



---

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing in response to the consultation for the development plans for South Warrington. I understand that the closing date for individual responses is September 29.

I have seen the proposals and, frankly, I am appalled at the continued focus for development in this area and by this Council.

As a long time resident of Appleton, I have seen the area grow both in terms of housing developments, traffic, speeding offences, ridiculous speed bumps, parking on double yellow lines, postcode lottery basis for charging of green bin collections, noise, fly tipping, litter dropping, litter in grass verges from drivers and frequent gridlock when there is a problem on the M6/M56/M62.

I have not seen the area grow in terms of schooling, medical services, visible policing, infrastructure, improvements to existing roads, cycle lanes, well maintained pavements, effective management of current traffic flows (Peel Holdings has no regard whatsoever).

To a number of my specific points...

Traffic - has anyone from the Council actually travelled through Stockton Heath in the last few years? There is frequent grid lock and cars seek alternative routes around the back streets (rat runs) to avoid traffic lights, congestion and the impact of Peel Holdings opening their ancient bridges.

Road infrastructure - I see no argument whatsoever to do anything that increases traffic flows on existing roads that are at capacity, poorly maintained and have not been measurably improved for decades. The potholes and sunken drain covers are a disgrace and yet you believe this is adequate. Has anyone done the mental maths here? For every new house, there will be at least one more car on the local roads. How is that going to work exactly?

Rail infrastructure - I am both surprised and disappointed that the Council is not considering light rail schemes, for example, a link with the Manchester Metrolink system. If the Council is serious about a city status then infrastructure capacity needs to be at the top of the list. Otherwise, how will it attract the private investment that will surely be needed to provide the kind of services that residents will expect?

Furthermore, there are frequent issues on any of the motorways that surround Warrington. Where do drivers go when there is a problem? They drive through Stockton Heath amongst other routes. How will that be catered for in your plan?

Law enforcement - the Council has consistently demonstrated that it cannot/will not enforce the laws against litter. We all know drivers throw rubbish out of their cars and they do so because they can with no consequences on them. Cars frequently speed on stretches of roads that are clearly in urban areas. Again, they do it because they can. How will this be taken into account in your wonderful plan for the area?

Medical facilities - one main surgery in Stockton Heath is not sufficient. Travelling to and from will be ever more difficult because of the increased traffic congestion. This will inevitably disadvantage those who need the facilities the most. Warrington and Halton hospitals are already operating at capacity. How will they cope with the additional 55,000 residents over the next 20 years?

Planning assumptions - why is the Council proposing to build over 1000 new homes per annum in the South Warrington area when it freely admits that it doesn't actually need them. The amount of brownfield opportunities in Warrington is obvious to anyone driving through. The old railway infrastructure is still standing. This could be utilised for innovative transport developments (e.g. Light rail) that will take pressure of the existing roads and provide much needed people moving capacity.

I have focussed on the key points that challenge everything I have read about the plan for South Warrington. The area has already expanded at a rate beyond the capacity of the existing infrastructure, services and has exceeded the capability or desire of the Council to protect the environment.

I totally oppose the plan.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.A black rectangular redaction box covering the name of the sender.