Warrington development plan,

I have some serious concerns with the proposed development plan, firstly the inaccurate and poorly detailed plans that have been proposed. The plans are not clearly marks and key doesn't cover all features that are in the area like the two streams that drain into the ship canal. There is no scale and no dimensions of proposed features making it possible to hide the behind colours without committing to sizes of any natural features.

The existing transportation links would need a serious upgrade and the canal crossings can't handle more traffic because of the poorly maintained old bridges could be taken to breaking point with more traffic. However, the crossings apart from when there is a ship on the canal aren't the bottleneck for the traffic. The transport infrastructure within Warrington centre and the M6 can't handle the traffic that already uses these routes. Two cars per household in the proposed development area will put more strain on these already heavily congested routs. Adding a link road won't help these areas in fact it will probably make it significantly worse. more will make it worse Motorway network, already can't cope with the volume of traffic. Looking at the proposed route for the new link road and canal crossing both ends of the proposed route already have significant traffic problems. The increased traffic and additional transport links will have an impact on health of residents due to the significant increase in diesel powered vehicles moving through the area, also the additional diesel powered commercial vehicle required to supply the local shops.

There will be significant destruction of the vegetation in the area which will have an environmental impact on global warming because there will be less vegetation to absorb co2 and more co2 production from the proposed houses and vehicles.

The construction will irreversible damage the local heritage and lost history, there will also be irreversible damage to the local wildlife habitats for the bats, foxes, badges, birds, insects that are present in the area. I believe that we are responsible for keeping our rural areas for future generations to see our heritage and have somewhere that they can enjoy.

There has been flooding in the area and the proposed construction will Increase the risk of future flooding due to drainage of surface water into a canal that is poorly maintained and struggles with adverse weather conditions. Additionally, the area has some history of being quite damp and this can be seen in the gardens of the residents due to the area being part of the route of the river Mersey.

The proposed plans show that only a small amount of the development isn't on green belt land with the clear majority of it being on green belt. This designation of land should be adhered to and greenbelt should remain as such and not disregarded when the peel holdings envelopes are fat enough.

The reallocation of land will reduced food production capacity of the UK while increasing the number of residents in the area. This will increase our reliance on imports and at a time where imported goods are set to become more expensive due to exiting the EU.

There will be an increased strain on the current amenities and for example the local health care service is already at its limits and near impossible to get an appointment.

Serious consideration about Warrington centre should be made because it isn't desirable for visitors, most people don't shop there because it is full of discount stores and e cig shops. Where are the

plans to improve the centre, or have these not been thought about because the amount of money that can be made from improving the lives of the current residents doesn't make as much money as selling land for residential construction?

The loss of a section of the Trans Pennine Trail for a road is a terrible consequence of this proposal and just shouldn't be a consideration. There are a lot of people that use the trail as a safe place to take their pets for a walk and to take their children because there are no cars. There isn't anything in the proposal that I can find that reviews the noise that would be created by the road. There is nowhere to put anything to reduce the impact of the noise on residents because of communities being situated close to the old train line which would have been reviewed at the time the planning was proposed for the construction of those homes. The other option that would be the destruction of the homes and the village community which just shouldn't even be a consideration.

The old railway bridge that crosses the ship canal is unlikely to be suitable for traffic without significant work, there are deformed steel sections that have been left to corrode and I wouldn't be happy that the structure could take any significant load. There also seems to be some erosion of the towers that support the bridge due to the marks on the brickwork. There are a lot of bridges along the rout of the old railway and none of these have had any significant maintenance and are probably not suitable for use as a road bridge. Destruction of these sandstone bridges would also be a tragedy to the local heritage.

There is likely to be an increased crime rate with more access for criminals and less community support in the larger area where communities have been damaged following the removal of local homes. Also, more strain on the local police force that will have a larger area and more traffic to cover with no additional support in the proposal. The same can be said for the fire service with a larger area and more strain on the motorway due to the increased traffic and the reduction in safety from the overloaded roads.

All the issues I have with the proposal just go to show that it is significantly flawed, I am a and to find this many flaws in a proposal in my trade would get the project scrapped without question. The same should be done with this plan because it is fundamentally flawed. I believe that more smaller estates spread out more evenly around Warrington should be investigated to reduce the destruction and spread out the strain of more residents across more areas.