



Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for the Park Royal consultation. I am writing to express my concern over the proposals raised by Warrington's local development plan. I fully understand the need for house-building projects. However, following the public consultation, I do not feel the proposals satisfactorily address this problem and object to the plan.

Please send me, in writing, the evidence that you have on the following points:

1 Affordable housing: I'd like to have assurances that the mooted future developments . If they must take place, are not to the benefit of private developers only. What will be the percentage of housing association to private profit? Following the Parr's Wood development, and the plans for this proposed development where exactly do you place the Maginot line between green space that is allowed to stay, and land that can be sold off?

2 The amount of housing: The 24.000 figure. Where does this come from? It is not stipulated by government.

3 Traffic assessments : 24.000 extra homes places a burden on local infrastructure that is already under strain Warrington is consistently gridlocked for hours and I have on many occasions, abandoned my car and walked home after sometimes being in my car for over two hours for a 20 minute commute. The strategic route crossing the canal by the old railway bridge was recently called an ugly rumour however it is clearly outlined on pdf's on your website documents. Why the obstruction ? And what precisely are the new link road options?

4 Lifestyle: childhood obesity rates continue to grow, lifestyles are increasingly sedentary and the weight of evidence points to encouraging Warrington residents to become more active. not only for physical benefits, but mental too. The proposed development delivers more housing/cars/roads, but not more green space. How do you plan to mitigate that?

5 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 well-being. said this: "Warrington Borough Council takes its responsibility for the health and wellbeing of 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

6 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?

7 Flooding: the area around the A50 is affected by flooding. 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?

8 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?

9 Town centre/brown field sites: I would like your reassurance that brownfield sites will be fully maximised and the town centre is focussed on as a prime area for residential and housing development before green space, wildlife and rural areas are sacrificed. Entire units on Bridge Street lay empty and have been for some time. Please can you set out and respond with your imaginative solutions and efforts to convert such areas to appealing places to live?

10 Another comment from one of your team at the consultation: "Know 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 its understandable that no one wants to live in a high-rise like Grenfell, but that does not describe the kind of urban living solutions seen in Stockholm. Copenhagen, or. closer to home. Manchester. Please send me a reassurance that building affordable urban living 'upwards' rather than always 'outwards' is not dismissed by your team out of hand.

11 Outside interests: I wonder if you could clarify how many members of the department live in or close to the areas actually affected by your preferred options?

12 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.

13 The proposed dual-carriage way is suggested to be alongside the existing, derelict, disused, rail bridge. Why can Peel holdings not take down that bridge to be replaced by the dual-carriageway if it goes ahead instead of taking up more space, affecting more existing houses just so Peel holdings doesn't have to impact its profits?

I look forward to your reply.

Kind Regards

