



---

Sir

1. The Council has a legal and moral duty to represent ALL of its Warrington constituents regardless of political colour, and in failing to include South Warrington Councillors over the years in which this plan has been developed it is demonstrably failing to take into account the needs and views of those of us living in the area which is most at risk from the plan.
2. In representing Warrington people the Council has a duty to do what is best for the majority of people affected in each area that is affected and not to pursue what may well be seen as a vanity project - what need is there AT ALL for Warrington to have City status? I have yet to find anyone in favour of this - what appears to be- a self aggrandisement project.
3. By its own admission, the Council plan projects the building of more houses than are needed, but with alterations to the plan and fewer houses, the very real objections to building on green belt can be minimised.
4. One of this town's greatest problems is traffic: bad at rush hour, appalling in bad weather and impossible when there are problems on the motorway, yet you plan to build (almost)1000 new homes on the Green Belt thereby guaranteeing at the very least 2000 more cars. Expensive houses will be bought by the wealthier who will need to two earning adults to pay the mortgage and inevitably they will have a car each. In the South there is the added unique geographical issue of the Mersey, Ship and Bridgewater Canals which seems not to have been addressed at all.
5. There is a real need for less expensive housing and many people would prefer to live nearer to work and not to need a car. In one fell swoop this can be delivered by re-developing Brownfield sites - coupled with the Waterfront development (a great idea -make it larger and enable a more vibrant community closer to town) this could reinvigorate a tired town centre.
6. Fiddlers Ferry and the current Hospital site are both due to become available for redevelopment within the next 20 years and offer great opportunities for housing, not to mention the possibility of adding eco-friendly green spaces to these areas to break up the dense built upon areas.
7. Which doctors surgeries and dental practices will all these additional people use? They are already well over subscribed. And what about school places?
8. The Garden City Suburb plan is grossly out of scale - Suburb it may be, but the Garden element is much too small, a token gesture.
9. The Green Belt is not "spare land" it is valuable (possibly vital once we have left the EU) farmland impossible to replace once lost. It is a buffer, the lungs of the Town, a huge natural resource giving a boost to the mental health of everyone, not just the few, all of whom can visit it. There are huge numbers and varieties of wildlife that would be impacted too, including protected species.
10. In conclusion the Plan appears unfairly and disproportionately to impact the South,

whilst simultaneously ignoring less controversial alternatives that could deliver much if not all of what is needed without damaging a vital resource.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.