



---

Dear S#ir / Madam

I have just completed the consultation document online. I have cut and pasted a number of my answer to questions here as I believe it is important that you see the level of feeling in Lymm and the South of Warrington.

I am outraged at the poor level of communication that the Council have perceived is sufficient in the process of consultation around the biggest change to the shape and face of Warrington in the last 30 years. They have done what is required and above that too but in fact in reality it has been woefully inadequate in terms of the fact that the original consultation period was over the main holiday period of the calendar, drop in sessions were badly organised and non-digitalised residents were not properly consulted with – and there are many contrary to popular statistics of digitalised households as I am sure you are aware. Budgets are tight but when swathes of the population of the borough will be affect by these proposals the least the Council can do is produce and distribute a leaflet – it managed with the green bins for goodness sake!!!! Oh yes it made money out of that!

My general point were:

- 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 per 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.

- 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 - [REDACTED] 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.
- 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 ) Face it - who wants to be in Lymm in their 20s its neither Warrington or Manchester it's just not happening!!!
- There is no detail around what type and level of employment is envisaged. There appears to be 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 employment land 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?
- 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 - [REDACTED] 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.
- NO NO NO NO NO 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 farmer's 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 look out of my window for the last 4 years and see 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.

- Don't get me wrong it's 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. Having said that my children [REDACTED] have been brought 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 at the end of the day it is their lives you are proposing to ruin not mine or yours. LEARN FROM MISTAKES MADE.
- NO NO NO NO NO 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.
- 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!!!!
- As a town we have an area within our boundaries that currently provides some housing but lots of space. Space is good. It's 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 it is a village because it is more isolated because it is more independent. An aspiration for a garden city is a bit like saying let's 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 unspoilt - we have a town, Warrington - warts and all, we have our greenery together with our urban bit in the middle, OUR greenbelt - LEAVE IT ALONE!!!!

Since these announcements were made in terms of a consultation document I find that I wake up with a sickening feeling in the morning - I feel it is inevitable but it is all so wrong.

We must defend what we have and preserve it for our children not destroy yet more of the planet - that is not a sustainable model.

Why do my children get it yet the councillors and officers of the Council do not? At the end of the day it is our children's world we are shaping not our own - we will be retired or worse by the time all these plans come to fruition - if they are saying no then we should be saying no - at least they are not tainted by alliances and money.

Kind regards

