plan, decisions will be made about general principles around green belt release that make it easier to push planning through for sites in the outlying settlements.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have no problem with the principles, but am unconvinced by the underlying assumptions about the scale of development needed. I feel that the document places more emphasis on expansion and release of green belt land than it does on maximising development in and improvement of the urban area. I would like to see evidence to show that the current infrastructure developments referred to will be able to cope with the level of growth planned. In particular, I would expect to see a reference to plans included in the STP plan for health and social care. The expansion of Warrington proposed here has significant implications for health infrastructure - while Local profiles refer to primary care, there seems to be no consideration of how the plans will impact on acute care. Given the STP is considering options for downgrading Warrington's A&E, I would expect the plan to reference this. This comment applies to subsequent questions

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please stop calling it a city. It's not a city yet - I don't believe many residents understand what the aspirations for Garden City status are and how that differs from city status (I know I didn't know the difference and am having to do my homework). See previous reference to infrastructure.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous reference to infrastructure.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous reference to infrastructure.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous reference to infrastructure.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The exclusion of the development of proposals for outlying settlements is of concern. This is likely to cause uncertainty in the short to medium term and it would be helpful to know when his information is to be available - and how it will be consulted on (it's not clear whether this will be part of the overall plan consultation or whether it will be separate). I am concerned that if this is separate from the wider plan, decisions will be made about general principles around green belt release that make it easier to push planning through for sites in the outlying settlements. With respect to Winwick, Burtonwood, Croft and Culcheth, the Local profiles are very useful documents but appear to have been developed as if each settlement stands alone (except in the case of schools and primary care facilities). It would be useful to see how the potential developments would interact. I note also that no reference is made to the planned Parkside development. This will have a significant impact on local infrastructure and is likely to place a burden on local roads in and around the Winwick / Croft area. This needs to be taken into consideration in exploring any proposals for development in these settlements.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is high time the Council made appropriate provision for Gypsies and Travellers and I welcome the intention to both formalise existing sites (even though here are on green belt!) and explore additional provision.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel there should be a more joined up approach to the links between this plan and other plans (notably the STP plan but there are likely to be others). There should be some reference to a downside scenario in terms of economic downturn, or failure to secure approval of infrastructure proposals. It would have been useful to include as appendices summaries of some of the background documents referenced. I know my way around consultation documents but this has been a very difficult document to digest, due to jargon and assumptions about prior knowledge of previous background work and current Council policy. The communication of the plan has been poor - I found out about it via our local Facebook page only a week ago. I think for something this important, a leaflet drop would have been an appropriate approach.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The type of housing that will undoubtedly be built won't match up with the type of employment. This area is going into to be ruined by the additional houses and strain on the already busy roads. Green belt land in particular should be left alone.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a town NOT a city and so calculations need to be proportionate to the type of place we live in.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt land should be protected in all circumstances. There is an abundance of wildlife in the Warrington area that needs protecting.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is not a city

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is a ridiculous plan. The garden suburb plan will put a disproportionate strain on the Appleton/grappenhall/lymm area

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Depends what the employment offering is? More warehousing is not welcome

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree that more homes are needed and it is extremely difficult to fit these new homes into the area. However, I believe as a resident of Lymm, these must be widely spread across Warrington not in single places.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

According to the plans for Lymm there will be no land safeguarded - all Green Belt has been flagged as potential and if the 5000+ homes is agreed all Green Belt will be gone!

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I cannot find the relevant information for Local Plan Objectives!

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The main development location in Lymm is in Statham and Oughtrington side of Lymm. Statham can potentially increase the size of Cherry Tree primary and also Statham Primary (at a push). However, Oughtrington Primary is at full capacity! A neighbour has recently moved back into the area after renting their house out for a few years and cannot get their children into their local school (and they live 2 minutes walk from the school!). To build on Oughtrington Lane and also Higher Lane would mean a new primary school would have to be built! The traffic already on Oughtrington Crescent is a nightmare at school times and this would increase the traffic as people from further afield would be trying to get to another school. The bridge on Burford Lane going under the canal can not take anymore traffic as is the same with Oughtrington bridge!

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Out of all the villages Lymm is already over populated! The schools are full, the doctor surgeries are full, the roads are busy especially when there is a problem on the motorways or Warburton bridge. Lymm has 500 houses that are proposed, the highest of all the outlying settlements. It doesn't have the infrastructure to support this. We will need another primary school, another doctors, a post office, a bank etc etc! Lymm doesn't even have a post office or bank in the village anymore which will make Broomedge the main postoffice for possibly over 14,000 people!! Introducing more houses means Lymm becomes a town not a village. Lymm village centre needs improving if more homes are built, no more charity shops are needed and moe support should be given to local businesses who are paying high rents to try and make the village a nice place to live. We live on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which is extremely busy at the school run times, adding children to Lymm High will only increase this traffic.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Having more homes means more employment. Unemployment is already high.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are already 3 gypsy sites which are on green belt which will be given to the gypsies. There should be no more!! This is encouraging more gypsies to come to Warrington and be given land for free. Every other citizen in Warrington have to buy a house on land and from the settlement profiles places such as Lymm are already priced very high! There should be no more gypsy land.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

- What % should be kept as greenbelt in each area if plans go ahead, is there a cap? - How many houses become council and private owned - The new laws for green belt land on what terms can you build

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses - the national formula for calculating housing needs was changed a week ago, which reduces the housing need considerably from 9000 to 4000. Massive difference and your figures should be reduced.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The green belt must only be utilised in exceptional circumstances, these are not exceptional circumstances.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a large town and that's how it should stay - it should never be a city which is clearly what you aspire to. We are surrounded by cities, Liverpool, Manchester - we don't need another. People love Warrington for its semi rural nature. The countryside is on our doorstep. What you propose is unnecessary, unwanted except by developers.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You wisely disregarded proposals of land that would double the size of Lymm and Culceth , but you still wish to increase these villages. They are villages and cannot cope with any further development on the scale proposed. There are not enough facilities or infrastructure.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

All options that dramatically reduce the green belt should be unacceptable. There are brownfield sites you should consider/regenerate instead.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Completely overestimated. You make allowances for gypsies and travellers, but no one on the housing list who has waited for a property for years.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You're proposing to reduce countryside villages to gardens! Unacceptable use of green belt land.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unacceptable use of land.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unacceptable use of land

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not at the expense of green belt land. Find another way.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unacceptable use of green belt

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Take into consideration the recent change of national formula for calculating housing, reducing numbers from 9000 to 4000

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Can't see how is has taken into account the impact of Brexit when it hasn't been experienced yet.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am a resident in Croft where I live due to the open green spaces, I strongly feel that any development in the areas would have a strong negative impact on the current community and the village life we have. Especially the HUGE development proposed by Peel Holdings. The demand should be met by using brownfield sites throughout the Borough and protect our green belt areas.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No greenbelt should be lost. There are other options which can fulfil the demand.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Greenbelt could be impacted

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much greenbelt is impacted

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Baed on outdated information

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

LOADS OF VACANT HOUSES AND HUGE WAREHOUSE ALREADY ALL OVER WARRINGTON

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

LEAVE OUR GREENBELT ALONE - BUILD ON THE ACHES AND ACRES OF UNUSED INDUSTRIAL UNITS AND SITE

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

WE DONT WANT TO BE CITY

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

YOU HAVE USED OUTDATED INFO TO SUIT YOUR WANTS

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

HAVE BETTER ASPIRATIONS FOR WARRINGTON - MIAN DEVELOPMENT SHOULD ON BROWNFIELD

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

BRIDGEFOOT IS A NIGHTMARE BECAUSE OF THE MERSEY CORSSING BUT GREENBELT SHOULD PROTECTED

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

WE ARE NOT A CUTY AND DON'T WANT TO BE ONE

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

IT IS TOO UNCLEAR

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

WE DON'T WANT THIS GARDEN CITY WE WANT OUR HISTORIC VILLAGES PROTECTING

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

NEED MORE INFORMATION AS CURRENTLY IT DOES NOT LOOK FEASIBLE

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

IF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND DONE SENSITIVELEY THIS WOULD BE BENEFICIAL

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

WARRINGTON IS FULL OF EMPTY WAREHOUSES

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

IF THEY ARE DORMANT THAY ARE NOT TRAVELLERS. I THINK THERE SHOULD BE A SPACE FOR THEM TO REST ON THEIR JOURNEY

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

NEED MORE INFORMATON

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

YES THE FEELINGS, THOUGHT AND IDEAS OF THE POPULATION !

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

unnecessary development which will ruin the townA Warrington city is NOT WANTED

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt land should not be released without local agreement

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

A Warrington city is NOT WANTED

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to my letter. The calculation seems to be exaggerated and not in accordance with government and ONS guidelines.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It seems that Green Belt land has been reclassified, rather than fully investigate/utilize agricultural and brownfield land.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Certainly not. Green Belt should only be reclassified in exceptional circumstances - the plan does not make any case for such 'exceptional circumstances'.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no consideration/wholly inadequate consideration of traffic and transport. Any proposed road developments will come only at the end of 15 years. We are already grid-locked. I do not agree with the use of Green Belt. I would like more consideration to be given to use of land such as Fiddler's Ferry. The calculation of

housing required seems exaggerated. The plan for Warrington to become a city appears totally undeliverable and unrealistic.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The 'spatial options' are a ploy to try and make it look like it may compensate for loss of Green Belt.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough research/thought has been given. It is the developers that are driving the choice of area. Main development locations should be supported by adequate traffic provision.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Absolutely not. Please refer to my letter.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have not had an opportunity to review the PDO for the City Centre.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A good idea and an opportunity to build low cost, high density housing, where young people may want to live. Should this not be replicated on the east side of Warrington to reduce the proposed impact on the Green Belt in South Warrington?

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Ridiculous.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to my letter. Undeliverable. Not supported by road/traffic improvements. Takes Green Belt without there being exceptional circumstances.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Plans for these areas are reasonable and it is unfair to have such heavy development plans for south Warrington.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Plans are unclear. It is a more realistic plan to place these close to the motorway corridor, but the motorway network does not currently support this. More haulage companies, such as Eddie Stobart, would only add to the congestion that we regularly encounter.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have not reviewed this. The PDO is vast and more time should have been taken to explain it to the people of Warrington. We have jobs to hold down and don't have unlimited time to try and ascertain the full extent of the PDO.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have not reviewed this. The PDO is vast and more time should have been taken to explain it to the people of Warrington. We have jobs to hold down and don't have unlimited time to try and ascertain the full extent of the PDO.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that it should be reviewed and amended to reduce the impact to South Warrington, leave Green Belt untouched, have a more thought out/measured approach. Please refer to my letter

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The calculation for new house numbers appears grossly over-estimated and does not take into account the type of houses really needed in the area and where those people will need to get to for work/ travel.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

More use could be made of brown-field sites.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The value of the green belt land to the local community has been grossly underestimated. In order to keep South Warrington as a place that people want to live in and wildlife to thrive, this green belt is essential. No land should be released from the Green Belt - surely that's the point of a Green Belt, that it's protected!

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no need to turn Warrington into a City, but it could be a sustainable large town, if sustainability was put at the top of the Objectives.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much development is planned for Green Belt areas and inadequate infrastructure improvements are proposed to alleviate the pressure that these developments will put on roads and facilities

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses; too few green spaces; inadequate infrastructure; profit for developers above aiming for a sustainable Warrington.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

More brown-field sites could be utilised.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Green Belt needs to be protected; it brings huge value to the whole town. The plans will lead to yet more characterless identikit housing developments, lacking community cohesion and overloading the Warrington roads infrastructure.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The employment land will just end up being more distribution centres with low numbers of employment at low wages. This will not bring value to neighbouring communities, only an increase in traffic.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Sustainability should be the headline here. There is a real opportunity for Warrington to do something innovative here, not just freeing up land for big developers to produce identikit estates. Smaller, higher quality developments would make Warrington a more sustainable town. These don't need to be high priced housing, just a drive to achieve the highest sustainability ratings for development (using smaller developers, or freeing up land for self-build). The infrastructure and planning of housing sites needs to be done whilst thinking about where people actually need to get to. Warrington is a desirable place to live because of its transport links to major cities, coupled with access to green spaces, yet the routes between housing and train stations are already suffering with traffic levels - ANY size of development really needs to cover this first.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand that the current growth in Warrington will be used as a basis for the calculations, but I expect that, in light of Brexit, that the underlying assumptions may change dramatically. However, until the final outcome of Brexit is negotiated (being out of Warrington's control) it will be very difficult to determine what the future underlying growth, and therefore housing demand, will be.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is very difficult for a member of the public to visualise what proposed density of housing will look like in reality and therefore to pass comment on whether that number of homes can be accommodated near impossible. However based on my understanding and experience, densely built properties, with tiny gardens and next to no parking do not sell well, cause transient communities, who, having bought there realise that they would much prefer to live somewhere else with more space.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again this comes down to whether the proposed density of housing is appropriate for the suggested area, which as a member of the public is very difficult to comment on. However I feel strongly that greenbelt should be protected as much as possible. Once lost it can never be reclaimed.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree that more homes are required and creating employment opportunities for Warrington will enhance the town. I think, though, that the impact of Brexit will be more sudden and significant but until we are 2/3 years down the line with the final outcome, the housing needs for the next 20 years will be very difficult to determine and assumptions made now completely wrong.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am concerned about the proposed amount of greenbelt being released, which will destroy the character of South Warrington, which has become a desired area to live. The natural environment, with its wildlife and green areas has become an area which is not only enjoyed by local residents but those from the whole of Warrington. To lose so much is a real tragedy. The amount released should be more limited and due consideration given to the density of houses built so that the character is retained as much as possible. Access over the Bridgewater Canal, as well as all the other proposed infrastructure, will need to be given serious consideration, as several of the crossing points are only single carriageway. As these are already bottlenecks at times, with any future development, they will get considerably worse.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

My comment here is that, despite planning rules, these sites are often occupied first and then approval by the owner sought afterwards, leading to protracted applications and appeals, which are difficult to negotiate once the travellers are in situ and costly. The rest of the general public have to oblige by planning rules before they change use of land/build etc.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think that you have used best case estimates (or worst from a residents perspective) as to growth and requirement. I assume that developers have had huge influence over this and that there are political reasons for the grossly over estimated figures. I also note that the calculations do not consider the impact on existing residents health and well being, current pollution rates, loss of greenbelt and increasing urban sprawl which must surely be a factor in terms of what is right for the residents of Warrington.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not think that you have exhausted all of the options. Release of greenbelt should be the last resort, I have no confidence that all other options have been exhausted. The influence of developers concerns me as greenbelt land is clearly more attractive a development prospect particularly in South Warrington. Additionally, the plan does not take account for any additionally brownfield sites which may naturally become available over the course of a 20 year period. We require strong leadership from WBC in terms of what is right for the people of Warrington.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No confidence whatsoever. I think expecting people to read and digest a 60 page plan with additional reading is a shocking consultation strategy. I am degree educated with time on my hands. I cannot imagine why any member of WBC would think it realistic that the average Warrington resident would be prepared to read the document and understand the information.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Who wants Warrington to become a new city? We live close to 3 cities. I do not understand the driver for this aspiration. Regarding sensitive release of green belt, the current plans completely destroy the south of Warrington. I do agree that the town centre needs some investment and additional housing. I agree that new infrastructure may be required for the future. Destroying the green space in south Warrington with take away a current provision for access to green space enjoyed by the whole of Warrington W5 - you are destroying a significant area of natural beauty and well used green space, there is now way to replace this, with a few strips of green space. W6 - how can building 24000 more homes, destroying the countryside in south Warrington, building new infrastructure ever improve the environment for us, we already have one of the worst areas for respiratory disease in the UK. These are just words that do not mean anything.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why is Appleton considered to be part of the central urban area, the very arguments used against development in other outlying areas apply to our communities. South Warrington is made up of a number of small villages which will be lost forever.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes you appear to be assuming that since Appleton and the surrounding areas are closer to Warrington Town Centre they are better placed to provide housing for people employed in the town. Have you assessed how many people currently employed in this area, work in this area? We live here as it is unique access east to west, north to south, west coast mainline and Manchester airport. As it will be for the 9000 new residents that can afford to live in this area.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It will completely destroy the picturesque villages of south Warrington. Appleton Thorn will be gone forever.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not want to live in a garden city suburb, no one I know in my local area wants to live in a city suburb, we do not live in south warrington because we want to be in a city suburb. I am perfectly happy living in my local village. By pursuing this development you will fracture communities as people look to move out of the area which is very sad for our children.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have concerns about the amount of green space to be released particularly the proposed loss of the nature reserve, its shocking in these times, when we know the damage that we are doing to the environment, we understand the link between access to greenspace and health and wellbeing, that this could get the go ahead.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

These areas should be taking their fair share of the housing demand.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As a huge amount of it seems to be on greenbelt and where I live will turn into a massive employment area. Its truly horrifying.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There's more than enough to last a lifetime.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As a lifelong Socialist I am angry and dismayed that such plans have been made without free and proper consultation with the very people on whom said plans have the most effect. It alarms me greatly that WBC sees fit to adopt such poor levels of communication with the people whose interests they are supposed to protect. Whether elected or not the council has a duty of care to all Warrington residents and I feel affronted by its lack of Good Will. Good communication lies at the heart of all good practise and its lack is evidence of the disrespect to which the people have been subjected.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand that the 2014 local plan was inadequate and has had to be revised, but I find that the wording is ambiguous. Is the whole thing a raft of concepts or have WBC already decided what is going to be?

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not one of the Planners I spoke to at any of the meetings lives in South Warrington. No account has been taken of the fact that Fiddlers Ferry is due for re-commissioning, thereby releasing lots of land which can be used for re-development. Not one of them has ever had to sit in traffic at peak times here whenever there are problems on the motorway or been late for a vital hospital appointment because they were held up in traffic on our already busy roads. WBC recognises the state of our gridlock but I am not convinced the proposed solutions are truly correct.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

New houses- of course Warringtonians need more houses and deserve more houses, but why eat up our Green Belt to provide them. The type of housing being proposed will be expensive and well outside the budget of local people. And why should we want to be called a city? I want a safe, lively and vibrant town which can stand tall and proud in between Liverpool and Manchester. Why can't we be Warrington Market /Floral Town. When will WBC show it's mettle and use the talents, skills and imagination at it's disposal.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This part of Warrington is a haven for wildlife, of flora and fauna of every kind so there is no need to provide it. It's here and WBC can dress the plans up any way it likes but that's the truth. I see it every single day on walks. When I feel heart-sick and worried I simply go for a walk and my sense of health and well being is quick to return. All our people should be enabled to feel this way- why not create more spatial options for those who cannot access them. This would mean opening up the plethora of brownfield sites and creating feelgood spaces. If it can be done on Hampstead Heath in the centre of London it can be done here in Warrington, Cheshire.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A lot more in imagination and goodwill is required!!!!

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It destroys more than it builds.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't want to be a Citizen of Warrington. Primarily I want Warrington to be a town built on peace not disunity.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I need more thinking time on this one because I have spent an inordinate amount of my free time going to meetings, discussing proposals and communicating on social media- my understanding of happenings on the Waterfront is sadly lacking as of right now. But I do know that the bridges in Warrington are dirty, rusty horrible eyesores which need a lot of loving care. A bridge should be a thing of beauty not a blot on the landscape.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have already said that I want Warrington to be a Beautiful Town. A Market /Floral Town. I was born and brought up in the slums of East Manchester. When we put the light on in the mornings the cockroaches used to scuttle away under the grate. I adore Manchester [REDACTED] will do wonders for that great City. And Liverpoolians are rightly proud of their heritage. But Warrington is not a city and should not aspire to be. WBC should make Warrington beautiful and bright, just like its people.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Far too much brawn and not brain (common sense) gone into it.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Just one word here, and I'm saying with my head hanging low. Moore.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Of course. But continue to approach new employment land with sensitivity, imagination and goodwill.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have not had sufficient time to devote to this question.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have not yet had time to give an answer to this important question.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe that WBC has a common law duty of fairness to the people affected by the Local Plan. There is no legal requirement for a twenty year plan. Even Jeremy Corbin is happy with ten for now! I believe WBC should provide more amenities for its people before it starts to build thousands of houses on what is exceptional Green Belt land. And I believe that WBC should not put itself in the pocket of Developers, but should, instead, work hard to maintain its pride and independence. Never forget that you exist for the benefit of the people. Oligarchical behaviour has no place in a Democracy.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This needs recalculating as it is far higher than we believe it needs to be.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

if the number of houses required are downgraded in line with government targets the amount of land from the green belt will be reduced

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree that some housing will be required but not at the cost of our greenbelt and individual villages

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

What different options? there are no alternative options for the south of warrington and the garden city suburb.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Although I agree that the TOWN centre requires major regeneration I do not agree with making Warrington a city. It is not required, the people of Warrington do not want to be a City. Who made this decision. Surely it should be put out to a vote.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We do not want to be a City, by developing this area you will destroy the character of the local villages and greenbelt which is what attracts people to the area.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I assume this refers to Lymm and Cultcheth? By making us a city and building out across the greenbelt they won't stay as outlying settlements for long they will also be engulfed into the rest of the city.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You are planning to put new employment land in an area where the people working in the new warehouses etc will not be able to afford the houses that are being built in the local area to the work. i.e.south warrington.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

More detailed transportation assessment is required.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am concerned about the number of houses planned for Lymm and whether these will be supported with the amenities that they will require.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would not agree with the release of green belt land.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe you have based numbers and locations on cash return misleading residents into believing this is driven at a government level.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't believe built up and brownfield sites have been given the adequate level of consideration. Again because these areas would not attract the return in property value that the developers and WBC could get in other areas such as South Warrington.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There should be absolutely no greenbelt being released and the safeguarded land is miniscule in comparison.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan is not seeking to solely meet housing need, it is seeking to make the most profit which is ethically and morally wrong.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The main development options are focussed on green belt land. It is environmentally damaging in terms of wildlife, air quality and drainage to release this land for development. Doing so will also impact negatively on the overall feel of the area turning it into a built up housing estate. Minimal assessment seems to have been done on brownfield sites.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

For all the reasons in my objection letter I do not agree. Housing need has been over inflated, plans have been concealed and not publicised until residents found out themselves, the consultation was nothing short of a shambles and the environmental implications of the plans will negatively impact this area forever. The plan is based on one thing alone - greed.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is not a city, we do not want it to be a city! We have cities close by if we wish to move there or spend time in a city. The only people who seem to want this city status is WBC, residents do not. I personally like the TOWN centre especially the Market Square and the cultural quarter. Granted other parts are in dire need of some development to improve the look and feel of the place however this is not the sort of development the PDO is trying to achieve.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes, traffic will be a nightmare as it will with the housing PDO. We are already at breaking point and short of turning the Manchester Ship Canal into spaghetti junction with all manner of flyovers and completely ruining the look of the area I don't see how this development is feasible.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Garden City Suburb, what a lovely phrase, sounds so green and pleasant and environmentally friendly doesn't it?! Couldn't be further from the truth. It doesn't make it OK to bulldoze green belt land and build dual carriageways through farmland and residential properties just because your housing estate includes a 'country park'. I would be surprised if said 'country park' ever materialised anyway and what would it be an artificial, man made replication of what we had lost but on a much smaller scale. No thanks

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please refer to my objection letter covering all of these proposals

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I didn't focus on this area to be completely honest but I am not prepared to agree with something I have not looked into. No option to leave a neutral response so I will say no.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand that provision is made to permit the site at cartridge lane to continue. I have no problem with this however the proximity of it to your new 'garden city suburb' may well affect your house prices

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Did not look at this part of the PDO in detail but cannot choose neutral response

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Accurate housing numbers and accurate maps and plans as the ones at the consultation events were appalling.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

why is there a need to make warrington a city..there has been no local consultationour local roads drs and other pulic sevices are not ready to deal with the population we have now still less for more people /cars etc.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

see the answer before

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments!

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see previous comments

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

only acceptable if it is for the current population

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

only if it preserves our green spaces

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would like you to further explain the projected population growth statistic, especially post Brexit vote and explain why you think Warrington will expand so rapidly. Is growth due to birth rate or because you think commuters will move here? In my opinion the figures are too high and without foundation

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not see evidence that you have fully explored utilising empty and brownfield sites - I think it is the easy option for developers and yourselves to take Green Belt land and start from new. This should be a last resort. There are hundreds of empty units and sites, and empty housing. Use them first

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green Belt Land by definition should only be released in exceptional circumstances and I do not find enough evidence of any exceptional circumstances in Warrington. Expansion plans by greedy developers (Peel) and council do not count. Develop Fiddlers Ferry site for example. 36% of new housing and 71% of new employment on Green Belt is totally excessive - especially given the current empty land, units, and houses currently in Warrington

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I interpret your objective as to totally change and in my opinion ruin, the character of South Warrington. Have you asked residents if they want this? Do you care? Too many of you are not from Warrington or have connections with Peel holdings. Despicable behaviour

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not clear which part of your documents this question even relates to. I have never seen such a user-unfriendly questionnaire. You should make clear which parts of the document each question is related to. We the general public need this information to be clear and accessible.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have overy targetted South Warrington, to the detriment of the currant character of the villages we are so proud of. Given that senior council members have made comments in previous meetings to the effect that everyone born in South Warrington was born with a silver spoon in their mouths, we feel a very stron bias from the council against the South. Come and talk to people and find out what they really think and want. I'm from North Birmingham and wouldn't know a silver spoon if I saw one

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Because I don't see any eveidence that you have asked the current population what our development needs are. Affordable housing for our children, improve traffic congestion issues, reduce pollution - those would be at the top of our lists. Certainly not build on all our green belt and increase traffic and pollution

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We are a town, not a city. Who has decided we should become a city? There has been no debate or ballot. You have moved too much retail shopping outside of the city centre leaving the centre beyond Golden Square to become neglected and devoid of quality shops. Improve the shops, improve the access (free car parking and better public transport)

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

What will the impact on the Mersey flood plain be? Will all public footpaths and green spaces be protected, and particularly Moore Nature reserve. If not, then you need to rethink your plans. People need leisure space and fresh air - for their health and well-being (eg reduction of asthma rates).

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses planned in this area (as per question 1 - I see no justification for needing so many) - some development around Grappenhall Heys was expected but the scale of your plan is totally excessive. Our access to green fields, nature, footpaths and wildlife would be harmed severely. What steps will you take to protect the valuable wildlife (badgers, birds, bats etc). You need to come clean about your plans to build an access road using the disused and current sections of the TPT, and not accuse people of scaremongering when they quite rightly draw attention to the lines you drew on the map stating that a new road was under consideration. The TPT should be protected at all costs. As said previously, consult and communicate with the community, not draw unclear maps and muddy the waters with accusations.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously mentioned - will you guarantee to protect Moore Nature reserve? Your maps are so poor and unclear it isn't at all obvious to me what will be destroyed and what will stay

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

South Warrington bears the brunt of the development again - almost 50% in Lymm, which has already been developed beyond its infrastructure capacity in previous 10 years.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It should not be taken from Green Belt (and your questions are becoming very repetitive...)

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Protect homeowners and taxpayers first, then consider G+Ts. Many Travellers in Walton have been resident there for 20+ years - please re-define them. When they contribute to the town (not city)'s economy then they should be allocated full rights and considerations. You need to be fair to all.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Truly I have no idea what your approach is. 4.34 - 4.36 and 4.95-4.102 in the plan are unintelligible gobbledygook. Please explain in clear English what your plan is and then I could comment

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Proper consultation with affected communities and clear, accurate information with reasonable timescales. This has been very lacking in the process so far -as you must acknowledge since you were forced to extend the consultation deadline. I would like to know much more detail about how you will provide affordable housing, elderly provision and care, improved traffic and pollution levels, and improved public transport - and mostly all of this relates to South Warrington. I would like to know how Warrington can afford this, or will Peel Holdings and the developers be covering all costs? Since you as a local authority were downgraded 2 levels this week by Moody, your residents need to be sure we can trust you to manage the public purse astutely and not fritter away money needlessly. I would also like much more clarity on the role of Peel Holdings in this plan, and to know all councillors links (financial, and personal) with Peel. Other planning applications not included in this plan need to be shown as development to, so that we have a clear and complete picture- eg I believe hundreds of houses are planned on Thelwall Heys and around Hillcliffe, Stockton Heath.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

*

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

*

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of land to be released south of The Manchester Ship Canal is totally disproportionate and way in excess of the land to the north of The Ship Canal.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand the 'so called' objectives but more 'Brown Field' site reuse MUST be considered first.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

All the local documentation which is being circulated advises that even the Council admits that the requirement of 1,1113 new houses each year over the next 20 years is higher than is required

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why is the plan to build on so much green belt land when there are other options available. Do we not value our environment? Do we not value our road systems - the current road system is absolutely horrendous (it took me 30 minutes last night to get from The Stag to Bridgefoot Island). All more houses will do is make this even worse.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Basically Grappenhall Heys, Appleton Thorn and Stretton will become one and vast amount of green belt land will be gone for ever - do you understand that you cannot get it back once it has been built on. The wildlife, environment and beauty will be lost for ever to this beautiful part of the county. Totally unacceptable

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Where is the infrastructure plan? How will our roads support this? Has anybody has proposed this, actually spent time in these areas to see the impact these houses will have on the roads, schools, doctors etc and obviously the environment

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can't see that any valid assessment has taken place

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Definitely not. What will happen to our villages? Yes, Warrington may become a City, but that means we will all be part of this City - we don't want to be, we want to stay in our villages and our wonderful location

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Loss of green belt land which can never be recovered; We don't want to become a City, we value our town of Warrington and our villages surrounding; Why not use Brown Sites? Can you imagine the traffic with all these extra houses? Has whoever is proposing this been on the roads on a Friday afternoon when the Motorway is closed / part closed; How will parking in Stockton Heath cope? How will our hospital cope? I've been waiting for an appointment for 7 weeks for something - how long will this be with all these new residents?

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Loss of green belt land which can never be recovered; We don't want to become a City, we value our town of Warrington and our villages surrounding; Why not use Brown Sites? Can you imagine the traffic with all these extra houses? Has whoever is proposing this been on the roads on a Friday afternoon when the Motorway is closed / part closed; How will parking in Stockton Heath cope? How will our hospital cope? I've been waiting for an appointment for 7 weeks for something - how long will this be with all these new residents?

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

I haven't seen this

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I haven't seen this

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The equation is obviously nothing to do with the wants and the needs of the people who actually live in this town. As a person who is born and bred in Warrington, within my life i have seen major developments, valuable green space lost forever. The scale and the time frame is truly bonkers!

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Employment land? For whom? What kind of jobs will be on offer to the people of Warrington - more warehouse operatives who cannot and will not be able to afford any of the proposed homes in the south!

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I totally oppose any release of the green belt full stop.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree with nothing in the local plan. I would like to see a new plan whereby the issues raised by the people who actually live in the town and have to negotiate the road systems and shop in the town which is a disgrace, dealt with and major improvements to existing highways and brown field sites.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Spatial OPTIONS.....Really?

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Assessed? Really?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why do we need future development on this scale?

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We are not a City - i live in a town and god forbid that ever changes in my life time.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington Waterfront? Do you mean Peel Ports? Port Warrington? At what cost to the environment?

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Bloody ludicrous

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The south of this town is green and lush, a beautiful retreat from the hustle and bustle, where the air is cleaner and you can hear bird song, there's ponds, wildlife, mature trees, wildflowers, teeming with insect life.....whats not to love - it needs to stay untouched.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Develop brown field sites.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Employment for whom?

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Can't they buy into Warrington and buy one of the 28'000 proposed new homes.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Believe Warrington is at full capacity currently and not coping with existing infrastructure, so adding to it until sufficient bridges, GPs will exacerbate the problem and does not make sense. Also am proud to live in a town and do not know anyone who wants to become a city, except for WBC. Public health rightly encourages us to become more healthy, but plan to take off us major green belt areas which we walk to. Roads within Warrington and eg Stocketon Heath and roads leading out eg to Chester are already causing considerable issues and we are already a laughing stock to non-residents.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As per my previous comments, I believe it is based on becoming a city, but no-one that I know wants this. Also, surely houses built on green belt would not be affordable housing anyway. Surely there is further brown belt land to be utilised first.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Because this appears to be based on becoming a city. If we wanted that, we would move to one. Stockton Heath is becoming a town and I do not know anyone who wanted that either.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previous comments apply.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previous comments apply.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previous comments apply.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previous comments apply. We need to get existing infrastructure sorted before adding to the mayhem.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Would love to see this in town centre but could not tell how far it spreads on the maps. Town centre was once so vibrant and it is so sad to see its demise. As a Warringtonian I think council should concentrate on improving that before it attempts wider areas, ie walk before it can run. Bridge Foot is horrendous with cars neatly having crashes every day, so embarrassing when visitors come from other towns and cities. Not a good advertisement for attempting wider growth.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previous comments apply. Do not want a city and do not want to lose surrounding green belt. Also, Something has to make up for town centre.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am not as familiar with this area so feel it is unfair to comment. Hopefully it is not based on becoming a city!!

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see all comments previously.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am afraid I do not understand this sufficiently to comment, but agree if it helps to improve life styles for those currently struggling as long as not based on city status.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I admit I have not fully taken this in but think the council is usually fair in this area.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, apologies for not taking all this information in so cannot comment but am worried if past waste sites is anything to go by.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

To give us the option of becoming an efficient town rather than sprawling city!

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

SAVE OUR GREEN BELT! I strongly object to any development of any kind on land on Lumber Lane and Green Lane, plan references R18/054, R18/083, R18/058, R18/084 and R18/085. These fields are the ones that have surrounded Burtonwood for centuries and this area is steeped in so much history relating to Oliver Cromwell and the battlefields his men once covered. There is so much wildlife which is an abundant habitat for bats, pheasants, herons, buzzards, ospreys, hares, rabbits, geese, ducks and swans being so close to Sankey Valley Park. First and foremost, Brownfield sites should be priority for any planning and development, and the Council where possible should purchase derelict land where buildings once stood to regenerate the urban area, particularly in the centre of the village where there appears to be a need to regenerate land at the side of where once stood The Bridge Inn and Elm Tree on Burtonwood Industrial Estate. Housing is already earmarked for where these public houses once stood. Burtonwood Villagers are proud of its history, but as yet, it has not had any TLC afforded to it such as a monument to recognise how valued the village was to the RAF servicemen. There is not a 'need' for a new school or doctors surgeries. This is demonstrated by the fact that Kinnock Park surgery is closed 4 out of the 5 days in the afternoon, as the Partners of the practice have a larger surgery at Vista Road a couple of miles away in Earlestown. And there is also another Doctors surgery just around the corner. Both of Green Lane school infants blocks were converted to something else over 5 years ago. This demonstrates that the village has a significantly higher age ratio and young couples preferring to live in Chapelford and Great Sankey close to all the town centre amenities it is building up. The volume of traffic and the congestion caused through the developments of Gemini and recently Omega and the various housing developments such as Butts Green and Chapelford have caused a significant rat run from Newton-Le-Willows (train station) Earlestown, Haydock and St Helens to get to Gemini/Omega/Winwick. It would have made more sense to offer one side of the motorway for employment and the other for housing to balance the 'need' for both. Farmers Lane was once a quintessential English Country Lane which has been spoiled and is now struggling to withstand the hourly battering it takes from the increased 'pull' from St Helens / Earlestown/ Haydock and other areas as there's no other way. NO, NO TO USING THE GREEN BELT, PLEASE HELP PROTECT IT BY USING BROWNFIELD SITES. THANK YOU.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The number of homes worked out in connection with employment is not justified by Omega as the large proportion are commuters from nearby towns and Burtonwood cannot cope with anymore major developments. Omega should have been split into 2 halves where one side was purely residential if that is the case to balance employment and housing out equally. There is sufficient run down and derelict parts of the town that there is a great need to be regenerated without slicing the Green Belt in half.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, because there isn't any need for ANY GREEN BELT to be released at all when there is so much regeneration that can be utilised.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

All objectives need to be reviewed and the general public should have been wrote to individually not just online for their opinions to be heard.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The call for sites should be been purely directed at landowners of Brown sites only.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

From the explanation, at no point does it appear to include areas of regeneration for sustainability. What happens after 20 or 15 year options, what will happen when we eventually run out of space?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, the Preferred Development Option needs to be urgently revised and more work is required to use Brown Belt sites and Regeneration of existing derelict and run down parts of the Borough.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

REGENERATE and improve the roads. Forward think when re-modeling roads to incorporate more efficient routes, not having to go back every 5 years and disrupt everything like the fiasco currently surrounding Omega where the Hermes vehicles effectively block villagers out during rush hours because they are nose to tail. There should have been a separate entrance/exit far away, as it is too close to the village.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

SAVE OUR GREEN BELT

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

SAVE OUR GREEN BELT!!! Theres more than enough employment land that is not being utilised or followed up!

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why should this be on Green Belt? No one rule for all.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Need more detailed information to comment on this.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

YES, WRITE TO ALL THE RESIDENTS IN THE BOROUGH AND GIVE THEM A RETURN FORM FOR THEM TO RESPOND.SAVE OUR PRECIOUS GREEN BELT.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No land should or need to be released from greenbeltPlease see uploaded document

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see uploaded document

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have not been given the time or information to consider this

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have not been given time or information to study this aspect

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No consideration has been taken of the road network which is totally unsuitable for such a development

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are plenty of sites round Warrington which could be used for housing

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No villages are now in danger of joining together and thus losing their identity

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

They are very short sighted with little regard for local residents

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Reference R18/105 . It is a important green belt area , the red lane bridge and Manchester ship canal bridge will cause a huge problem for the increased traffic . It is already heavily congested especially when the motorways are congested. Pollution in the area will hugely increase. Schools , dentists, doctors are already overloaded and will be even worse . Red lane bridge is small and you can't see over it . The road is used constantly as a back route to avoid the A49 and this will become worse . Causing pollution and possible accident to the school children walking along it . Pollution has caused health problems to grow in the last decade .

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of houses under R18/105 is not enough for any new facilities so all the village facilities will be put under more pressure .

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I would like strongly discourage any change to the local plan objectives. The green belt is very important in this area as Warrington area is too big as it is with the houses and traffic problems.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of houses you are proposing to develop is huge and the area can not cope with this . Mostly due to the traffic congestion. New roads will not solve the 2 canals we have running through . Which is just going to single carriage ways and then if the m6 and m56 are congested the entire motorway traffic comes through A49 and Warrington centre and bridge foot cannot cope .

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too may houses, leading to traffic congestion, pollution and local services under pressure

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have more than the required services and roads for the amount of houses , to try and help this situTion

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The infrastructure can not cope with the new development

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Smaller numbers of houses could be accommodated in more areas rather than large developments imposed on villages. Has consideration been given to development in urban areas where people have little option of buying property as it is built solely for investors. This is particularly true in Manchester and should be addressed.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

More housing is obviously needed.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous comments

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Information is difficult to access. Little information given to residents about the discussions/meetings.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Should have been distributed to all householders in the area with more information given as to what is involved. Explanation of how the process will continue is necessary. There is little information on improving infrastructure with the additions of extra housing. Why has there been a call for sites before this discussion has taken place? Why have some developers submitted full scale plans in the call for sites?

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

1. I am concerned that this can even be considered in the locations suggested without the main infrastructure already in place. 2. I feel the number of houses is excessive and not based on up to date needs or predictions.3. It is concerning that on your documents handed out at the consultation meetings in point 14 that no Environmental parties are mentioned as who you have communicated with so far, surely they should be one of the first.4. I don't believe the health and education authorities have the funds to fulfill the suggested improvements to be put in place alongside the housing and due to short falls in their budgets even if promised with the housing will not be guaranteed or come to fruition.5. Green belt land should be protected and considering you have recently refused planning to individuals (not myself) using the protection of greenbelt as the main reason surely this is not only hypocritical but also prejudice against the small developer vs the large scale developers such as peel holdings. How is it okay for one and not another. If you agree to free up such large areas for greenbelt land for this type of development surely this indicates you should now go back and free up smaller plots to the smaller developers or individuals to avoid discrimination. 5. Has a basic survey been carried out from the current residents of Warrington to find out if the majority are even on board for such large growth or for a garden city (which also say isnt a city!)? I may be wrong but feel the majority are not in favour and a huge amount of resource and cost may have been saved had this been questioned first.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I drive past so many vacant buildings and plots in existing built up areas where affordable flats and houses could be built or developed so it is heart breaking to see this plan and I do not feel it really takes into account what is available. I would also like to see all built up areas fully utilised as stage 1 of the project then reassessing the future needs in terms of number of houses, size of properties and affordable homes needs etc before stage 2 is even considered.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No I believe it is excessive and should be pulled right back with very little or no green belt land used.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand the need for housing but feel that in the area you have chosen then very few people who need affordable housing will be able to benefit from this due to the nature of the location and poor public transport routes (which are no longer controlled by the council and will not run if not profit making) I believe that it is excessive and a much smaller scale development in that area may have been more welcome, especially with less greenbelt invasion and if the transport routes were already in place such as lumb brook bridge and the dingle way/london bridge junction - I am totally puzzled by how this may be addressed as an additional bus route will not help any of the car drivers which is likely to be the majority of the new home owners.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think the development is totally unbalanced and no reason for this is given in terms of spatial options. such as looking at your map provided there seems very little release of green belt land around the croft, winwick, Burtonwood and Culcheth areas. Although I would prefer no green belt land used, if you insist on this then surely it would be better to spread the number of houses out more evenly around these areas as they have much better access to train lines to manchester and liverpool and also bus routes. I don't feel we have seen how you have assessed different spatial options and have only been shown 1 plan.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Perhaps the Preferred Development Option map provided is unclear as to my understanding of all the areas were proposed and considered for release to development and it details the possible number of new houses per area so unsure what the alternative options are?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe it excessive and not based on current needs or future needs.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that considering the size of area the number of houses could perhaps be increase with a view to more being flats/apartments. Please do thought still look at the infrastructure as we really do not want to bring warrington to a stand still as it already is at times.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please reduce the size of this. I agree some development is needed there but this again appears excessive for the area and takes away too much wildlife and land. Where development is needed could this be waterfront apartments and not sold to investors, mainly focusing on affordable housing?

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please, Please, Please do not use the greenbelt land. Consider all other options first. Please ensure the current infrastructure in both south and north warrington is improved before any of these developments are

carried out or plans approved. Please take into account your current residents. I have lived in Warrington for only 11 years and chose this town as it was just the right size and balance of town vs countryside, please do not take this away or many residents including ourselves may look to move elsewhere. If I wanted a city I would have chosen Manchester or Liverpool not Warrington. This plan is far too aggressive and uses too much greenbelt.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Would prefer not to have this land developed there but if you have to then reduce number and ensure infrastructure in place

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel the north Warrington ones above the M62 are out of balance with your plans for south Warrington although I still wish no green belt to be built if possible the plans seem totally biased towards the south and unreasonable.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

If it is very close to the motorway as I don't believe this makes the best residential land and is also often better for employment however the issue with where you are proposing is the lack of public transport and the hours the staff in locations such as this often work if warehousing or workshops as they are often shifts so public transport is not possible.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No I am astounded that you have recently given permission for the travellers site at Stretton/Daresbury area to become permanent as they have been there so long and raised families there. That for me is not a fair reason. If I lived in a flat for 10 years but didnt pay rent, would I therefore be allowed to own it just as i lived there for so long and would this be fair on the owner or anyone who pays rent or in the case of travellers council tax. If you do make any sites permanent then I believe long term residents should be liable for council tax and short term should pay a rent to the council to cover local services as I imagine they still use the schools, doctors and roads, etc.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

unsure where this is in the plans

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

More about environmental impact and about what the residents actually want - if they had been asked before this.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have you considered doctors surgeries, congestion in Lymm and spoiling the beautiful greenery we have

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is too many for Lymm and will take away too much green land

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We don't know how you've worked it out - we have not been directly made aware of the plans

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have not been made aware of your methodology

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt should not be released without proper consultation

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has been insufficient information and consultation with residents

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

We would need more information

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Little or no consultation has been conducted with residents and rate payers. No regard appears to have been given to existing cultural, visual, social amenity

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Local residents have not had their say or the option to protect or improve their community

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No proper consultation with the users and residents

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

We don't have enough information to comment

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Having attended one of the events we were disappointed at the lack of information available. There even seemed to be confusion over the use of the word city . The definition of the word suburb , therefore, was unclear. The terminology in use appeared to be deliberately vague.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough information to comment

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough information

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

We specifically asked for details on your approach but no explanation was given. This was unsatisfactory and left us unhappy with the whole process.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No information

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Insufficient information

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Hospital, high school, community centres, police stations, fire services more detailed consideration needs to be given on the impact on local services

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes the government revised the way it has come up with its housing figures last week and you have not revised the plan. You need to do this and extend consultation otherwise you must read- submit and start consultation again. We will fight this through the courts if necessary so please do this properly and don't waste more public money!

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above. This is where you should be putting housing NOT commercial development. A Warrington City is not sustainable this close to Manchester and Liverpool and none of your documentation proves a business case that it is! You can meet your national quota based on revised methodology by building on brown belt and in the centre. The 'Garden City' plan has no substance

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Y S see above you don't need to touch green belt! Re-do your figures!

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Ridiculous and unsustainable. See above

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See above

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt in Croft should remain protected. Houses that would be potentially built in Croft would not be affordable anyway. We live on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] which is currently a major cut through road where motorists regularly go above the 30 mile an hour speed limit. It will increase the dangers on an already dangerous road as the amount of traffic would increase. The size of the schools in Croft would not cope with an increase in population.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Unnecessary number in Croft

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green belt land in Croft needs to be protected

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Building new houses in Croft will be highly detrimental to the village. Will increase volume of traffic, noise levels and pollution.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not build on green belt in Croft

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Building more houses in Croft will not solve the problem

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not build on green belt in Croft

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Town not large enough to cope

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Leave our lovely environment alone and the wildlife

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

What's the point nobody listens

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Leave us alone let us live our lifes

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Just leave us alone

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel the number of houses proposed has been overestimated, as has the plans for 'city' status. How will the residents of such a large number of houses access appropriate health, education and social resources?? There are currently massive strains on the services already. Employment is welcomed, but what industries are you encouraging? Cheap, manual labour jobs that in time can be replaced with computers and machines? It is easy to say you are encouraging employment but will this be if long term benefit to the town?

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A vast amount of our much loved, much used green belt will be lost with your plans. Residents homes, quality of life, natural habitats will be negatively affected.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There appears to be an excessive amount of green belt to be destroyed, area that are the 'lungs' of Warrington. It appears coincidental that lots of the land, in some direct and indirect way is associated with Peel Holdings who no doubt will gain financial benefits from our loss of green belt.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The objective to become a city is not my idea for Warrington. I enjoy our green spaces and our town. I don't want to live in an over crowded, congested city.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't feel that thousands more homes will be of benefit to our already struggling healthcare providers. I doubt that the plan has realistically accounted for the extra strain this scale of development will put on our hospital and healthcare services. This is also the case for schools, road networks and refuse collection to name only a few.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The centre currently is run down and has numerous vacant shops and units, and at night the centre is not a place most resident would entertain socialising in due to the lack of safety, and decent places to go. I feel it's naive to expect this to drastically change. If the current development of the new town centre car park/eyesore is anything to go by I am not very confident of your plan.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Is this just a way to line the pockets of Peel Holdings? What have they done for our town? Except drag their heels about refurbishing the swing bridges.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

When have so many beautiful green areas dotted around the town, that are accessible to so many. Why stipulate that much of this natural, green space should be lost to make way for something new

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why not focus on the employment land we have already and regenerate that? Encourage long term industry to the area instead of short term, low skilled, low paid industries

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can not understand why any green belt land needs to be released.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even

allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum – although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As

any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand – the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a

higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences

of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number

could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum – although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the

recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand – the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling).

Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set.

CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and

requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern

Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum “ although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand “ the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability “ the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included). CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing “ the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa “ unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem

to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be

the intersection of HS2 and HS3 “ indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers “ would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then

the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge. CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not

misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum – although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand – the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It

also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND

distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers – would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained

approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test.

CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The

legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum “ although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand “ the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability “ the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the

definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more

significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers – would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent

consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test.

CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent

parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum " although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand " the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most

expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether,

and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test.

CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements " hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity " much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material " more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 " this

is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum " although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand " the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience

although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not

have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements " hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity " much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions

are open to challenge. CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material " more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 " this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum " although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which

Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand – the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any

further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any

specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior

to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum – although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at

the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand – the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect

(the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set.

CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any

higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the

innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no

separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum “ although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand “ the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability “ the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included). CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing “ the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa “ unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and

abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or

infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers – would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of

funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge. CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead

only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand although the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability although the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets

underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of

such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers – would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not

require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test.

CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed,

prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum " although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand " the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability " the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other

areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base

city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers – would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample

size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test.

CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations – for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of

the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum " although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand " the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability

Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why.

Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test.

CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs.

CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements " hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity " much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material " more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable

statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 “ this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth. CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum “ although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook. CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand “ the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be

wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly

similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set.

CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total.

CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements " hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current

approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum – although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of

ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand – the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability – the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing – the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa – unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be

surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty

inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

RESPONSE TO WBC PREFERRED DEVELOPMENT OPTION Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years? The inadequate level of responses (78) to earlier consultations with those received being biased towards developers " would suggest poor process and communications on the part of WBC rather than a lack of public concern. Whatever, the response is unlikely to be representative of public opinion, given small sample size and population bias, and should have led to a fundamental change of approach for subsequent consultations. Unsurprisingly Green Belt development opportunities represent 'clean sheets of paper' with lower costs and greater sales prices and so margins for developers; consequently this will always represent their first choice. Hence starting with a call for sites will always generate an outcome biased towards what could be built on (and easily) as opposed to what should be. A call for sites based on brownfield regeneration alone ought to force innovative thinking and efficiency. In addition, an unconstrained call for sites will not require developers to consider the creation, or contribution to creation, of the necessary infrastructure to make a development viable, including any environmental considerations. Even allowing for the unconstrained approach to the consultation, there has been no consideration of deliverability. The limited financial models included in the Supporting Documents are based on unrealistic and non-market rates of interest for borrowing and deposits yet still show anticipated internal rates of return that are wholly inadequate for any developer prepared to risk their own capital and would not get approval from any bank credit committee (even if banks were lending developing finance). Hence it is not clear that there is a verifiable business case or source of funds for the levels of proposed development without recourse to the Council's own balance sheet, either directly or through its investment in Redwood Bank. If development is only achievable through subsidy, then the Council should fully disclose its lack of independence, the nature and extent of its relationships with developers and the governance and transparency processes it will undertake to ensure that all transactions and approvals would satisfy an independent arm's length commercial terms test. CHALLENGE 1: The consultation process has been not only inadequate, but driven by an unjustifiable end point. WBC should have learned from earlier consultation stages and evolved a constrained development option driven solely by the innovative regeneration of brownfield sites to meet anticipated demographically required housing needs. CHALLENGE 2: There is no evidence beyond an incorrect and inadequate financial model to support deliverability of even just the demographically required housing needs. Moreover, a higher standard of disclosure and transparency is necessary to regain the support of the electorate. The PDO document is very technical and references certain key numbers as given fact without direct links to the source material or alternative calculations " for example the Objectively Assessed Needs is cited as 839 new homes per annum. Although the executive and officers were in possession of an updated May 2017 addendum to the SHMA prior to publication of the PDO in July 2017 which derives a comparable figure of just 738 pa (but that the number could be as low as 679 homes pa), this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the Economic Development Needs Assessment, then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa within the ONS live tables used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. It appears the planning office has ignored any scenarios or independent reports/models, however robust, that lead to

lower housing need due to net migration and unattributable population change, and have further discounted any trend rate of change in later years that requires additional reductions in the projected housing stock, even allowing for additional economic led requirements. Could it be that these quite verifiable, but wholly uncomfortable, truths also undermine the evidence for higher local economic growth and so yet even higher housing levels? Indeed, many of the numbers used appear to include explicit and material margins but these are all premised on underestimating future requirements – hence combined the total will be excessive compared with an evidence based bottom up calculation. Whilst prudence is generally welcome, the current approach masks clarity – much better to say that the best estimate is, say, 17,000 with a possible variation of 5,000 -7,000 either way. Unless there is clear consensus on the base data, then all subsequent conclusions are open to challenge.

CHALLENGE 3: The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum (or at very least noted at outset that it was based on historic estimates that had subsequently been shown to be material – more than 10% - overstatements). There is no recognition of the inevitable statistical variation within a multi-factor model or alternative assumptions and so the broad range of potential outcomes, particularly those with much lower housing requirements. The PDO is stated to be Option 2 – this is based on the aspiration of the Council executive to create a 'new city', it is not the independent, objective and expertly assessed need of the town. There is now no accepted definition of a city, although the Cheshire and Warrington devolution plan references the international reputation and airport connections of Liverpool and Manchester that Warrington does not have in its own right. Under the Gold Standard of Housing Area definition, Warrington is actually split on the boundary of Liverpool and Manchester with the eastern parts of the district recognised as having more in common demographically and socio-economically with the affluent parts of south west Greater Manchester. This is also supported by South Warrington being recognised as a politically marginal seat. Development at the levels proposed will fundamentally and detrimentally change both the geography and the population of the area with no obvious compensation for the wider borough. There is no evidence to support a contention that the residents want to be part of a city and there are no immediate direct financial or economic benefits to Warrington from being awarded city status. Indeed, prospective residents not currently within the housing area don't want Warrington to be a city either - the SMHA of January 2016 cites the major justification for movers into Warrington was to escape the city! The legal challenge to the previously adopted Local Development Plan was premised on the plan not properly reflecting the Objectively Assessed Need. Hence as a minimum, this process must be based on the deliverability of a Plan based solely on a robustly assessed OAN. Any higher levels of development should be clearly and separately identified as excess to needs and so subject to a much higher standard of justification and challenge. The current PDO blurs the reasoning between OAN and aspiration when it should focus instead only on delivering the equivalent of Option 1 in the first instance. Although the Council may wish for greater development, this has no justification in Government statute and the officers of the Council should not misrepresent this, as they regularly do. Higher levels of housing creation should and can be only as a consequence of excess, sustainable and independently verifiable economic growth, not based on a dream of 'if we build it, I hope they will come'. Option 2 seems a perfect example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Indeed there appears to be a flawed premise in an EDNA model justification for higher housing since economic growth will be also needed simply to sustain the expected demographic population increase and no separate evidence has been provided for this. Hence all the initiatives cited in the devolution and Northern Powerhouse plans (assuming they ever come to fruition) are actually required for this purpose in the first instance, not excess growth.

CHALLENGE 4: The Local Development Plan should focus on delivery of the Objectively Assessed Needs alone and no other aspiration. The Plan needs to produce robust evidence of employment and economic viability for the OAN rather than double count it into a higher EDNA target. The projections are based on data periods prior to the Brexit referendum – although the Leave outcome has led to many claims for downward revisions in national expectations of immigration and economic growth levels, at the very least there will be considerable geopolitical uncertainty over the next five years, not helped by the recent election of a minority government. Just the uncertainty itself will lead to delays or cancellations in proposed investment, so reducing economic growth and employment prospects. Hence the source data which generally references periods prior to 2015 will not reflect the current economic outlook.

CHALLENGE 5: The LDP should be based on an updated SHMA that takes account of latest economic, demographic and migratory expectations. The PDO was published ahead of the Government setting out details of a standardised, and

nationally and regionally consistent, approach to assessing housing need based on Office of National Statistics projections. This has now been issued for consultation with the expectation of adoption from Spring 2018. As any new Local Development Plan is very unlikely to be submitted for expert inspection before this date, it is reasonable to expect the inspector to reference the new basis in reviewing WBC's assessment of needs and more. This means having regard to both the methodology and the latest 'live' data tables. Although the consultation on the methodology does not close until November, given the previous White Paper it is not unreasonable that any challenge is more likely to focus on the Affordability Adjustment rather than the use of ONS post Referendum projections for the base. The latest live ONS projection equates to an increase of 716 homes per annum until 2039. This is largely driven by simple increase in the UK population to which Warrington has demonstrated historically an over 90% correlation, rather than immigration or other factors. WBC often reference the development of Omega as cause for abnormal higher employment and housing demand "the evidence would suggest it has no specific differentiating impact and the Officers should be wary of extrapolating relatively short periods of supportive data to create an apparent long-term trend expectation. These latest numbers apparently make some adjustment for post-Referendum experience although actual demographics may prove somewhat different, especially as there appears to be evidence of a slowdown in 'natural change' i.e. life expectancy improvements (and older generations are suggested to be forming a greater proportion of the Warrington population). There is a proposed adjustment factor reflecting affordability (or lack of) local housing. Warrington property values are allegedly six times local average earnings which translates into a 12.5% uplift giving a housing requirement of just 790 pa. The Affordability Adjustment may be well intentioned, but by simply increasing the supply of properties most in the most expensive areas as opposed to where people want to live or are needed suffers from flawed logic. It also ignores other factors that contribute to real affordability "the existence of mortgage finance, ability to meet deposit requirements, desire to buy rather than rent as a lifestyle choice, and the ability of the private rented sector to meet demand (which appears to be ignored from planning policy). Moreover, blind application of an overall total to Warrington's base level OAN ignores the huge price premium noted between Lymm and other areas. The Government also proposes a cap on higher density development where an authority has an existing plan adopted within the last five years. Although parts were subject to legal challenge (largely on the definition of OAN), WBC's plan only dates back to 2014/2015. This plan had a projected housing requirement of 607 pa suggesting that a cap would bite at 850 pa, irrespective of any additional demographic need or council aspiration. This would equate to a twenty year requirement of just 17,000 homes that could all be built on brownfield sites (and easily so once the potential Fiddlers Ferry landbank is included).

CHALLENGE 6: The LDP should be based on a determination of OAN that is consistent with the methodology and data sets underpinning the Government's latest proposals. There is also a need to define the right type of housing "the 2011 census highlights that Warrington has more 3 and 4 bedroom homes than the national average. It also highlights that nearly 80% (again more than the national average) of these are under occupied i.e. have more bedrooms than the household needs. ONS data cited in the January 2016 SHMA suggest an average population increase of around 1000 pa since 2001 (including claimed high economic growth such as the Omega development phase) with very wide variation, even falling occasionally on a year on year basis. The SNPP projection to 2037 suggests a continuation of 1000 pa "unless Warrington has a very peculiar (and abnormally low) normal occupancy rate, then translating this number into housing requirements would seem to suggest something more like 500-700 one to three bedroom properties each year would be more than adequate. Even if Warrington did only have persistent dwelling occupancy rates close to one, this would seem to require micro-home style apartment blocks clustered in the town centre to meet lifestyle needs, not a concreting on the Green Belt. Similarly there appears to be uncertainty surrounding the translation of employment into population and so housing needs. Comparison of the various reports seem to imply near 1:1:1 correlation between employment, people and homes which anecdotally and intuitively seems incorrect (the ONS projections suggest a falling average household size for Warrington of 2.3 to 2.1 people per dwelling). Although the data is confused by commuting and multiple job holders (and this is recognised in the SHMA), the illogical conclusion of a 1:1:1 ratio would be that there would be no need for schools or other family facilities, since the only new members of the increased local population would be adult employees not forming multi-person households.

CHALLENGE 7: The data used by the officers to derive the housing need is highly sensitive to the interrelationship between employment, population demographics and dwelling occupancy. The

assumptions used appear to have been selected to justify a higher housing requirement significantly above OAN and do not appear logical or robust, even in the face of a common sense challenge. The PDO claims that a higher housing requirement can be justified by reference to the economic baseline case and affordability. These should be largely nullified by the use of ONS projections which will reflect the overall impact of future national economic prosperity and the need to be internally consistent i.e. by definition not all areas can experience above average economic growth concurrently over the long term, and if everywhere is subject to an upwards adjustment based on market signals and affordability, then the total housing stock would be surplus to national needs. This is why the Government requires WBC to develop formal statements of collaboration with neighbouring authorities before proceeding with large scale speculative development. Any further housing requirement is not needs based but instead a consequence (but not a cause) of excess economic growth. Again, this needs to be internally consistent regionally and nationally and not double counting factors within the economic baseline adjustment. The ONS demographic projections suggest broadly similar growth for Warrington to Liverpool and Manchester and all are lagging significantly London and the southern counties. This would suggest that the various factors used to justify relative excess growth will not have the desired effect or come to fruition. Specifically, the forecasts produced by Oxford Economics are based on pre-Referendum data, secondly the projection of previous employment trends are based on a relatively short and unrepresentative period for Warrington (IKEA may have opened their first UK store here but wouldn't contemplate building a second in Appleton) and, thirdly, there is no evidence or justification within the Supporting Documents as to which new major employers would relocate to Warrington and why. Given the Golden Square exit of Marks & Spencer, historically the preeminent retail anchor and bellwether, and apparently service companies like Talk Talk too, the Council needs to first demonstrate it can at least protect the status quo before indulging in heroic growth economics. Indeed, there appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact working (domestic and leisure too) practices in all sectors in both nature and number, an issue not unique to Warrington. For example, the Finance sector is proposed to be one of the biggest future employers based on ongoing relocation of middle and back offices from higher cost base city centres or in-shoring of overseas operations. This might be justified if the trends of recent years were to continue. However, there is a finite number of entities with scale operations that can be relocated but more significantly developments in electronic ledger and straight through processing are decimating overall headcount requirements. Indeed, anyone currently employed in the wider Services sector will be familiar with the trends towards hot desking, home working and digital connectivity/virtual workspaces i.e. you don't need the same floor space footprint as ten years ago. Likewise, the ongoing evolution of online retailing may seemingly have benefits in demand for distribution facilities but ignores the likely progress in automation of such facilities (and most probably transportation too where automation is currently excluded from the planning office model) i.e. in the Amazon Prime future you need bricks OR clicks, you can't justify retail AND distribution. To ignore such transformational impactors in determining the number and form of housing required over a twenty-year term seems naïve at best. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employment land is required let alone where it should be. Higher economic growth is also allegedly justified as a consequence of the Devolution bid and Northern Powerhouse initiative, neither of which appear an immediate priority, legislative, financial or infrastructure creating, for the current Government. For example, there is no evidence that Warrington will be the intersection of HS2 and HS3 – indeed the routing of HS2 to Airport City, with its even better interconnectivity, instead creates an obvious economic growth cannibal to the town. The January 2016 SHMA uses the alternative Cambridge Econometrics model which suggests a lower economic growth outlook than the ONS data set. CHALLENGE 8: Option 2 is based on an excess employment and economic growth outlook that is based on very high level aspirational assumptions and considerations completely outside the control or influence of WBC and ignore the competing aspirations of adjacent and further afield housing areas. Any higher housing target should be a consequence, not a cause, of economic and demographic experience and requires detailed ex-ante evidence if it is to be factored into any LDP. With all the geopolitical, demographic, economic and technological uncertainty, perhaps the biggest issue with the PDO methodology is the term. There is no statutory requirement to produce a twenty-year plan even if ONS statistics exist for such a long term. Plans are generally produced on a 10-15 year outlook presuming it will take several years to achieve adoption. Consequently, it would be more prudent to produce a, say ten year, plan until the end of the

currently approved plan by which point it would be much clearer of the economic and migratory impacts of Brexit, the impetus or not from any completed national infrastructure initiatives and what the consequences of technological change have been on work and home life (and balance). In this period, it is likely also that a significant brownfield site (Fiddlers Ferry) will become available for regeneration, diminishing the need to safeguard or develop greenfield sites. WBC should also be clear on the level of approved but unbuilt developments and the number of unoccupied homes as these should be deducted from any future total. CHALLENGE 9: WBC should only produce a ten year development plan given the significant uncertainty inherent in any forecasts longer than that date, the prevailing geopolitical situation and the absence of any specific evidence that would support unique circumstances applying to Warrington to justify a longer term plan that is robust and sustainable.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A major development of this nature on the green belt will change the area beyond recognition. Burtonwood can be considered a rural village albeit in close proximity to Warrington. There is no infrastructure to sustain so many homes and access to the area will be severely affected. Lumber Lane is already a busy traffic route despite efforts to keep HGVs out of the area and I would argue that the council has done nothing to prevent this. The view from mine and others' homes will be spoiled and will also affect the value of properties. Areas of this nature are few and far between and should be protected. There are areas of local interest nearby such as Sankey Valley Canal (popular with walkers), Wheatacre woodland and Colliers Moss Common that are widely used by the local community and this will cease to be the case if Burtonwood is turned into a major town. The people who like quiet parkland ie. the people who chose to live here because of the nature of the area, would no longer use it as it could become a haven for youngsters and yobs. I categorically oppose this development.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe it is a ridiculous amount of properties and the area could eventually resemble London as the built environment would be compressed. As development pushes into the green belt the need to build higher in the towns will increase

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You should not be using green belt land to develop. The whole point of green belt is just that and it should be protected.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has been so much housing development in the Warrington area over the last 20 that we will soon reach saturation point and I disagree with your assessment that Warrington needs a further 18,500 homes

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not know how the council has made such an assessment or why it dresses the phrase up in spin. Who are you trying to kid?

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is obvious that the assessment has been made by people who are not from the area as it will have no affect on them. This is my home; would you like it on your door step?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No !!

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I wasn't aware that Warrington was a city? Or will it be after you have imposed your grand plan?

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous response

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Previous response

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You won't know where Warrington ends and the next town begins

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous response

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No!! Why do we need more distribution centres? We need real jobs not many more lorries

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not want more gypsy sites

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not know sufficient about waste management to provide a response

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A sense of compassion for the local community. Warrington is already well developed and has progressively spread out. There should be no more development

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Lack of infrastructureImpact on Stockton heath not consideredLoss of integrity to local villagesNO high level traffic surveyNO environmental / air pollution surveyNO increase to hospital capacitySignificant loss of green belt

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Destroying the green belt is an absolute travesty and is not justified as warrington is a town and not a city.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The calculation appears to be what land do we need less what non-green belt do we have = green belt we need to release rather than considering what green belt it would be preferable to maintain.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am not convinced of the need to aspire to City status, although continued economic prosperity, of course, is desirable.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Infrastructure is everything, and specifically the road network. The entire area is straining under current circumstances; it is unacceptable that some areas of development (garden city suburb) have been proposed without even the most high level review of the infrastructure that will be needed - simply a promise that it is to be looked at further.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan is premised on the need for further work on developing appropriate infrastructure. Road infrastructure, and the ability to design, plan and accommodate road networks that will not add to the already congested area, really ought to have been considered in more detail at this stage. The A49 / M56 junction is already congested at peak times and gridlocked whenever there is a problem on the M6 (not to mention the likely impact of the toll bridge at Runcorn opening). This and the amount of Green Belt that is proposed to be taken for development are my two most significant concerns for this particular development.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Figures and assumptions are stated to be based upon the SEP for Cheshire and Warrington. This was produced in 2014 prior to the UK decision to exit the European Union and this document is due to be refreshed and updated in response to new challenges and priorities. The government methodology has also been revised since the figures proposed in the plan were produced and I am unsure of the impact of this has. Furthermore there is a significant leap from the original plan proposing 500 homes per year to the now proposed figures. It is unclear what the proposals are for the employment space and what type of premises. Given current investment and scope within in Enterprise Zones, the Science corridor and sites such as Daresbury sci-tech the additional requirements on the scale proposed are unclear.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plans appear unsympathetic to the areas around Warrington particularly where there is greenspace. The Government whitepaper emphasises that greenbelt should be protected and brownfield prioritised. It is unclear the extent to which brownfield has been considered and is in/out of scope for development. Also whether brownfield is not considered on a cost basis with greenbelt/green spaces being a more attractive development option avoiding land remediation costs. The numbers proposed would completely change the character of surrounding villages with boundaries becoming blurred. The physical geography of Warrington with the Ship Canal and the Mersey make it a potentially cost ineffective proposal to support the number of homes proposed with the level of infrastructure required. The Government white paper states that councils should work with neighbouring councils to consider housing needs being better met before looking to use greenbelt.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously stated this is unsympathetic to the character of the surrounding villages and a strain upon infrastructure. A potential new high level crossing identified in the plan over the ship canal where the current old railway bridge stands would transport significantly more volumes of traffic into an already problematic area. The Western link is proposed to deal with existing problems therefore it is difficult to see how a new road carrying additional traffic from the proposed homes and employment sites would be beneficial. It is stated that the infrastructure is needed to release the Greenbelt however the location for homes would present a couple of scenarios. Either that the residents of these homes would locate their for the motorway connections to Manchester and Liverpool in which case the additional road infrastructure into Warrington would not be needed or if these residents were to travel by road it will be into a congested area and the infrastructure it joins up with inadequate. It is difficult to assess what would be the beneficial impact upon Warrington and existing Warrington residents compared to the loss of green belt and other green spaces.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand the need to respond to the Government policy to build more homes however not on the scale proposed and am not supportive of City Status when this brings no tangible benefits to the residents of Warrington. Existing regeneration and investment in Warrington Town Centre is welcomed but this needs to be completed and in place to ensure Warrington can attract people and businesses and to be a desirable place to live and work. The scale of building proposed for the Garden City Suburb is unacceptable with the high level strategic road potential contradicting a desire to improve air quality by increasing pollution and commitment to health of warrington residents by destroying a very popular and well used trail along a significant stretch of the transpennine trail which provides a safe off road walking and cycling route and being part of a 200 mile stretch coast to coast trail. The homes this could potentially effect will force families out and even based on current values in Grappenhall will not buy an equivalent home elsewhere in Grappenhall. This forces people to move further out of the area impacting upon work commutes and proximity to schools attended by our children. The plan does not seem to be forward looking or innovative and should seek to exploit opportunities to encourage alternatives to car journeys into warrington and low carbon alternatives such as cycleways and tramways. The proposed scale for Garden City Suburb is completely disproportionate to the number of homes already in the area which would have substantial environmental impacts through destruction of countryside, habitat and recreational space. A country park centrally located is a poor substitute for the current widespread and diverse network of woodland, pathways and fields.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

To reiterate previous comments the proposals for South Warrington are completely unsympathetic to the area and the human factor and wellbeing of existing residents does not appear to factor. In particular if the proposed high level crossing were to go ahead there are potentially hundreds of existing homes would need to be demolished and there are many homes that will be in close proximity of a busy road causing noise and air pollution putting families health at risk. Families will be either trapped in the area or forced to move further afield to cheaper areas or take on greater financial commitments and strain in order to stay in the area but away from the negative impacts of the proposed development.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The underlying assumptions need to be revisited in line with new methodologies, potential impacts from brexit and a refreshed SEP. More innovative and low carbon and active transport solutions also need to be considered rather than a focus upon road and bus transport network in order to ease congestion into Warrington and provide better links from the proposed suburb areas to central rail infrastructure. There seems to be a missed opportunity to consider a Whole Place low carbon solution that can deliver real benefits for existing residents of Warrington.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

To reiterate previous comments the proposed scale is disproportionate to the existing make up of homes in the area. It is also unclear what type of housing is proposed and how this has been considered and how land and homes in the area which can command a premium can meet affordable homes criteria. There are many in Grappenhall as an example that cannot afford to move on to bigger homes within the area. The proposed transport and bus routes would require a significant amount of restructuring to overcome access issues particular for buses to regularly use some of the routes identified. There is an unacceptable loss of greenspace and greenbelt and recreation areas particularly if there is to be any repurposing of the transpennine trail and railway bridge. There is a significant number of homes in my area of Grappenhall that would be impacted significantly by any repurposing of the transpennine trail and many families have recently moved in to the area investing in their homes and the benefits of this will be lost in loss of value to homes and unable to move to an equivalent home elsewhere in the immediate area. There are potential huge environmental impacts in relation to flooding where land that currently drains away water is built upon, waste disposal, pollution, loss of habitat and wildlife, loss of agricultural land provision.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The type of employment land and its strategic link to other initiatives and business/science parks is not clear. Also if future more automated warehousing space is to be accommodated this will not address and grow employment.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The proposed scale of development will have a huge impact upon levels of waste.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

More innovative transport options that don't centre around road usage by cars and buses. A more sympathetic assessment of the character of the areas where development is proposed and the impact of in some areas doubling the number of homes - a more proportionate approach should be considered. Consideration of the type of houses that are needed - provision for an older population, affordable homes for those looking for the next move and bigger family homes, affordable starter homes (if people could afford to move into a bigger family home they would be vacating affordable first time homes). Also consideration for innovative low carbon homes and waste disposal solutions. Move away from city status aspirations and the required development to support this and a focus on the development that can meet growth aspirations while delivering real benefits to existing residents and their wellbeing rather than negative impacts and displacement of homes. Greater exploitation of brownfield sites and unoccupied homes and unused/underused sites. More sympathetic consideration of environmental impacts, preservation of habitats, wildlife and agriculture.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Seems to be an excessive number required. Do not want to be a New City.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I disagree with utilising green belt and feel it will have a significant impact on Warrington, reducing the appeal of living here.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not want Warrington to be a city. I do not want to lose the green belt.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is too much. The infrastructure needs much more consideration. Traffic congestion is already horrific throughout Warrington, adding all these extra vehicles would have a significant impact and there seems very little different to the infrastructure. If you lose the volume of green belt, it will be a much less desirable place to live and work, people will move to other areas.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see previous comments, a development of this scale is not wanted and will not work in the area.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Information on who benefits from this plans and the links to those involved e.g. developers and their links to Councillors / decisionmakers.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I recognise the need for the Town to provide homes and employment but feel that changing the entire feel of the Town in the process is not the way to go about it and that the proposed plans will change the area completely and bring additional problem such as traffic and congestions and pressure on the towns infrastructure.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes, I recognise some need for additional housing however development on this scale will have a too costly impact on the area.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington does not have a great deal of green spaces and those that it does have are well used, as well as this, the green spaces and green belt make are part of its appeal, taking this away would be a terrible shame and stop the area being the desirable area that it currently is. Plans to make Warrington into a city are not supported by the town's residents.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not on the large scale proposed

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough information to answer this question

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Each option has the potential to have a massive negative and unwanted impact on the area.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not on the late scale

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a Town and not a City, most residents would prefer it to stay as a Town and have the current facilities to be improved rather than the development of new ones.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The is will change the feel of the area completely, generate even more traffic in the area and is a change for the area on a massive scale, which will take away the charm and desirability of the area, as well as green belt land and other country side in the area.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too large scale for the area

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See attachment. Considering it is a call for sites why do some sites have such detailed development proposals?
The current infrastructure is inadequate for proposed developments in Lymm

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

My main comment is regarding the considerable extra traffic that the development will cause, particularly along the A49 and into Stockton Heath. I work in Northwich and use the A49 everyday, crossing the M56 at junction 10.1. The traffic lights at the Cat and Lion regularly cause long queues. From my daily observations by 7.45am every work day the queue stretches back to the small roundabout at the junction to Longwood Road and beyond. 2. At night coming in the opposite direction it can also be quite dangerous. The tail back caused by the Cat and Lion lights will often cause queues between 5 to 6 pm which stretch across the motorway and onto both the A49 and the A559. The 'chicane' on the A559 makes it worse. This can be quite a danger as there are then queues to get off the M56 on both slip roads. I am surprised that the police and the highways agency (and any other agency) have not reported this to the council already. In both cases more houses, especially of the type likely to be built, with considerably more cars than the average UK household will make this matter worse. As will the new tolls on the Runcorn bridges. I am sure that the council has taken note of the need for provision of doctors, school, shops etc, but the traffic is very important. The suggestion of an Eastern link may help, but simply leaving the road network may simply cause even more gridlock. 3. From my address you can see that I also live on the A49. The traffic has increased in quantity during the ■ years we have lived here. Several years ago I requested that the speed limit on our stretch of road be dropped from 40 mph to 30 mph. there are many examples in the rest of Warrington where this is the case for similar roads. This is also worth consideration.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

brown belt should be the first consideration

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

not with becoming a city. Not necessary. But we do need housing.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

not unless you sort out the traffic FIRST and not after the event

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

agree. it will be good to develop this

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

sort out/ prepare for the extra traffic that will come as a reesult of the Runcorn toll bridge situation.?

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Sensible traffic options. I shop in Northwich as it is too difficult and time consuming to get across the river into town. Until this improves then extra shops in town will be irrelevant to those of us who live south of the river.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

it is incorrect and based on old data from 2012, rather than the updated data from May 2017. Therefore I consider your predictions are not correct.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

mainly because you have not made it clear why you are using green belt and the report done is subjective. Also I cannot see any evidence that it meets the 'exceptional circumstances' legal framework for releasing green belt. you are also wanting to use greenbelt that has a high contribution. This is therefore a flawed proposal.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

please see my letter uploaded,.If your local objectives were more realistic, up to date, objective and included more options and had open consultation and involved the local people who can support the WBC then I might be able to support the objectives

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not understand why you have chosen in the PDO to consider more the value of south warrington to develop when this is the least urbanised. it needs further consultation

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see my letter

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am in support of developments for the city centre however I would like to see the full use of any current disused, empty or areas of industrial land in the centre, prior to using brownfield or greenfield for any development I would like to see the council consider more modern technologies for transport links to

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am in support of this

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

please see letter. I am strongly against this

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am strongly against this. see letter

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

see my letter

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

please see my letter and also response from [REDACTED]

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

a 10 year plan, rather than 20, creative response to transport, a full environment, ecological, transport and air pollution surveys.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The calculations seem excessive and over exaggerate the amount of homes needed. They appear to be in contradiction to Government guidelines. The type (and area) for building the majority of houses does not match the type of new employment opportunities suggested

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not clear that you have utilised all the brown field sites or proposed enough regeneration of already built up areas. Instead you have concentrated on a Garden city and using up a large portion of Green belt land to build houses unnecessarily.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are unused Brown Field sites, and the plan to destroy the green belt land in south Warrington is excessive.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no need, or any reason, for Warrington to become a city. How can an area, where the transport/ infrastructure does not support current size of the town, which does not have, and is not planning to have, a

theatre (or any other significant cultural investment) and has a town centre in need of renovation (recent household names are leaving (M & S) even be considering becoming a city.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Can only think the current areas have been considered as WBC believe they can make most money from selling off land in these areas. What in reality this will mean, is everyone who can afford to will move out of the area, and the overpopulation/building on the green belt, loss of space, nature etc will reduce the appeal of the area.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not believe it is realistic.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Is it necessary or appropriate - is it not in a flood plain?

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no need to develop a Garden City Suburb. To date there are no statistics which show the advantages of doing so. The number of houses actually required, rather than outlined in this Local Plan, means there is no need for it. In order to create it, you have to destroy large areas of natural habitats, green field, and green belt - to achieve what gain.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, the whole plan is ill thought out and does not mirror what the population of Warrington want.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

While new employment is always a positive thing, the right employment is most important. the area of housing being proposed in the south of warrington, if it follows the same guidelines of the proposed outline planning permission going through the WBC at the present time for grappenhall Heys and Appleton Cross and comprises houses in the same price bracket they are aimed at professional people earning over the national average salary, however the new employment in the area will be lower paid. the two do not marry up.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

get rid of the green belt, but leave the travellers sites

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Local Plan should be rewritten. The amount of people living in the WBC catchment area who are horrified at what is being proposed should indicate to WBC that this is not an appropriate plan for the area.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

i have concerns about the impact on the air quality of increased traffic in the area together and the degraded quality of life and associated health risks that it can bring to the area. The level of congestion in the area is already creating long delays and the increased number of vehicles will cause even gretaer issues. I do not think there has been sufficient evidence produced to allay these concerns and insufficient consulation to allow due consideration and validation of the issues. the documentation provided does not make a clear case as to why warrington should be seeking city status and does not take account of the detrimental impact on existing residents of aspiring to that aim.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I cannot see that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that air quality will not be detrimentaly impacted by the increased volume of vehicles that will be in the area to support the number of houses proposed. the congestion in the area is already a concern and will be worsened if the proposed building plan is approved. There has been little opportunity for local residents to interact with the consultation process for a plan that will have major impacts on the area and the quality of life currently enjoyed.I do not see real evidence to support why Warrington is aspiring to become a city or that benefits will accrue to the are a if this is acheived.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

it is not clear why the plan has determined that the housing should be developed in the areas identified which are on green belt and away form teh areas that are being commercially developed to providde employment - this can only increase the level of tyraffis from teh proposed residential area to areas where employment will be available

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

the local plan is not backed with evidence that provides confidence that there is a need for city status or the volume of proposed housing in the green belt areas identified

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

previous reviews have determined that the green belt areas should not be developed - why is the plan looking to develop housing in areas away from the commercial expansion in Warrington

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

large scale development of the area away from areas that are being developed to provide employment creates increased traffic resulting in poor air quality and congestion. development on such a large scale will prove disruptive and is unnecessary. proposals to build on over multiple dispersed areas should be included in the plan as a way forward to minimise disruption and issues from any one specific area

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

clear outcomes of analysis from an air pollution and ecological and transport assessments of the proposed developments

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe that the high housing numbers have been based on policy decision by WBC linked to a Devolution Bid - Devolution is not on the governments agenda so it should not be on Warrington's agenda. The number of houses proposed is too large. There is a mismatch between the number of houses required and the population projections - the number of houses proposed is too large. Aspirations for Warrington to become a city - this is not what we want as residents on the information we have at present. WBC should present a case for becoming a city with clear benefits and downfalls and as a town we can assess this and either vote in the next local elections on this very question or hold a referendum prior to this. At present though WBC Councillors do not have a mandate to take Warrington down the route of becoming a city - therefore the projection of the number of houses required has been based on aspiration rather than true understanding of need and is therefore too high. The projected number of houses does not take into account the implications of Brexit and should be looked at again when the position is clearer even if this means waiting a year or so to put a final development plan into place. The Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) is cited on p.5 of the PDO as 839 new homes per annum - but this was based on 2012 surveys. Before publishing the PDO, WBC were in possession of an updated May 2017 report based on 2014 data which shows a comparable figure of just 738 homes per year (but could be as low as 679 homes pa), but this number has been ignored. As the 839 is taken as the base for the higher Economic Development Needs Assessment (EDNA), then if the 839 is a significant overstatement, so must be the EDNA. The lower number is more consistent with the 716 homes pa average until 2039 within the latest ONS live tables which could be used to underpin the Government's proposed formula for calculating OAN published in September 2017. The PDO should have been prepared on the basis of the May 2017 addendum. Adopting a lower assumption of new homes per annum could significantly reduce the amount of Green Belt Land which would be needed for housing. There is no requirement on the Council to produce a 20 year plan - life is too fast moving at present for us to predict that far in advance - My [REDACTED] daughter will be in her early 30s for goodness sake we, me and the Councillors and officers of the Councils will be at best retired and at worst dead when this really takes shape - look back on the classic predictions and we would all be flying to work by now if historic predictions were to be believed. Concentrate on a shorter timeframe that is manageable, understandable and conceivable - 10 years ahead is enough for anyone.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough emphasis has been placed on affordable homes. Affordable homes take up less space and therefore overall less greenbelt would need to be used to accommodate the new housing levels. Likewise if the emphasis is put where it should be on affordable homes for our children rather than executive homes for the more affluent or those later on in their careers or their lives (which would I know make the developers more

money Who wants to be in Lymm in their 20s its neither Warrington or Manchester its just not happening!!!There is no detail around what type and level of employment is envisaged. There appears no specific consideration of how technology will impact lifestyles and working practices. Unless and until there is a proper understanding of future employment nature and density, it is almost impossible to define what employmentland is required, let alone where it should be. This is another nail in the coffin of the 20 year plan - in reality even the very best of us/you do not know what is likely to happen to working practises and employment mobility. Stick to a shorter plan which will offer stability in the short to medium term but flexibility in the longer term to truly match need and demand to supply of housing. Not enough joined up thinking has taken place around brownfield site both available now and potentially in the future. What about the decommissioning of Fiddlers Ferry and so the availability of an enormous brownfield site requiring regeneration?

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

NO NO NO NO NO Brownfield sites have not been investigate to their full extent. The Green belt land should be protected as much as possible. What is to be safeguarded - it feels like nothing is safe!!!! Moore Nature Reserve - Reserved means reserved - hands off please you have no right to impinge on this wildlife habitat. The quality of the Green Belt in the South is of so much higher value than the report that has been commissioned states. Sense of space, Sense of wellbeing, cleaner air, openness, ability to view wildlife in proximity, the ability to exercise in the outdoors instead of pay for the privilege in a gym. Green space is priceless - be it a farmers field, a cycle path or a piece of disused turfed area - every square inch of greenery left in our world should be cherished for what it gives us and not looked at for a potential concrete pavement. I have looked out of my window for the last 4 years and seen corn growing through the seasons - my mental health has improved unbelievably due to the fact that I can see beyond bricks and watch our world change as it was made to do. Do we or do we not have a mental health issue in Warrington - concrete = increase mental health issues = fact. Childhood obesity is such a growing problem and in this plan we look at devastating huge areas where children play and exercise - the Transpennine Trail through Grappenhall in favour of a high level road - REALLY - get real this is one of the most used areas of greenbelt for miles around. LEAVE IT ALONE!!!!!! Don't get me wrong its not about not in my back yard. If I had been a little older and wiser when Warrington New Town was developed or the Chapleford Estate et al I would have been protesting just as hard but perhaps years give me a better understanding. Haven't you learnt anything? The Model has moved on. Having said that my children [REDACTED] have been bought up in a household that respects nature and enjoys the open air - they are devastated at the prospect of their local field being made into housing estates and have made their own submissions as a the end of the day it is their lives you are proposing to ruin not mine or yours.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

20 years is too long - you are not visionaries. Make it more reasonable, understandable and conceivable - 10 year plans at maximum. Strategic objective is stated as wishing to retain the character of settlements - if that is really the case then you are going about it in totally the wrong way. We will end up with urban sprawl not settlements or rather villages as they are known as at the moment. The proposals will kill off any sense of identity, any local feel and any individualism. The proposals will sap the soul out of characterful villages which will no longer offer attractive places to live - just estates. Sorry if you already live in an estate but it is not where I would like to live.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too technical - please explain further and I will respond fully

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes it is developer led - of course south warrington is perceived lucrative in terms of the housing that can sell if you build on this land. That does not mean it is right for the town. This is money driven and not need led - please contact me with a full explanation as to how it can be any different. Money does not fulfil need it just lines pockets. Warrington will be poorer after these developments. Developers will be richer. Eh that's not right, think again.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Excessive projections in terms of housing requirements. Unrealistic expectations about the amount of business/trade that will be taken place in Warrington - even if this comes to fruition many of those workers will not live in Warrington! You will end up with a situation where you have sacrificed green belt for commuter housing and will encourage business and trade that doesn't match the skills set - what will happen increased congestion, poorer working lives and more mental health issues

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Town centre really needs an overhaul and this is what is offered by the current development plan and in terms of council offices, cinema, market hall and amenities but also the proposed housing development is welcomed too to rejuvenate a tired facade

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Town centre really needs an overhaul and this is what is offered by the current development plan and in terms of council offices, cinema, market hall and amenities but also the proposed housing development is welcomed too to rejuvenate a tired facade

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

NO NO NO NOAs a town we have an area within our boundaries that currently provides some housing but lots of space. Space is good. Its not potential it is good in its own right. The proposal is to merge so many villages into one urban sprawl and lose all identity and historical value. People live here because its a village beacuse it is more isolated because it is more independent. An aspiration for a garden city is a bit like saying lets concrete over the barrier reef..... we could then build a load of hotels, apartments and a sea life centre so that residents can see what normally lives under the sea. We don't want a garden city with a park - we have a garden city already, beautiful, unshaped and unspoit - we have a town, Warrington - warts and all, we have our greenery, the greenbelt - LEAVE IT ALONE!!!!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why? Is it really going to ease congestion? I think not. Maybe think out of the box a little and consider a tramway that links Warrington with Liverpool and Manchester - that would really make something to put your name in the history books and your photo on the Town Hall Wall - more house - no but a tramway - yes I think that could be quite career projecting!

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Oh Yes. NOT IN MY BACK YARD - everyone is so afraid to say it but no way have you been to Lymm recently? Do you quite understand what your development would mean for the village - VILLAGE a few hundred or thousand dwellings - you are proposing a potential increase of 25% in the population of Lymm over the next 20 years - on that basis Lymm will be applying for city status!!!! WBC have such a wonderful combination of urban and rural under its jurisdiction but yet seems adamant on making it all a grey jungle. Play to your strengths, promote the villages, bring in the business, bring in the rates and taxes and your quids in. Create urban sprawl and create drudgery and the sink to Manchester/Liverpool pull. Please contact me and we can walk through the village for the day and actually see what you are proposing in reality - it looks a lot different to what you see on a map (even those very blurry ones prepared for the consultation). We would like to preserve the open spaces between Lymm and Thelwall and between Lymm and Oughtrington and between Lymm and Broome Edge.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes because I think new employment land should be provided. No because I think this has been done with a developer led approach which cannot be right for the borough as a whole - the Council is the lead - take a lead

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Fine - travellers need to be accommodated so I think this is fit for purpose

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too technical - please advise me further of your approach and I will respond fully

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

fiddler Ferry Site
If the hospital were to move then this site needs to be included into the plan
More information about the brownfield site in Warrington should be given before green belt land is released

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not think that the infrastructure for development has been considered fully and the traffic chaos calculated accurately if at all.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not think the infrastructure for the proposed development and loss of green belt land has been balanced with the traffic chaos which will occur.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The numbers quoted sound astronomical.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plan is not feasible without further due consideration of extensive infrastructure development.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The main thing that is not clear is how an increased number of new homes will be supported by appropriate and needed infrastructure in the area- school places, dentists, doctors etc

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Little outline of the infrastructure that will support the homes to be built.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Poorly presented, insufficient evidence for rationale, no provision for 'recession proofing' proposed development

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Same as previous answer: poorly presented, insufficient evidence for rationale, no provision for 'recession proofing' proposed development.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There seems to have been an utter disregard for the value of the green belt to residents' physical and mental health in what is an already very built up environment. I have not seen any provision for adequate wildlife corridors (flora and fauna) to replace the ecosystems contained within the current green belt. Warrington still contains undeveloped brown field sites. The Green Belt (in its current form) by its very definition should be 'safeguarded'.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The LPO will have a detrimental effect on quality of life, health index (physical and mental) of the residents of South Warrington. The scale of housing and industrial/employment areas (which will realistically be faceless warehouses providing minimum wage jobs), is disproportionate to the population density as it currently stands.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Firm evidence needs to be provided that all brownfield sites within the Warrington Borough have been utilised before targeting what is arguably one of the greenest and most ecologically diverse suburbs of the town.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington's future needs haven't been convincingly demonstrated - there is lack of evidence and there seems to be no consideration for the fact that, post Brexit, we may be teetering on the brink of a stagnant economy or further periods of recession/ depression.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This needs to be done in a democratic manner without undue and unfair influence by bullish private investors. The result must have proven benefits to both the local economy and to the region as a whole.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The scale of the city suburb is too large when compared with existing population density. The maps and graphics have been extremely poorly presented which has led to ambiguity. Proposed change of use of the trans pennine trail (TPT) from its current state as a traffic free green corridor for recreation and wildlife has caused a huge amount of distress to local residents and TPT users. Again, the poorly presented graphics have inflamed this situation. Green space provision in the PDO is wholly inadequate, especially given the proposed population density. Flood avoidance provision is notable by its absence. The handling of the PDO for Warrington Garden City Suburb has been highly unprofessional.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Multiple warehouse sites already exist/ are being built within the town. Clarification of what type of employment Warrington City is aiming to attract is required.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Better maps to avoid ambiguity. The lack of clarity has lead to an atmosphere of mistrust from the outset. Certain green corridors should be 'ring fenced/ protected' ie Trans Pennine Trail, Timberland Mersey Valley Trail and should be included within the Local Plan. Statements regarding how the PDO will benefit and optimise residents' (both existing and future) physical and mental health should also be included within the Local Plan.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Needless destruction of green belt, destruction of wildlife, pollution, cpo of houses, distress to the residents
.....

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous answer! !

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

WE ARE NOT A CITY!!!!!!!!!! NOR DO WE WANT TO BE A CITY!!!!!!!!!!

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Using the trans penine trail route should not be an option. The construction of a road along the old railway line will directly affect my own family and extended family's lives. I do not want to loose our family home or live next to/under a busy road. So much wildlife will be lost not to mention the pollution. Why would anyone want to bring their children up in such an environment? It is not fair!! We love where we live and the thought of what is being proposed actually happening is simply unbearable!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is becoming grid locked. Houses being built on any available land. There's not enough services to cover these extra peopl/ households. The hospital is just ridiculous, roads cannot carry all these extra cars . Build the extra homes in Omega and stop building huge businesses on there - no extra roads need to be built as the motorway is just next to OmegaStop destroying the few beautiful areas we have left in Warrington

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Safeguarding areas of land? Warrington needs all the green belt areas

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Need to re think where these homes are going to go

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Really do not agree with your preferred development option

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

City centre? We are a town with a really dire town centre . Work needs to be done on encouraging orooke to come into the town - park n ride or even trams would be better than ugly main roads that destroy communities and become complete eye sores

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington waterfront with restaurants shops and bars yes with parks and seating not a port?

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Think it's just ridiculous about being a city

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Feel there could be better options

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You really need to consider other areas of Warrington - improving existing business sites and industrial estates

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please leave our beautiful view we have had all these years .Burtonwood air base has loads an loads of land to build on please leave our little fields at the back of our houses.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think this needs to be looked at again it seems current forecasts are for fewer houses needed than your plans allow for. Brexit may well slow down growth and jobs and numbers in this country. Automation may also have a major impact in the next few years

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am pretty sure if better use could be made of all available brown field sites there would be less need to swallow our valuable greenbelt

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Greenbelt is so valuable for many reasons and it seems that you have taken one area in particular and will change this beyond belief from a quiet village in the greenbelt to a massive garden city. it is not what The local people want at all!!!

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

We do not want to be a city or a garden city. Stop this massive development it's not needed. I question also the council links with Peel holdings there appears to be many conflicts of interest here and the relationship is far too cosy!

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Does not appear to be many options other than a massive garden city in South Warrington which I don't agree with

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's outrageous and not what the local people want

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Stop this outrageous plan and listen to what people in the area want it is not a garden city!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why try and close up the gaps between the settlements there is meant to be space in between villages

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Greenbelt should not be used for employment land there are areas of brownfield that could be utilised

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not really as it seems that they can have heir sites wherever they choose despite all the planning rules! But I also see that it is the simplest option to formalise existing arrangements

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are already homes planned for the centre of Appleton Thorn village, why use the lovely green around us to stick more houses?

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why South warrington? Homes are going to be demonlidhed, people currently living in the area, their houses will devalue because of it and it's not fair!

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Everywhere is going to get congested. The impact on people's homes will be massive. It will devalue existing homes.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of houses proposed is horrifying. Currently there is plenty of greenery around but there won't be with the proposed.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The NPPF refers to the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt. There is land within Warrington that can meet the housing needs of the Borough without encroaching on Green Belt land.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

500 new homes in Lymm/Oughtrington is disproportionate to the size of the settlement in comparison with the proposed provision elsewhere within the Borough. Lymm does not have the infrastructure (eg. roads, schools, GP surgeries) to cope with proposed provision. The allocated land off Higher Lane and Oughtrington Lane is on Green Belt land and its allocation does not meet with the five purposes of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. It is not an infill site and will therefore result in unrestricted urban sprawl, detriment to the openness and landscape quality of the area.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Firstly, I understand that adopting a 15 year plan is more usual than a 20 year plan. The Council is proposing a housing target of 1,113 homes per annum over the 20 year Plan period. I challenge the assumption of 1,113 homes per annum. I note that Central Government has very recently issued, for consultation, guidelines for establishing housing need (see consultation on 'Planning For The Right Homes In The Right Places'. This indicates that a minimum of 955 houses per year would be required to be built in Warrington. Using Office of National Statistics, the forecast population growth for Warrington by 2037 is only 25,400. Assuming 2 people per household, this only equates to 12,700 houses. The housing assumption of 1,113 included in the PDO indicates that WBC believes that population growth is more likely to be around 55,000 people. I do not believe that the significant population increase used in the PDO is adequately explained or justified. If the population forecasts used in the PDO were reduced, it may not be necessary to build on any green belt land. I note that the urban capacity is 15,429 homes – this would appear to easily cover the number of homes required over the next 20 years.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The Council has confirmed a total urban capacity for 15,429 homes and 129 hectares of employment land. It's not clear in the PDO whether the housing density assumptions for the brownfield sites are higher or the same as the assumptions for green belt sites. My understanding is that WBC has used 30 dwellings per hectare throughout. If the densities are assumed to be the same then a recalculation involving higher density housing in the urban area (e.g. 40 dwellings per hectare) might eradicate the need to build any housing on green belt land or it could enable a different mix of housing to be built in other areas (such as retirement bungalows for elderly residents). Proposing a higher density in the town centre would also match the desire of many new potential home buyers for housing without gardens, close to the town centre for social life and close to transport hubs to avoid needing a car.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO includes the release of greenbelt land to support 9,000 new homes over the next 20 years. I am strongly opposed to any development on Green Belt land. Paragraph 83 of The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. There is no definition of 'exceptional circumstances'. WBC indicated on page 15 that they believe that these are exceptional circumstances, but their reasoning is unclear. This land is not 'spare' land, it is actively being used for agricultural purposes. In the current context of uncertainty following 'Brexit' and broader climate change, using no greenbelt land, or at least a smaller portion of it, should be considered. I strongly believe that Brownfield sites should be exhausted before any building is permitted on Green Belt Land.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't support objective W1 in its entirety. I don't support the idea of transitioning from a New Town to a New City. I don't support the figure of 1,113 houses as the development target per year. I do support the regeneration of Inner Warrington. With regard to W2, I do not believe that the PDO reflects a 'sensitive release' of Green Belt land. To me, it looks particularly insensitive to turn swathes of South Warrington into an urban sprawl. I do support objectives W3, W4, W5 and W6. With regard to W6, I think that a full environmental impact survey should be carried out in the Stockton Heath area. This area has particularly poor air quality due to the congestion on the A49.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

WBC have selected Option 2 - Majority of Green Belt release adjacent to main urban area with incremental growth in outlying settlements. I think that WBC need to revisit Option 1, alongside a revised (lower) housing development target. I think Option 1 seems to perform well alongside the objectives of the PDO and also would reduce or eliminate green belt release. I can understand that Option 2 might have been chosen because the building of a large number of housing in one area is likely to attract a greater level of investment in infrastructure such as schools, roads, healthcare. But I am very concerned that only the housing would be built and not the supporting infrastructure. If WBC does go ahead with Option 2, local residents will demand that the infrastructure is built BEFORE the housing.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It seems that the main development locations match up with the Call For Sites. Therefore I have to question if WBC has simply decided to allow the developers and land owners to lead them into selecting the main locations. I'm sure that developers only ever want to build in the areas most likely to generate high levels of income for them.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, I don't agree with the selection of Option 2. I would much prefer to see Option 5 selected. If Option 5 is not possible, then Option 4 is the least worst of the other options available.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think that the development of the Town Centre is quite rightly a priority.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can understand the logic of developing this area and seeking to capitalise on Port Warrington. My main concern is that the increase flow of ships along the Manchester Ship Canal will create further traffic chaos throughout Warrington. I really think that WBC need to further consider investment in additional high level bridges. The Warrington Waterfront development is also clearly dependent on the Western Link connection.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am opposed to the Warrington Garden City Suburb idea. I am opposed to building on the Green Belt if alternative Brownfield sites exist. The proposal of a Garden City Suburb in South Warrington has horrified me and many of the residents who currently live in this area. The smaller villages such as Appleton Thorn, Grappenhall and Stretton, which are currently separated from one another by fields, will be completely engulfed by the new residential developments. This will completely change the character of the area and destroy its history and heritage. The ability to access and enjoy green space is an amenity in itself and the loss of such a significant amount of green space will be detrimental to all residents, not just local ones. I moved to my home in South Warrington because the area offers the feel of the countryside combined with easy access to the town centre and to the national road and rail network. I grew up in the countryside and do not want to live in a major urban area. If the Garden City Suburb is approved, I shall leave Warrington. I didn't want to live in an urban area when I bought a house here and I certainly don't want to in the future. Even if the PDO does go ahead, I really struggle to see how WBC plans to address the road congestion in South Warrington. All of the roads linking the area to the motorway network are single file, country roads. You can't build 9,000 houses here without significant investment by the Highways Agency in the junctions. Local residents MUST have commitments that the infrastructure will be provided BEFORE housing is permitted.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am opposed to the South Western Urban Extension. I am opposed to building on the Green Belt if alternative Brownfield sites exist. The impact on Moore Nature Reserve will be catastrophic.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It makes sense to focus housing around the District Centres. I am opposed to development on Peel Hall. This is one of the last few remaining large green areas in North Warrington which has a rich abundance of wildlife.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can understand the reasoning for the new employment land. My concern is over the types of employment opportunities it would offer. For example, if the employment land in the Garden City Suburb is all warehousing and offers mainly low income employment, then I do not see the benefit of this when the surrounding houses are generally owned by higher income householders (assuming the future mix of housing is similar to the current mix).

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand the need for the provision of Gypsy and traveller sites but I note that the existing sites are used by travellers who are settled and are no longer transit sites.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand the need to safeguard sites where mineral deposits exist. I think that these sites should only be safeguarded if it is viable to extract the mineral deposits. And I think the aim of WBC to be self sufficient in managing waster is the right aim.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I expected the PDO to provide details on the proposed mix and supply of affordable housing and social housing. There is also no specific mention of provision of smaller family homes or provision of retirement properties for elderly residents (e.g. bungalows). I don't think it's clear how the building of a Garden City Suburb in South Warrington would support any such housing given that the current type of homes here tend to be of larger size, built at a lower density and therefore are more expensive. I expected it to be clearly stated

in the PDO that Green Belt land would not be built upon before all Brownfield sites were exhausted. I expected the PDO to include a more radical view of the infrastructure links between North and South Warrington. I envisaged that there would be additional high level bridges in addition to the planned Western Link. I expected the PDO to include a more radical overhaul of public transport. It would be good to see investment in other modes of transport such as local rail or tram services. This could help ease road congestion if carefully planned.

Traffic Issues and Geography - A high level traffic survey has not been included in the PDO. Warrington is uniquely positioned close to the M6, M56 and M62 motorways. The growth of Warrington has often been attributed to its proximity to the transport network. But Warrington is affected detrimentally whenever there are problems on the motorway network. Whilst we are supportive of investment in infrastructure should housing developments take place, the PDO includes a number of routes which cause serious concern. These routes will result in the deterioration of the quality of life for current residents who will be subjected to increased noise, air pollution and vibration from the increased traffic flow:

- o The 'Eastern Link Road' from M56 Junction 10 to the north of the Manchester Ship Canal would cut right through the proposed new residential areas. On the downside, this would provide a new HGV access road to the Barleycastle Trading Estate (which, at the moment, is only accessible from the M6 junction). It would also provide an alternative route for traffic caught up in problems on the M56 / M6 motorways.
- The PDO also suggest the use of an old railway embankment and bridge to the west of Latchford Locks as a new strategic transport route. Again, this route would be detrimental to the people currently living in this area.
- The 'Howshoots Link' from Grappenhall Heys to the M6 junction would effectively become an alternative HGV route for traffic coming to/from Warrington and Runcorn areas, leading to even more traffic flowing through the A49 and A56 in Stockton Heath.
- Warrington residents have to pay the tolls to cross the new Mersey bridge crossing. There is concern that the Link new roads through South Warrington will attract traffic that would otherwise have used the Mersey crossings if there was no toll to pay.

In the 2011 Census, 81% of Warrington households had access to at least one car / van with 39% having access to two or more cars / vans. Nationally, just over a quarter (26%) of households had no access to a car / van which was considerably higher than in Warrington (19%) indicating higher levels of car ownership in Warrington. If a further 24,000 households are created in Warrington without substantial investment in sustainable transport options, the traffic situation will deteriorate further.

Environment - A high level environmental impact survey has not been included in the PDO. A wide variety of animals and birds live in the greenbelt areas including badgers, water voles, great crested newts and bats. In May 2016, the World Health Organisation reported that Warrington is the second worst town / city in the North West for breaching safe levels of air pollution (second behind Salford). According to the WHO, ambient air pollution is the greatest environmental risk to health and causes more than 3 million premature deaths worldwide each year. Although Warrington Borough Council claims to take air pollution seriously, recent council decisions suggest this is not the case (e.g. the new multi-storey car park in the town centre and the increasing bus fares / reduced bus services). Unless the Warrington transport infrastructure can be improved significantly through appropriate investment in sustainable transport, the level of air pollution will increase – this will affect all Warrington residents, not just those living closest to the new housing developments.

Healthcare - Warrington and Halton hospitals are already operating at or near to capacity. Almost all of the GP / medical centre in Warrington are operating at or near to capacity. Whilst the PDO makes mention of providing new health facilities in the Garden City Suburb and the South West Extension, there is notably no mention of increasing capacity at Warrington Hospital. The residents occupying the additional 24,000 dwellings will also need access to healthcare facilities.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The ratio for houses to be built in south warrington significantly out weighs other areas in the Borough, significantly removing large areas of green space

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of green space surrounding Appleton Thorn is significantly reduced surrounding the village with urban sprawl which destroys the character of the village

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Thee local services / amenities are at capacity as well as road structures cannot deal with additional traffic despite the suggested new road routes.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It will destroy the character of south warrington. Destroying open green space, wildlife and creating urban sprawl throughout south warrington

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

much higher than required incorrect figures

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

figures too big

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

definitely no need to use green belt

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

too many houses

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

these have not been addressed

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

too many houses on green belt

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

plan is unsustainable

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

car park too big too high historic buildings should be renovated

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

all bridges need painting

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

too many houses on green belt

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

green areas need to be kept

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

villages need to be kept small green areas unspoilt

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

traffic problems

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

too much money spent on this when the town itself is full of empty buildings

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Given the current economic uncertainty due to Brexit, house prices outstripping most wages.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Should be concentrating on building more affordable smaller houses / apartments on existing brownfield sites and promoting better living experiences in town. Better facilities , parks, investment in public transport

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Brownfield sites must be used before greenbelt. You aren't 'safeguarding' it now and you haven't defined what you mean by this or what exceptional circumstances are that can mean that the 'safeguard' can be overruled

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Seems to be based on the ambitions of WBC for city status rather than looking after local residents

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Based on 'incremental growth in the outlying settlements could contribute to longer term sustainability of local services and local business' COULD CONTRIBUTE ? Significant investment in supporting infrastructure would need to be made before hand

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Bias

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don't agree with your vision of this 'garden city'

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don't agree with the garden city proposal. Current land is already in use - agricultural. Lack of facilities , infrastructure.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's a flood plain and plan based on the location of a proposed new road - not yet agreed

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Brown field site need to be looked at first

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not in the current economic climate

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No details of the proposed new sites - seem to be able to do this for housing?

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Residents approval

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The traffic in and around Warrington is awful as it is. How is building more houses going to help?

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Official documents show you have overestimated the amount of houses required

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have not taken into account brownfield sites. Not seen any evidence of safeguarding land.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses will be built in Lymm. This is because the developer thinks they will make more money, nobody will buy if you get rid of all the green spaces that make it an attractive area to live in the first place

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Seems like you located the affluent areas only

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Affordable housing is not a priority for developers as they want only profit

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Awful idea

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

All this jargon is pretty useless to anyone, what does this even mean?

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Build on brownfield sites and selected green belt land once the brownfield sites are used. Make developers build affordable homes. We don't need hundreds of £60,000 houses.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see comments in attached document Response to WBC preferred development plan 29.9.17 DB.docx

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I can see that there is a need for housing and employment land and I am not categorically opposed to this. However, seeing the presentation at the consultation evening and the development plans for the possible sites, I don't think restrictions on local facilities, schools, transport and infrastructure in general have been taken into account. Development plans state existing schools and bus routes in Lymm, when in reality there is no reliable bus service and the schools are all oversubscribed. It has been done as a paper exercise without any deeper research. It is impossible to get a doctors appointment within 48 hours, there are hardly any facilities left in the village - no banks, no post office and a library at risk of closure. The roads are busy and queuing in and out of the village on a daily basis, especially at rush hour. Without any investment into the infrastructure, it would be ludicrous to build even more houses.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think it is not right to release green belt. There is no consistency for grading of land, and what is the point of having green belt in the first place if it can just be released without any issues. Green spaces in towns and villages are disappearing fast, which leads to less leisure spaces and it is very short sighted to damage a place like that.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree that more housing is required in Warrington however the numbers which have been stated are higher than is required.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No. You're planning to build more houses than are required and the fact only 30% will be social/affordable housing suggests that the location has a lot to do with attracting more affluent residents. Green belt land should be 'safeguarded' full stop.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Because I don't.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

We are not a city as far as I am aware.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It appears you intend to create a Stepford Wives utopia. There are areas of Warrington that are in desperate need of investment and regeneration.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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 have not have proceed on the basis that the Preferred Development Option (PDO) had received sufficient consultation and instead sough to widen and strengthen the level of responses and breadth of engagement with the plans.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

For reasons stated above.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Justification needed for economic growth figures.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Impact of flood risk needs to be properly addressed.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

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)

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Provision for more doctors surgeries and attracting GPs to warrington.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The original assumptions regarding the need for new homes and employment land appear to have been derived in 2014. In particular, the impact of Brexit and changes to the formula used by the Government to calculate the requirement.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is sufficiently more vacant buildings and land which could be utilised which are not detailed in the plan.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The proposed use of Greenbelt is absurd. In particular, if full consideration was given to the use of vacant properties and land on existing brownfield sites, surely this should be the first option for development? Why would the Council want to eradicate one of the only remaining things Warrington has to be proud of?

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I, alongside thousands of residents, did not choose to live in Warrington for a city status. Regardless of whether it is 'packaged up' as a Garden City. Many residents choose to live here and commute to work in the neighboring cities of Manchester and Liverpool for this very reason.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Use brownfield sites first.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The main development option of utilising greenbelt land ignores: Human factors - character of the area, health and well-being of residents (especially children) will be impacted, higher levels of pollution. Environmental - some of the proposed areas already experiences flooding (e.g. fields on A50 out of Grappenhall), surely development will increase flood risk to area. Potential loss of habitat to wildlife (including protected species such as bats), increased noise and air pollution (Warrington already ranks highly in the country), does Warrington have capacity to manage increased waste disposal?

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

All the reasons previously stated. Appears to be a lack of imagination from the Council regarding plans.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previously noted comments in earlier questions, in particular impact on human factors and environmental factors.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Previously noted comments in earlier questions.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Need to consider carefully what type of employment this will attract to the area. In particular, if businesses which provide zero-hours contracts, how much benefit will this truly bring to area.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A complete environmental impact study before any further actions taken.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As you already say in the plan, there is a lot of uncertainty over the level of future demand and more work needs to be done in this area.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't know what appropriately means, I expect rules have been followed but to a resident of WA4 it feels like a huge loss

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have no desire to see Warrington become a New City

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are already plenty of homes in south warrington without more being built. The roads get congested enough as it is without adding more.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Whatever the housing need, the Greenbelt must be protected at all costs! Urbanization has to be stopped at some point! The Greenbelt had been protected for this reason!

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No - there are other brown field sites to develop!

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Absolutely not - it's vandalism!

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes! Warrington isn't a city - you are wantonly planning to destroy beautiful countryside! Please do not turn Warrington into a concrete jungle!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's unnecessary!

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Another dreadful plan!

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It needs completely revising with the input of the community!

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See Attachment. Very disappointed that the proposed development has got to this stage with limited public notice. I was informed via neighbours and had no direct communication from the council.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is not obvious where this 'need' is coming from

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not sure you have looked at brownfield sites which will naturally become available over the next 20 years (through movement of businesses etc). They will accommodate the need for future development of housing. After all, Warrington is a failing town centre where shops are concerned.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It's never acceptable to build on green belt land. It's green belt for a reason and that is to protect it from what is happening now.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Is expanding Warrington so greatly in the interest of the people who already live here?

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't recall the people who matter in all of this, the residents, being consulted.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

If it had been properly assessed, green belt land would never have been amongst the options.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too big, too much growth for a town. Unless the rumours of wanting Warrington to become a city are true.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a town, not a city. It has very few great buildings as Manchester and Liverpool do. Although I do believe that most of the new future development should take place within the town centre and surrounding area, as Warrington town centre is failing its residents at the moment. It's become such a scruffy town and this is not due to the ongoing building work currently being undertaken. It's being neglected as a town.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is one of the better ideas to come out of the plan. This area has long been neglected and is used regularly by drug users peddling their wares. Over the years I have seen this first hand on many occasions.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It won't be a garden city if the green belt land has been used for development. The road network in this part of the town is already at full capacity. This has been an ongoing problem for many years which has not been addressed. Adding further houses / people into the mix is not going to resolve anything.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again, if it's green belt land then it should not be built on. If we build on green belt land now, what's to stop WBC wanting to build on any remaining green belt land in future.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Brownfield sites only should be used. Who amongst the residents is wanting this huge development.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

We have many units available around Warrington for rent that are left empty. Let's fill these before considering building any more.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

They are called travellers because their lifestyle is transient. If they are given permanent sites to live on, they are residents not travellers and should therefore buy the land or houses for themselves as the rest of society does. This should not be greenbelt land either, as the rest of society are restricted by green belt rules.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The consideration of the current Warrington residents.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Calculations made prior to Brexit

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

None of it should be used there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant the destruction of so much agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Not to mention the removal of valued outdoor recreational facilities.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not proven to my satisfaction that the road networks will improve the longterm traffic problems.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Ridiculous desire for wanting Warrington to become a city. Ask the people of Warrington, I have yet to meet anyone who think it is anything but laughable. We need to sort out the towncentre and make it a desirable place to shop. I do not know any English cities that do not even have a Marks and Spencer.....

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous comment

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

So disgusted by the plans to destroy Moord Nature Reserve. Will not stand by quietly and allow this to happen. Concerned that Peel Holdings seems to be a force behind this PDO.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too many houses planned, too few appear to be the type of property needed i.e. social housing and starter homes. What hospital will all these residents be treated at? No capability at W & H hospitals. They are struggling to cope as it is.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again green fields destroyed. What about using brownfield sites.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Depends where it is

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes start again with a realistic plan that is of benefit to the existing residents of warrington.,Not a plan that benefits large companies at the expense of the wellbeing of the people in the areas affected.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am very concerned about the scale of the proposed development and the lack of infrastructure to support any major development in the Warrington Area.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The number of new houses proposed in in excess of the number we need to provide

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There will be very little green belt left south of Warrington and the whole character of the area will be changed forever

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The amount of development for my area is totally out of all proportion

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

All these options will provide far too much housing south of Warrington

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too excessive

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I have no desire for Warrington to become a city and find the whole idea totally preposterous

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not feel that a development of this size is in keeping with the area and what is a Garden City Suburb anyway/

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The impact that the extra traffic would have on the area will be horrendous

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I agree that some employment land will probably be necessary

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As this is a 20 year plan brownfield land will naturally become available to address the issues currently faced. I have concerns about developers looking purely at generating profits rather than a solution for the town of Warrington.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Infrastructures are not in place. Schools doctors roads cannot cope with an increase of residents in many of the areas indicated. Traffic build up and safety are a particular concern. Commuting to Manchester and into Warrington (with the bridges) is already becoming problematic.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

In reference to Lymm. The roads and infrastructure already struggle to support the current population. Schools are full the doctors and dentists are full, roads are damaged through volume of traffic. The roads are dangerous at school drop and pick up times and narrow pavements make it difficult to walk, especially with a pram. The historical importance of the area and attractions that encourage visitors to the area will be lost forever.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a town not a city. The close proximity of Manchester Liverpool and Chester mean another city is not necessary. Money needs to be spent bringing what's already there up to standard.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It makes sense to build a new suburb with the necessary infrastructure rather than expand areas whose local resources are already under pressure due to too many residents

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see previous comments about struggling infrastructure and resources. Changing the historical importance of many of these areas

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

If it bring jobs and prosperity to the area, but not if it just takes advantage of Warringtons good motorway links

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Protection of historical sites and important views for future generations

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

The proposal to provide 24,000 homes over the next 20 years seems to be high and not realistic, there is a mismatch between homes and forecasted population figures. There is a concern that these numbers are being driven by council policy which has not been properly thought through and runs the risk of not being supported with only the most profitable green belt sites actually being developed.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Maximising the utilisation of existing brownfield sites within Warrington's existing built areas should be the main focus for the development plan going forward. The development plan does not seem to address smarter thinking and innovation. By focusing the density of housing / employment land on the brown field sites this will reduce the number of greenbelt sites that are being proposed to be released for development. The plan is not clear on the type of employment development being put forward there should be a mix, low density employment/high land use proposals should be discouraged.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

Disagree that the amount of green belt being put forward for development is unacceptable, the Council has demonstrated poor judgement by even allowing significant green belt parcels of land to be considered. Arups report does not assess the Greenbelt appropriately for the south of Warrington and undervalues this area. This should be re-assessed.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

We object to the proposal to provide 500 additional homes in Lymm, this seem disproportional to the other surrounding areas. It would radically alter the village, have a detrimental effect on the community, the local services, road and public transport, schools and doctors. We object to the number and location of green belt sites being put forward for development. We object to the land identified as reference 2901 in the 2015 SHLAA and referred to with this reference by Berrys. This site should not be released from the Green Belt, as per Arup report that concluded that LY22 makes a 'strong' contribution to the Green Belt. As the site is not bound by a physical boundary such as a road, the site is more vulnerable to encroachment due to the non-durable boundaries. Release of this site would cause the potential loss of vegetation including possible historic hedgerow loss and mature tree cover associated both with Crouchley Lane and related TPOs. The regrading of levels to provide building plots and site access will result in the loss of a distinctive landscape feature. The introduction of uncharacteristic elements including access infrastructure, street lighting and mains services; introduction of new residential buildings set within landscaped plots including off road parking; traffic intrusion arising from proposed development; Light intrusion arising from proposed development; The site confines it is evident that any access works to Crouchley Lane will significantly alter the rural character and historic approach/threshold to the village. Wider indirect effects on landscape character and visual amenity arising from the above (direct) effects including the loss 'of reading' of historic settlement edge and of locally distinctive built and landscape features. The affect of developing this site to the volumes outline would have a major impact to the local transport network. Crouchley Lane has St Mary's Pre-school the development would pose safety concerns arising from the presence of young children and increased traffic pollution concerns. Due to the width of the road, free flow of traffic would be impaired unless a traffic enforcement order being implemented. Significant increase in flow/level of traffic on road that essentially goes to nowhere as beyond is just a network of country lanes. There is a definite danger that traffic will turn left out of the site and use these narrow lanes as a shortcut to the motorway network. The Crouchley lane junction would be a problem, right turn off Crouchley onto Higher Lane due to volume of traffic especially in peak periods. Proposed emergency

access road to site opposite Woodlands Avenue is 'off set' from Woodlands Avenue " would not have good visibility for exit. Significant highways work to be undertaken to make it a safe junction. There is also a question mark over its current width for emergency vehicles. Pedestrian access from Tower Lane Residents of the new development walking towards Lymm village using Tower Lane instead of Crouchley Lane would encounter a public foot path at the side of Lymm Water Tower which does not have sufficient width for wheelchairs / prams / buggy's. The majority of the proposed housing will be for people not working in the area but traveling to Manchester and Liverpool.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The plans make reference to a City, Warrington is not a City and these ambitious and unrealistic plans runs the risk of trying to do so at the cost of the community and the future viability of the area. If we wanted to live a City then we would move to Liverpool or Manchester!

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

unsure

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

to provide response to the local preferred development plan as a resident of Warrington.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

its too many for the area - the town is losing many shops and businesses and we do not want to live in a city.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is biased to the south ow Warrington where house prices and taxes are higher

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

it does not take into account affordable housing, it does not take into account that the green belt is better quality in the south, it does not take into infrastructure at all. It does not take into account extra people / vehicles/pollution. How is it preferred - no residence have said its their preferred option.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It has not be done very well at all

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

It has not been done very well at all

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

too many houses

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

we don't want a city

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is ok

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

too big - in fact ridiculous in size. to have 6000 house without any provision for schools, dentists, doctors, shops and green space for people to enjoy. we need to protect our green space like the Millennium green (awarded green flag and Moore reserve along with fields for pasture and crops.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

How can it be preferred, when its the only option given. I do not prefer it. I do not want it and it will negatively impact the surroundings.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

too many houses concentrated around the villages. every field is 'pink' on the map - that is massive development. Not what we want or need. Field for pasture and crops gone to houses, no other provisions no infrastructure and NO consideration to the wildlife - fauna and floral -traffic and pollution increase, will make the place undesirable to live.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

where has the consultation for this been? If brownfield sites then yes do it - but build the infrastructure to go with it.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

its not common land

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No all people have access to the internet and the initial information went out when a lot of people were on holiday. The plans were not clear on the website. The planners seemed ill informed not knowing really how many houses were really needed. It is not a preferred option when its the only one. Too many houses for the area, all concentrated in the south. No infrastructure. No concern for the green belt and the impact on the environment.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not believe that your plans will deliver the long-term objectives that you hope they will. The housing you are intending to build will in the main be in the south of the town, where housing is much more expensive. This housing will destroy huge amounts of green belt land and will affect future generations of our town as it will become increasingly difficult for them to find affordable housing within our town. Other areas such as Latchford will become increasingly higher in price and force skills away from the local area with young people unable to take their first step on the property ladder within the town. The plan appears to be very 'south' concentrated with little thought for the impact this will have on green belt land, the existing trans Lennie trail and other areas such as Moore Nature reserve.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

The housing need stated in the plan is significantly larger than your own revised figures published in May 2017. The idea that this housing will be filled by people taking up employment created by new business to the town is false, many of the roles that will be presented by potential commercial investment will be at the lower end of the spectrum and these people will not be able to afford the housing proposed by you in the south of Warrington. There doesn't appear to have been much consideration given to the use of brownfield sites within this plan and no clarity has been given to residents regarding the potential impact of this plan on their existing homes. We live in a property that could be affected by compulsory purchase or we could be asked to live directly beside a high rise road complete with traffic and noise. This is totally unacceptable that people could be forced from their homes and relocated unnecessarily. There are other sites including Fiddler Ferry that could be included and is being made available in the next 10 years.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

You appear to have taken approach to scrap green belt land at all costs with little consideration for alternatives such as brownfield sites. Some of your own policies highlight the importance of green belt land yet

this plan contradicts this and seeks to utilise vast amounts of green belt land to build new housing. The removal of green belt land is driven by your desire to build at all costs.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This plan will not deliver your desired objectives and appears to offer objectives that will not be achieved. It will not provide more affordable housing in Warrington and it will not help to reduce congestion. Once the new toll road in Runcorn is introduced, more traffic will come through Warrington as people will seek to avoid paying the toll charge. People will be uprooted from their existing homes. Consideration should be giving to achieving your objectives in alternative ways such as encouraging better incentives for car sharing, cheaper public transport.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The consultation process for this plan as been abimsal. As a homeowner that could be directly affected by a new highway, I am extremely disappointed that no information was shared by WBC locally, it took action from residents to force the council to extend the consultation period which took place over a time when most families were taking their summer holidays. I do not feel that the consultation has been meaningful. When speaking to an employee from the council at a consultation event, the told me that the need for the road would be assessed after the housing had been built, surely this should be the other way round.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No, the preferred development option could see the compulsory purchase of my property or I could be left in a situation where I am left to live next to a high rise viaduct. The number of properties identified within the plan far exceeds the required number outlined in the government's proposed methodology and will not help meet the town's future development needs.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is a town, there has been no discussion about the true benefits this plan will bring, particularly around turning the town in to a city. For people wanting to live in a city, they make alternative choices to leave in other places. The proposal does not meet with the chosen landscape.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The housing will be excessive and far too expensive, therefore not creating affordable housing for current homeowners. The plan to turn huge amounts of green belt land in to housing estate and business properties does not meet with the current landscape and the volumes of properties are in excess of the government requirements and have been miscalculated. Other alternatives such as using brownfield sites should have been given more detailed consideration.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not believe that you are going to generate vast amounts of employment throughout the town and feel that your estimations of the number of jobs that will be created by this development is inaccurate. A small number of low paid jobs will be created by this development.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

What most certainly should have been included was a more structured, robust and meaningful consultation process which should have been communicated more effectively with the local residents affected by your proposals. More effort could have been made to engage the local community in the decision making process ensuring their engagement and taking on board their concerns and considerations. The plan appears to be aimed to enable some businesses to make huge profits on the back of decisions made by people who share roles within the council and also on the board of these organisations. We live in a democracy, yet our local council who should be answerable to their local constituents and residents have chosen to address this proposal poorly. Consideration is not being given for the future young people and generations of our town, who will be deprived of opportunities to visit beautiful places such as Moore county reserve and will see huge amounts of Greenbelt land disappear from view.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

1. I think that your method of working out is very miscalculated and based on fantasy and sheer greed. The Government has issued a standard method to be followed so it should now be re-worked out. The projected 20 years is ridiculously insane and does not Safeguard or protect The Trans Pennine Trail and Moore Nature Reserve. It does not protect our homes and businesses which may fall under CPO. We cannot move or sell or extend with this hanging over us. People may be forced to move away from their families, friends and schools and Warrington where they have made their lives. This will have a detrimental effect on the wildlife, our Greenbelt which produces oxygen in a very already polluted Warrington and the health, wellbeing (happiness, comfort, security) and mental health of Warrington residents affected by what you want to achieve. Did you know there are currently 1000 homes in Warrington advertised for sale or for rent in the Warrington area that could be used for housing without causing destruction?As for employment, there are other brownfield sites in Warrington that can be used for warehousing and distribution. There are empty shops and units all over Warrington that can be used. Unfortunately, you are making it harder for businesses to survive as rent and rates are sky high. Some areas of Warrington are desolate as businesses cannot afford to carry on, especially in the town centre.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

2. Again, you have miscalculated this. If you filled up the empty houses, shops and warehouses throughout Warrington I don't think there would be a need for mass destruction on the vast scale and purging of our Greenbelt. The town centre is desolate, big names are pulling out BHS. Marks and Spencer and Debenhams. How are you going to fill the empty shops? You can park for free all day in Northwich and Nantwich. Knutsford and Whitchurch Â£1.00-Â£3.00 all day. People don't shop in Warrington anymore because you charge too much. You would rather build on Greenbelt instead. There is a lack of affordable housing in Warrington and bungalows. People are living to 100 yrs. of age. How have you planned for the need for more bungalows and social housing? I believe there is a waiting list. Care homes are overflowing and on a weekly basis underperforming in the Warrington area. These are private and NHS. In twenty years' time how will you tackle this? Build more care homes? Have you made provisions for this? Warrington Hospital is flooded with elderly patients requiring specialist care in care homes as they cannot return home. Our existing hospital cannot cope. An average wait in a corridor is 4-9hrs if you're lucky as there is a shortage of beds and staff. Are you planning to build a new bigger one?Unemployment is high in Warrington. Why are you not getting these people back into employment? Your vision is to create new homes and businesses to attract people from outside Warrington to live in your new 'Garden City', what about the people who live in

Warrington who need jobs? How can you expect the people of Warrington to pay Â£400k + to live there? How are you going to re-home those that are CPO'd?

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No because you intend to use Greenbelt first before brownfield. There should be an independent body who assess this with no previous dealings or connections and cannot gain financially from it. You are not safeguarding enough. Developers don't know the meaning of safeguarding.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

4. No, I don't agree with any of the local plan objectives. City status doesn't mean anything but more money to pay councillors wages, more council tax and rates. Insurance premiums rise. More pollution. We will be more congested and Warrington gridlocked. I am disgusted that Grappenhall has been labelled weak. If you look at the whole picture this has been sneakily going on un-noticed for years to put things in place to support city status and your big dream. The new Widnes bridge and road infrastructure near the M56. The new junction at J19 M6 linking the M56 which by the way has not made any difference to the amount of traffic that passes through daily. You used to get rush hours, it's now rush hours all day and night. The smart motorway system again has made traffic worse. Stockton Heath fire station being moved and re-built on a massive scale at the Lymm interchange. New flood defences. Chester Rd, Slutchers Lane, Walton, Moore, Sankey all link together. It's also happening along the M6 corridor at Holmes chapel, Sandbach, Crewe all major developments right by the motorway junctions.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

5. I don't think you have assessed the different spatial options correctly, when there are other sites on the other side of Warrington to consider first. I think you have only chosen South Warrington because the house prices are more in that area and you will gain from it massively.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

6. Your assessment of the different options for the main development locations are heavily weighted to the South of Warrington. With 93% of Greenbelt disappearing and more than 1/3 of the total new houses not taking into account the Appleton HCA not declared in the plan. This is not balanced or fair.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

7. No. You have based your conclusions on solely economic and business considerations with no proper assessment or thought given to environmental or social concerns. You are ruining thousands of lives. You are ruining our wildlife and Greenbelt. You are ruining Warrington.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

8. We do not have a City centre as we are not a City but a town, Warrington town with a town centre!

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

9. I am against the development of a Warrington waterfront. We are surrounded by The River Mersey, Bridgewater Canal and the Manchester ship canal. We are surrounded by water. We do not need Port Warrington. We have freight coming up and down all day and night. If we had anymore the swing bridges would be permanently open to the ships and we would never be able to get across. It's already a nightmare.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

10. I was born in Grappenhall and have lived here all my life. I am not happy with any of your development options and certainly not the Garden City suburb. I remember the trains that ran along the train track just. Since, I have watched, helped to nurture and monitor the wildlife on the embankment and Trans Pennine Trail from being a young child to adult hood. I am a member of the Cheshire Wildlife Trust and take part in the monitoring surveys of butterflies and birds yearly. We have built up a catalogue of species and photographed them for many, many years. I cannot believe that you would want to destroy this natural habitat and that of migrating birds. We have foxes, badgers, owls, bats, hedgehogs, toads, squirrels, butterflies, bumble bees and moths. Trees and flowers. The list is endless. The Greenbelt provides us this already, we don't need a new one.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

11. I am against this as again it is the Southwest and you are destroying Greenbelt.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

12. A fair distribution of necessary housing would be more appropriate and fairer.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

13. I am against the building of new employment land and depots and warehouses on our Greenbelt.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

. This local plan should not be forwarded until:
• Environmental aspects have been properly investigated relating to preservation of wildlife, prevention of air pollution, prevention of worsening flooding risk
• That people have been properly consulted with, not the way you have gone about it underhandedly hoping that no one would notice until it was too late
• Better accessibility for pensioners, the disabled, IT challenged.
• Paper copies freely available and the questions easier to understand to make it easier to fill this form in

• Thorough transport assessment
• Thorough investigation into healthcare, school, emergency services, care home needs
• You listen to what the people of Warrington want. 80% say NO to City status
This whole thing shows Warrington Borough Council up for what you truly are. What amazes me is that you have the money to pursue your City status but you can't give the people of Warrington basic needs because of cost cutting, like filling up pot holes in the road to make them safe, cutting grass verges, supplying dog poo bins, emptying overflowing dog poo bins and cutting back on public transport. The list goes on.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As someone born and raised in Warrington, about to give birth to my first child I look around and am horrified how the landscape is changing so rapidly and how the town I wanted to bring my son up will never look for him as it did for me, my parents, grandparents and so on. What was a beautiful semi-rural town is turning into a monster. How can we continue expanding with homes and more roads ready to be grid-locked?! I can only assume that the people making these decisions are neither from Warrington nor have ever had that sense of 'home pride' as if they did, I'm sure the outcome would be much different.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I saw this week, research released about how the amount of houses needed have been over calculated. Meaning lots more green belt and normal land being built on than what is needed. I am somewhat bemused when I think about who is expected to live in this housing. As if I was an on-looker, I would certainly never look to Warrington as somewhere to move to - I would avoid it at all costs. And I think presently all is being done to drive those living in Warrington away. So who will be left and who will move here?

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

It is heart breaking to think of any Green Belt anywhere being built on. Although I know you aren't thinking with your hearts but with your heads and I'm sure the money promised by the government if you build on it must be producing big pound signs to those in the decision making spots. One day, maybe many years from now, people will look back and it will be there hearts thinking as they realised we have built a grey, cement metropolis that can never be undone.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I am baffled by this question as it refers to a city centre. As far as I am aware, I live in a town - we haven't been granted city status yet!

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think that as with everything else, the amount of sites needed have been over-estimated. Yes, travellers and gypsies pass through but not enough to warrant 26 sites in Warrington alone.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I believe your figures are not accurate and the number of houses proposed is too many.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Figure is too high and not based on most recent statistics.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again - you do not seem to be using the most recent and relevant data.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Number of houses proposed for warrington is too high for the infrastructure. You are constrained by the canals in terms of transport and I don't think that has been given enough credence.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I don't think you've fully considered the impact of so many houses on the value of existing developmenrs nor the effect of so many more vehicles on the town.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Foe all rhe reasons already given.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Daft idea!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Far too big an area need for the buildup ramp at Walton. The idea that it is opening up new areas for development is a bit silly as the land it is opening up floods regularly.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Too much development and too great a loss of green belt land

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not think green belt land should be used for development. It has been designated green belt land in order to protect it from future development. Therefore, it should not now be released for use as and when the council deem it necessary. The areas will be irreparably spoilt by continued building and growth . Recent growth in the town is already a blight to the area.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Due to over development of the town. In my opinion the town will be spoilt and not a pleasant place to live. I have no desire to live in a city. I choose to live in the Warrington area due to it's size and the location of the town in relation to the Warrington villages and the fact that we have ready access to open countryside, which will no longer be the case if the Preferred plan is adopted.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

it will result in unnecessary over development of the area - no need for Warrington to be a city, there will be no benefit to current residents. Already blighted by roads constantly blocked by people travelling across the town to areas of employment.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

not necessary and will spoil that area of Warrington

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

not necessary and will spoil the area

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not necessary and these areas in particular will be permanently spoiled by building on green belt land. These have always been rural villages, where the green belt land is farmed by local people and should not be subject to further development. North Warrington already suffers from the Warrington New town development and the associated traffic that passes through the area twice a day on unsuitable roads, causing additional danger to residents and additional pollution due to queuing traffic. The area is not suitable for such development and the services in the area will not support such growth.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

there is enough employment opportunity in the area and access to several major cities for further employment opportunities

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The assumptions and projections used in the PDO far exceed the previous growth figures and the government guidelines. They are premised on the fact the Warrington is to become a city. Warrington council has no remit from its constituents to turn Warrington into a town and I for one do not want Warrington to become a town. The figures are excessive and do not bear any resemblance to the reality of the current situation.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO appears to for go any consideration of existing or upcoming brown field sites that could be used for development in favour of proposing a massive green belt land grab south of the ship canal. As mentioned the projections are flawed and therefore the calculations for the existing built up areas are flawed. The green-belt is essential and should be preserved. There is more than enough brown field sites to accommodate a sensible amount of house building.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO green-belt land grab is horrendous and the fact that the majority of it is south of the ship canal is disgraceful. A revised housing need assessment with lower projections would show that green-belt reclassification would not be required as previously mentioned. It is very suspicious that the main green belt areas the PDO is considering building on happens to be in the more affluent part of Warrington where house prices are substantially higher.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I disagree with the whole of the local plan objectives. The PDO is critically flawed by the assumption of Warrington becoming a city. The council needs to re-evaluate the actual housing needs over the next 20 years for a town NOT a city taking into account Brexit and the current political climate.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The PDO suggests developing the majority of the home in the green belt south of the ship canal. How is this fair!It quickly dismisses other spatial options and ignores completely any non green belt spatial options. In fact the council has not consulted with Warrington residents at all on any building options.This whole process has been disgraceful and the council should seriously consider the fact that they are there to represent its constituents and not big business.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The local plan is massively biased towards creating a framework for exceptional circumstance to justify a massive and unwarranted green-belt land grab in one of the most beautiful parts of the Warrington. The whole plan is flawed under the assumption of growth for a city when Warrington is a town. The development locations do not reflect any sensible option other than providing green belt land to big developers to build big houses on and make big profits. It does not consider the needs of the residents of Warrington who cannot afford such housing.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As previously stated, the central tenet of the PDO is that Warrington is to become a city and as such needs to grow to city size. This is a flawed starting point. The council has not held any referendum on this issue and has no mandate to do so. A true and fair projection of the existing growth trends would show that the massive green-belt land grab is totally unwarranted.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are many empty or due to become empty brown field sites in and around Warrington that have not even been considered for house building. If we build houses where the jobs (where possible) then the congestion Warrington suffers from would be eased. Building a major garden city suburb south of the ship canal which has minimal crossing points is madness. How is all the extra people meant to get into Warrington everyday? In fact it would seem to me that the kind of people that can afford the big houses planned for the garden city would probably be working in Manchester, Liverpool or London.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think the whole idea of the PDO is flawed. But especially the idea of a Garden city suburb over the ship canal. As already stated it is likely that most people buying their would likely not be working in Warrington. This would bring nothing to the town other than increased traffic around the south of the city. The whole idea is preposterous and should be dropped immediately. Clearly this idea only benefits the developers.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Since I massively disagree with the Garden city suburb proposal I also disagree with the need for any supporting infrastructure. We do not these big developments when there is more than enough brown field land to justify a decent growth projection.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yet again I have to repeat myself. The outlying settlement development is excessive since the projections in the PDO and excessive. I more realistic development plan for the outlying settlements needs to be done.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The are many empty factories and business units in the Warrington area already. Why do we need to take more green-belt land to build new employment land. The PDO again completely fails to properly assess the situation.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I understand government requires you to allocate land for gypsies and the like. However the PDO uses this requirement to further its aim to steal green-belt land.If we have a local plan based on green-belt preservation then I am sure the requirements for travellers can easily be met.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As per my last comment, the PDO uses this requirement to make a case for exceptional circumstance to free up green-belt land. This cannot happen, if we have a local development plan with the primary aim of protecting green belt land then other more suitable options for minerals and waste can be found.

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Firstly I would reject the current local plan entirely. Then I would suggest the council develop a new plan in accordance with the wishes and ideas of the people who actually live in Warrington. The projections need to be aligned with reality and the preservation of green-belt land should be the primary driver.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

The need for homes is obvious if Warrington is to continue to expand.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There has been no consideration to the residents of Warrington, its environment and its Wildlife. The consultation hasn't been coordinated properly, giving everyone a chance to understand and view proposed plans as venues were restricted and limiting the public interaction and comments. I feel the pollution and congestion situation that Warrington currently deals with on a regular bases is only being added too, our green belt is all we have left, as businesses close down in this current climate why are we not looking to reclaim these areas of land. As a resident I feel that tax payers money in this town is wasted on facilities that are not needed, (Town Centre Cinema and Car Park and Winwick Rd retail park). The old fiat site would have been ideal for housing, why do we need to push business away from the town centre its already derelict and looks a disgrace. I was once proud of this town but the more I see and feel I pay towards I am appalled!

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

No thought into current climate, recession, and environmental aspects of the town, Building houses to support the spending on redirecting congestion around the town.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

hhhh

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Presume new houses are only planned when existing empty properties have all been filled. Figures based on increased population figures. Surely it is not necessary to build on green belt land.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not encroaching into parks and recreational spaces within built up areas e.g Sankey Valley Park.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Green Belt should be the last resort, surely the industrial heritage of Warrington means there is enough land from ex-factory sites.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Need to re-think the Western Link, use the existing bridges over the Mersey, take into account the new toll bridge at Runcorn. Look at existing traffic congestion and what can be done about it - traffic lights at Stockton Heath. Only allow ships on the Ship Canal at off peak times, look at other towns with the same configuration of a river and what they have done to improve transportation. Make sure that the Town Planners actually live in

the area so that they are aware of the local problems. Don't be influenced by large Corporations and nimby attitudes.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not sure about this section.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Hopefully not showing bias depending on which Councillor lives in the affected area! There is a growing disillusionment with local decision making and a cynical attitude to the influence of large, rich, Companies in the future of Warrington.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous answers.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Don't give planning permission for more housing developments in the centre e.g Mr Smiths. Keep all the buildings that show that Warrington has some history. Sympathetic architecture, the new car park is an eyesore.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not touch any green belt. Explain the plans in layman's terms not jargon and Council speak!

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

If this is all based on the new Western Link you need to make sure you have got that right first - this is not popular with the Residents!

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Do not build more houses than necessary, make sure your calculations are correct. At present the way local residents feel you might find that you won't need extra houses because people are talking about leaving Warrington especially at Lymm where they are planning to leave WBC control.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Surely the future is working from home especially in communications and small businesses. Future trends should be taken into consideration.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Have you consulted with the local Residents as to how this will affect their area. Unfortunately this ethnic group have a bad reputation for their treatment of their surroundings and interacting with the locals so a permanent site has to be with the agreement of all parties concerned.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Change the terminology and make it more easy to understand, explain the rationale behind every decision, consider the least disruption. Go to each local area and talk to the Residents so they can understand the impact that the plan will have on their environment.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes I have several comments which are included in the letter I've attached to this form.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter but no not at all - the Green Belt is not something you can simply access as and when you feel like it - once Green Belt land is released and built on it can never be reversed to become green spaces again; there are numerous Brown Field sites in Warrington which should be accessed and used first before any Green Belt land is even looked at.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter - the number of new houses is neither warranted or practical; the infrastructure is not in place; the desire for City status for Warrington is misguided, inappropriate and unwanted by the majority of local residents - some new housing is required but not to the tune of 24000 houses - Warrington will be destroyed forever and there will be one swathe of concrete from the Wilderspool Causeway right up to the M56 at Stretton if this proposal goes ahead.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Yes lots but please see attached letter.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Please see attached letter.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There are no need for more people in Warrington. The town is ridiculously busy as it is.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

The new road to be built is ridiculous. It is unfair on homeowners, the green belt and wildlife

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I disagree with the need for more than the minimum new homes required by central government, as there is no certainty that Warrington will grow in employment/population numbers above the minimum.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Proposes use of the Green Belt Land but exceptional circumstances are not justified. Relies on an unrealistic vision of economic and population growth.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Over stated the potential growth of the area. Warrington is not and should never be a City!!! If the Borough predictions are half that stated Warrington North and South will be GRIDLOCKED.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Comments as previous page.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

By far to much green belt to be destroyed. Use more Brown field sites. Thousands of houses can be built on the Fiddlers Ferry Power station site which is to be decommissioned 2025.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Again over stated requirements for new housing. Objective should be to provide new housing without destroying and polluting rural areas.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Existing and newly claimed brown field sites should be considered first.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

There only appears to be ONE option. ie. Take countryside away from South Warrington. Where are the other options!!!

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is not a CITY and never will be. Great to provide Many thousands of homes and apartments in the Town centre.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Get on with it. Should have been developed years ago, as other towns in England have done.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Nobody wants a garden city suburb Borough should provide more sensible and achievable options for consideration.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Why do TRAVELLERS need permanent sites!!!! They should be downsized not increased.

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

What are the proposals for the construction of new A roads to prevent grid lock on the A49, A51, A50 etc.

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that decisions for housing have been made to satisfy the investors and not for the good of the town or its growth, this town suffers from a serious environmental and pollution issue with land being over developed and traffic congestion. As the plan for new ring roads has also been submitted I can only feel that the housing plan has been presented to finance this.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This option seems to be very limited as its greenbelt land that is currently being reviewed (what little is left in this town that hasn't had some development Housing / Industrial).

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No consideration has been given to this option, Warrington hasn't much green belt left, we are living in a town where it's the norm to live on an industrial park. The environmental aspect, pollution, traffic congestion, residents and wildlife have not been considered. This option is about limiting the space of the town and recreation, making money to finance other options and destroying the areas that Warrington Borough Council already publicise to entice people to move to the area.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As already Stated

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Not enough consideration has been given to other areas that are currently not being used, vacant Industrial units / commercial properties and land / retail facilities under utilised.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Some sites have already have previously been opposed by residents but are included in this development option once more, and land owners have been asked to show an interest. The council have published options that are not acceptable for development, which has caused mass unrest in the town and they did not provided enough consultation or adequate premises for the public to air their views limiting attendance.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

As a life long resident of this town I feel that our basic needs are ignored, our health is at risk from pollution, our environment is being destroyed and our money is being wasted. This town is over developed, under financed and not managed.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Total waste of money the heritage of this town has been overlooked as Bridge street didn't get a disadvantaged grant from the government (its a disgrace to the town). We needed the new development of the market, we didn't need a new car park which is an eyesore and we certainly didn't need a Cinema when we have closed all the previous in the town and moved it to Westbrook. As we now watch this close down once the town centre opens do you think the site in Westbrook will be a development option for housing?

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Money making and destroying once again places of interest and nature in the name of development

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

As already stated on the previous waterfront option, development comes before green belt, nature and recreation in this town

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is big enough as a town, we are not a city and our villages are not towns.

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think there is currently enough facility for businesses wanting to move to Warrington look at the vacant premises that are currently available and publicised

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is greenbelt that seems to have already been dealt with prior to this consultation, as I was informed about this by the council

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

limited facilities for the cost that the tax payer pays to the council. we currently receive a poor service

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Better consultation, not just a date extension for objection. this town is now divided

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

FAr too little land safeguarded, too much green belt used in my opinion

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

the M6 regularly closes or becomes grid locked, when this happens all the traffic comes through Grappenhall and Warrington. The industrial areas suggested are going to increase this heavy goods vehicle traffic, I want to see the access to the roads into Grappenhall and Stockton heath weight limited and something done about the speed of the traffic.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Some guarantee that you will sort the roads and access out before you build, the current roads around Grappenhall, the A56 for example can't take any more traffic, commit to sorting the access first please

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I totally disagree with the numbers, distribution and density of housing you have proposed. Your figures rely too much upon historical figures leading to over inflation of need. You should be using the formula recently published in the Governments white paper Fixing the Broken Housing Market

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have failed to demonstrate that you ensure all brown field sites are developed before you use Greenbelt. As supporting regeneration of previously used urban land is one of the 5 purposes of having Greenbelt you have failed in your responsibilities. Your claims that we need more land for employment when Warrington already has significant numbers of units capable of offering employment lying dormant demonstrates that you have not undertaken a suitably comprehensive base line of what is required.

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No your estimated housing numbers are flawed as it does not reflect the truth projection of Warrington's future population growth (especially since Brexit). This means that Warrington only needs about 16K homes which means that all development could and should be on Brownfield sites. The use of 'safeguarding' that in reality means that you will declassify even more of Warrington's Greenbelt is a con of which you should be ashamed as I presume you are trying to avoid any future consultation with the population of the town

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

Whilst on paper the objectives look clear in reality WBC needs to resolve Warrington's basic problems of too much reliance on motor vehicles, a unattractive town centre that is a disgrace and a failure to build an identity for the town. Building unaffordable houses and low grade employment together with the industrialisation of the town through Peel holdings will not support an improved and attractive environment where people want to come and live and work.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Your consultation document is far too complicated and full of technical terms for most of us to understand. Much of it is therefore unintelligible meaning that your process is not transparent or clear enough for me to take an informed view.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

You have not applied a logical rational or clear explanation of how you assessed the different options. Your proposal disproportionately impacts upon the South of the town undermining the principle of fairness. Provide proper information and then I will be in a position to send you a properly informed answer.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No. You seem hellbent on making Warrington a place for transition of good, people and transport. Think about what would make Warrington an attractive and vibrant town and community where people can live health lifestyles, bring up families, access jobs that pay a proper living wage and want to stay. your PDO does none of those things.

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Warrington is not a City! You need to use your imagination, Look at Manchester to start with who have transformed their city centre to one that has generated a community of young people who live, socialise and participate in their communities. If you include the idea of Port Warrington in this question and you think this will solve Warrington's problems then you need to think again.

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This development will do nothing other than bring noise, more pollution, poorer air quality and an industrial feel to the town. It is more than disappointing that WBC as so many other have done have allowed themselves to be seduced by big business in the vain hope that it will transform their town. Salford needed the BBC to transform Salford Quays in the end as just building housing, some retail space and siting the Lowry there was insufficient.

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

Its already a garden. This is precious Greenbelt that is used to grow food, contributes to offsetting our poor air quality and provides open spaces for the population of Warrington. Your idea of building a park in the middle of your proposed housing estates to give the population some green space is pathetic. When all the senior management of WBC move to the town, educate their children here, use public services and sit in the traffic jams that everyone else has to endure then I will take your ideas for a garden suburb seriously. I shan't hold my breath.

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

See previous answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

There is no justification or need for this development as your estimates for housing and employment needs are over inflated. These are communities in their own right and should be left alone.

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

This is mainly on the edge of town, once again taking precious Greenbelt. It will generate significant amounts of traffic pollution and unnecessary road journeys pushing more onto the over crowded motorway network too. The density of jobs that have transpired on the employment land at Omega etc is very low. You should focus on getting better value out of all Brownfield sites, new and existing before building more.

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I want these people to be treated fairly and with respect. I don't believe your plans do this

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

This requires a level of knowledge that I do not possess and your consultation documentation has not helped me to understand

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

A Vision rather than a sop to greedy developers

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Yes

Please explain why you gave this answer

I think it is a very difficult position to be in as noone can predict what will happen in the future.

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

No one knows what the future holds.

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I feel that there has been a lack of information available to the public about the whole process.

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not have the information available to make an informed decision.

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I do not have the necessary information.

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

I dont have the information to comment

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

No

Please explain why you gave this answer

not enough information available to be able to comment

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 1

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the need for new homes and employment land in Warrington over the next 20 years?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 2

Do you have any comments to make about how we've worked out the number of homes and amount of employment land that can be accommodated within Warrington's existing built up areas?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 3

Have we appropriately worked out the amount of land to be released from the Green Belt, including the amount of land to be 'safeguarded'?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 4

Do you agree with the new Local Plan Objectives?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 5

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different 'Spatial Options' for Warrington's future development?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 6

Do you have any comments to make about how we've assessed different options for the main development locations?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 7

Do you agree with our Preferred Development Option for meeting Warrington's future development needs?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 8

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the City Centre?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 9

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Wider Urban Area?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 10

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for developing the Warrington Waterfront?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 11

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the Warrington Garden City Suburb?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 12

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for the South Western Urban Extension?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 13

Do you have any comments to make about our Preferred Development Option for development in the Outlying Settlements?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 14

Do you agree with our approach to providing new employment land?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 15

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 16

Do you agree with our suggested approach for dealing with Minerals and Waste?

Please explain why you gave this answer

QUESTION 17

Having read the Preferred Development Option Document, is there anything else you feel we should include within the Local Plan?

Please explain why you gave this answer