

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: My Objection to the Local Plan - Winwick OS6
Date: 22 October 2021 14:43:13

Dear sir madam

I am writing to express my concern over the **Local plan OS6** for Winwick, Cheshire and to inform you that **I do not agree with your plan to build 130 new houses in Winwick.**

Please allow me to explain my reasoning.

As a resident of Winwick I am very aware of the volume of traffic that travels through our village, particularly along Parkside road and Golborne road. This is despite current hybrid working, home working and office workers having not fully returned to work due to Covid. Rush hour traffic significantly increases the amount of traffic that travels along these roads and every day we have 'back to back' vehicles queuing as they wait to exit onto the A49 in the mornings and in evenings. As a pedestrian this is noisy, there are increased vehicle fumes and it can be dangerous and difficult to cross over the road but as a cyclist it is very risky in these conditions, the roads in our village in my opinion wouldn't be able to cope with additional traffic if this plan was to go ahead. Adding 120 additional houses (not to mention the amount of extra vehicles and size of vehicles that would be used when constructing these houses) our village roads cannot cope with the additional traffic. This is clearly evident when we have road diversions or road closures in the local area (for example problems on the m6, A49, m62 & A580) which force a significant increase to the amount of traffic coming through the village causing tailbacks and congestion around our small roads. Most recently a weight restriction ban has been implemented on the arterial route A573 through Winwick yet on a daily basis i see that this is ignored as huge lorries continue to travel through the village without any regard for the restrictions. I can only imagine without any new routes available for this development road traffic will get worse in the village and we will be affected by the construction traffic & then the additional resident's vehicles..

The proposed location of the development can only have access and exit via a) Golborne road (A573) which is a busy highway as I mentioned above or b) waterworks lane - this is a rural lane that heads directly onto the A49 dual carriage way leading to the m6 motorway or directly into Myddleton road which would be severely affected by the additional volume of traffic, and it should be noted that this junction in waterworks lane is directly opposite a primary school which already suffers from congestion (parked vehicles and traffic using the lane to access the M6) at school opening and closing times already ...Both these routes will suffer as a result of the increased traffic. My concerns are increased further if your proposed plans to develop 75 new homes in Croft, policy OS1 & 200 new homes in Culcheth policy OS2 as Winwick's Myddleton road leads directly into those villages, further increasing the potential for increased traffic through the village.

Our village has limited facilities, we don't have a post office, there is no doctor's surgery, no chemist and just 1 local convenience store and 1 primary school (which I believe is over capacity) so how can the village infrastructure cope with additional residents and their individual family needs? the infrastructure is already lacking, so adding more demand will create greater pressure on our very limited resources.

Our village is very fortunate to be surrounded by greenbelt land, wildlife and nature. The village has historical importance and environmental assets, wildlife and agriculture and yet this plan takes no regard to safeguarding this greenbelt. Constructing a housing development would destroy agricultural

land and wildlife would be lost if it was replaced by housing development. Have you also considered the civil engineering challenge of moving the electrical pylon which sits in the middle of the field where you are proposing to make new houses in Winwick?

Golborne road is very susceptible to local flooding, roads side drains are often blocked, Myddleton lane and Parkside road are in disrepair so increased traffic would make the road surfaces deteriorate further and on days when we have heavy rain, given our high water table, existing traffic in our village is disrupted due to flooding again causing tail backs and blocked roads...so adding more traffic from this proposed development will only increase the problem...for example Green lane in Winwick is impassable when flooded, water blocks 1 lane of the A49 and cars and pedestrians cannot use the road further exacerbating the volume of traffic forced to use Parkside and Golborne road. Increased traffic will also increase the risk of accidents along Myddleton road as despite speed bumps and a 20mph speed limit, vehicles regularly speed without any regard for the restrictions.

Goldborne road and Parkside road by their very nature are rural roads. They're often used by large farming vehicles which undoubtedly (particularly at harvest time) increase the potential for accidents & traffic congestion. Due to their sheer size and speed any traffic moving along the A537 slows down to accomodate them if you increase the number of vehicles use the road from this housing development clearly the risks and congestion increase further.

This plan does not suggest a solution to reduce traffic in the village, it does not propose how it would increase facilities for all residents, it offers no solution to improve the road network or safeguard our greenbelt, our historical landmarks and our farmland and wildlife.

In my opinion this development is unjustified, it adds noise, pollution, increased traffic, congestion, construction vehicles to our village roads and surrounding area. It increases the risk to pedestrians and cyclists and put unconsidered pressure on the local facilities, our poorly maintained roads will require regular increased surface maintenance

I do not agree with this local plan and ask that the plan is stopped.

I look forward to your reply

Many thanks

Eamonn Kavanagh

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]