



I am writing to register my objection to the Preferred Development Options proposals for a large number of houses to be built in South Warrington.

The number of houses proposed is vastly disproportionate, and will overload an already inadequate infrastructure. Warrington has major traffic problems already which will become worse when the new toll bridge opens, and the new Western Link will do little to improve matters. The geography of the area (ie two canals and a river) make any solution expensive and complex, and in their turn, have created patterns of ownership that make change expensive.

Stockton Heath suffers badly from congestion that has caused all the surrounding residential roads to be used as “rat-runs”. All the other local facilities ie shops, schools, doctors etc are at limiting capacity, and would be overwhelmed by any major new development that did not include major investment and planning these areas as a key part of any proposal.

In particular, the proposal to build several hundred new houses between Red Lane and Houghs Lane is ludicrous. Access will be almost impossible for the number of houses proposed! Red Lane is a road with several narrow portions and already has queues for the Red Lane Bridge at rush hour, and Houghs Lane is a narrow road with a stream on one side and Walton Hall on the other, and could not possibly carry the volume of traffic required. Due to their geography, any widening of either of these roads and their access to other main roads will be difficult and expensive, and may even be impossible.

Finally there is the issue of amenity: there are many areas in South Warrington, including the Trans-Pennine Trail, bridlepaths, walkways and wooded areas, that are enjoyed by many residents of Warrington (including myself), and help make it an attractive area to live (despite the traffic!). Given that almost all this area is Green Belt, it seems crazy to concrete it over.

In addition, the consultation on these proposals has been poor (to put it politely). It should have been recognised early on that a great deal of public concern would be created, and a lengthy period (say 3 months) of explanation and publicity would be essential. As it is, it appears to have been pushed through in an underhand way, diminishing the credibility of the proposal and those who support it.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address line 1]

[Redacted address line 2]

[Redacted address line 3]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]