

[REDACTED]

To the Planning Policy Team,

I am writing to object to the local plan preferred development option July 2017. I have lived and worked in Warrington for [REDACTED] years and so I am very familiar with the area its attractions and its problems.

There are a number of grounds for my complaint but the most important one is congestion. South Warrington is very congested in the mornings and afternoons. Although one big problem is bottle necks created by need to bridge the Ship Canal, the town centre is also very congested. Even though there is a proposal to create another Ship Canal crossing, all this will do is to dump more traffic into Latchford and then Warrington which the town centre can't cope with. On many occasions there has been a problem with traffic flow on the M6 over the Thelwall viaduct. With the advent of sat nav, even those people who don't know the area can bypass the obstruction by going through Warrington, the route takes them up or down the Knutsford Road causing traffic standstill and misery for the residents of Grappenhall and Thelwall trying to get to work or get home. Recently (17th August) we had one of the worst incidents of this that I can remember in all the [REDACTED] years I have lived here. It was the first time I had ever seen queuing traffic on Weaste Lane. South Warrington was so gridlocked we had change the venue for a family celebration to one within walking distance. At 9:30pm there were still queues.

[REDACTED] I am well aware of the importance of keeping fit. The facilities in South Warrington are very poor. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The one good public facility that we do have is the Transpennine Trail and yet you are proposing to turn this into a road way? Why? [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] we encounter a lot of people on the way enjoying walking on Weaste Lane and sometimes heading for the Transpennine Trail to do a circular route. A new main road cutting through the area will put up a barrier for walkers, diminish the pleasure of walking in the area and so

the motivation for doing so and will remove the option of a popular circular route by eliminating the Trail back into Grappenhall as well as dividing communities.

A further concern I have [REDACTED] is provision of medical services. The local A&E has at times been unable to cope with the demands of the current population let alone the larger population which would have to be served if the development proposal goes ahead.

The area around Weaste Lane is very prone to flooding. There are frequently times when we cannot get anywhere without driving through a flooded stretch of road. The areas particularly prone to flooding include Cliff Lane under the Bridgewater canal, Weaste Lane just east of White Gate Farm, The west end of Weaste Lane, Half Acre Lane under the Bridgewater Canal and Massey Brook Lane where it comes into close proximity with the canal. Development of the area with houses and roads will make drainage problems significantly worse.

As well as creating housing in areas potentially prone to flooding, you are also proposing to build housing on land contaminated with Japanese knotweed. Are you and the developers aware of this? All the fields around our house and beyond have this plant which grows through concrete and renders properties uninsurable. The owner of the land around us comes around at intervals with a protective suit on and sprays the plants which makes them die back for a while then they regrow. There is no serious attempt to eliminate it but if building was proposed who would be responsible if new home owners had problems and wished to sue? Would it be those who let the land go for development or would it be the developers themselves? If the latter then in the interests of potential future residents of Warrington what steps have you proposed to ensure that the developers have dealt with this problem in accordance with the highest standards to make sure the problem is eliminated from proposed sites and not spread around the area via the wheels of the developers machinery?

As well as your proposal to tear apart the loveliest and most rural area of Warrington taking away the very reason why people want to live here you will be destroying the habitat for a lot of wildlife. Over the years we have had the pleasure of seeing foxes, deer, badgers, kestrels, buzzards, red legged partridges, jays, barn owls and pipistrelle bats. Your development plans will seriously disrupt this environment.

Finally, what benefit is there to Warrington in building many more new houses? Warrington is a dormitory. People like to live in South Warrington for reasons mentioned above but they often work elsewhere. This area is commuter belt for Manchester. Warrington's centre cannot wear the name "town" with pride never mind city. Golden square is a copy of high streets everywhere but without Marks and Spencer. It contains nothing original. The area outside Golden Square is dirty and shabby, it has no character and is not attractive. If Warrington is doing so well why

have so many businesses either failed or gone elsewhere? I would rather drive to Altrincham or Northwich than shop in Warrington. Norwich in particular has a lot of character, it has one of the few remaining wool shops in the area, an art shop a family butcher who does excellent pies and an independent department store. Warrington has none of these. If you build several thousand houses in South Warrington the occupants are likely to work elsewhere and shop elsewhere while putting an unwelcome further burden on already over stretched local services.

You promise to safeguard what is left of the green areas after development, safeguard them for what? Further development when it suits? If you refuse to protect what we have now it is unlikely that anyone will believe that you intend to protect any greenbelt areas in the future.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.