

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Sirs

Further to receipt of the Focus leaflet received last week, and having attended the consultation meeting in Lymm on the 22nd August I write to express my concern and out right objection with regards to the proposed developments in South Warrington and in particular the proposed new road utilising the old Manchester Ship Canal Railway Bridge.

Having read Warrington Borough Councils (Preferred Development Option) in full, I feel that Warrington Borough Council have not given this proposal detailed consideration and long term strategy for the wellbeing of its residents.

This plan takes no account of environmental matters, Carbon Footprint reduction and Climate change. It appears from the plan that there is an aspiration and focus on Warrington becoming a New City over the next 20 years. I would ask at what point the residents of Warrington have been consulted on this, as I believe like me the majority of us live here because we don't want to live in a city like Liverpool, Manchester or Salford.

However we do want a town that is prosperous, and an environment that is health and attractive to live in. There are comments throughout the PDO making reference to the Fiddlers Ferry site, but advises that this site is currently not included in the plan as the remaining life of Fiddlers Ferry is unknown. Any research into this would show that the government is committed to decommissioning all Coal Fired Power Stations by 2025. Information also advises that SSE have been running at a massive loss for several years. Its current contracts run out in 2019 and that would be a prime time for decommissioning.

The redevelopment of the Fiddlers Ferry site must be considered paramount within this PDO prior to the acquisition and removal of any green belt land. This PDO suggests that green belt is the only option however Warrington has many Brown field sites begging for redevelopment.

Understanding the future demand for housing at what point has WBC taken into account that there is a natural churn on existing properties, this is not mentioned anywhere in the tables displayed. Additionally the points below should be considered

- Increased noise pollution levels aside from those already from the viaduct.
- Air pollution (Thelwall already has poor levels).
- Loss of greenbelt
- Loss of wildlife
- Potential flood risk from additional houses / roads (Thelwall is already on a flood plain)

- Negative impact to country walks including the Trans Pennine Trail, a beautiful walk/cycle path which is used by many local residents for healthy pursuits such as walking, cycling etc. and the Bridgewater Canal also full of historic listed bridges.

I would also request clarification with regards to the following

- How much of the carriageway is to be high level?
- Are the proposed carriageways single or dual?
- Are the proposed houses at Thelwall Heys to be affordable? If so price range?
- What provision is being made for additional drainage of surface water?
- What consideration has been given to residents who's property has been devalued due to the proposed roads
- Do we need crossings over the Manchester Ship Canal in such close proximity to residential property, would it not be more beneficial to place the crossing at Woolston to the east alongside the M6, or is this a cost issue to utilise the old railway bridge, but at the detriment of the Thelwall and Grappenhall villages?
- Why when the Village Development Plan for Thelwall states “The preservation and protection of Thelwall Heys is without doubt the most important issue affecting both communities and it is essential for it to be designated as Green Belt. It should also be formally recorded in the Unitary Development Plan as an Area of Local Landscape Value” would Local Parish Council recommendations be ignored and the green belt built on?
- The Village Development Plan also states “The extensive matrix of footpaths throughout the parish provides valuable access to the industrial heritage and varied ecology of the area. The Bridgewater Canal and the Trans Pennine Trail have created linear recreational arteries and wildlife corridors linking the two villages Existing public and permissive rights of way must be maintained, and where possible extended and enhanced, to ensure that they can continue to be enjoyed by future generations” why then would a roadway be implemented which would have a negative effect?
- Has the property which becomes available due to an ageing population been offset against the new build requirement? If so please advise where this shown in the calculation.
- Shouldn't we be promoting British farming rather than selling off land in particular with the imminence of Brexit?

I trust my concerns above will be in taken into account with regards to the current proposal and look forward to your response regards to my request for clarification.

Yours faithfully

