

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE : Response to P.D.O. July 2017

1. I strongly object to the quietly conducted Consultation 24<sup>th</sup> Oct. to 5<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2016. Only 78 responses, no surprise there. Why was this not more widely publicised? The timing of the present Consultation has been deft and at a time when people are on holiday and less likely to become aware of the full implications of the plan on where they live. Why has there been no meeting in Grappenhall where most of the development is planned? There are plenty of venues in the locality. I welcome the actions of the local M.P. and others in highlighting for people what is being planned. I only found out as the result of an anonymous letter placed in my letterbox. Why wasn't a letter sent by the Council to all householders potentially affected by your plans? The whole process smacks of deliberate subterfuge or low key Consultation to minimise responses which might challenge the received wisdom of the planners. Keep it quiet, get 78 responses and then conclude that no one objects. Really.

Further to the above I object to the fact that the Council did not contact the Trans Pennine Trail group. Having read their submission for Consultation I find it to be another example of deliberate obfuscation. Surely seasoned planners such as yourselves know about your obligations to work with this group and that improvement of Sustainable Transport provision is part of any planning. A total neglect suggests that your Plan is already flawed and should be scrapped and rewritten.

2. I object to the plan to create a strategic road along the disused railway line starting at Bridge Foot and due to finish half way along the A50.

In keeping with the management methods being deployed I note the intention to conduct a full transport model analysis in the next Consultation phase. That suggests already an intention to proceed with this idea irrespective of concerns or objections whilst minimising information such as environmental concerns or the role of the Transpennine Trail Executive. The protected status of this route? Has an archaeological Survey been carried out? I have to ask the question, is the Council guilty of deliberate obfuscation or ignorance or incompetence?

The route itself. Such a road would destroy the wildlife and eco systems which have developed on the Trail. I use the trail regularly and so do many other people. It is a blessing.

The practicalities. While I can understand the wish to create another high level crossing of the Ship Canal to satisfy the demands of Peel Holdings and their intended use of the Canal is the use of a railway track last used fifty years ago the answer? The remaining infrastructure , the bridges along the route and the one over the Canal is hardly suitable for a new strategic road with a cycle track.( I have heard that this may need to be a dual carriageway). Then there is the need to consider the effect upon the numerous properties which border the old railway line. The cost of all this? Surely a new route or crossing in the Statham area would make more sense.

Then the route as shown shows the convergence of this road with the new strategic road from the Garden City Suburb at a point half way along the A50. Is this for real? The traffic at this point would be ridiculous remembering the traffic from the motorways and from Warrington. Your plan also suggests a village centre at this point. Obviously whoever did this plan has never experienced the A50 at certain points during the week.

A bus route along this proposed road? How do the people along this route access a road along the top of a raised embankment? Are there going to be lifts for us all to reach the road?

Where are your plans to improve the Trail and create a cycle path to Bridge Foot? Or a tram or train to get people off the roads?

### 3. I object to your preferred planning option 2

It is excessive and will destroy the character and ethos of the South Warrington area. At the moment is a pleasant rural introduction to the town for visitors. It feels like Cheshire, not the urban environment north of the Mersey.

It will create a commuter village for people from elsewhere who will rely on the M6 and M56. This will pressurise the M6 even more. I note the specification on your planning map for upgrading the M6 and M56 junction. Isn't that area congested enough with the Heavy transport service area? Surely planning in the Statham area or on land south of the M56 would be more sensible.

Let me say that I have already responded to your on line questionnaire but the format was limited in terms of allowing a response which suits me rather than you. Your response attempts to limit response to the grounds which suit you and allow you to put off many members of the public from making responses to your 'planning' jargon.

Oh and this 'city' obsession. I have been assured that this is nothing to do with the Council's failed attempts to become a city when the monarch invited towns to respond and that it is the jargon being used by the Government in planning material. Nonetheless, the town council does seem to have 'city' aspirations with the numbers and scope of proposed development to the detriment of the town as it is. Leave the south of the town alone, planting a commuter village and destroying the atmosphere and tranquillity of this area will destroy the ambience and character of an area I deliberately chose to move back to 

