

From: Peter Marsland [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2012 3:47 PM
To: Kathryn Powell
Subject: Proposed A556 ByPass

Dear M/s Powell,

Please find attached letter which is self explanatory.

Thanking you in advance of your kind help in this matter.

With very best regards,


Peter Marsland

This email was received from the INTERNET and scanned by the Government Secure Intranet anti-virus service supplied by Cable&Wireless Worldwide in partnership with MessageLabs. (CCTM Certificate Number 2009/09/0052.) In case of problems, please call your organisation's IT Helpdesk.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.

Correspondents should note that all communications to Department for Communities and Local Government may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for lawful purposes.

M/s Kathryn Powell,
Senior Case Manager,
The Planning Inspectorate,
3/20 Eagle Wing,
Temple Quay House,
2, The Square,
Bristol BS2 6PN



25th.October 2012

A556 Knutsford – Bowden Environmental Improvement Scheme.

Dear M/s Powell,

I feel that I **must** write to you most strongly regarding **Unfair Consultation** on the above proposed road destroying our beautiful countryside.

Regarding the “adequate public consultation” undertaken by the Highways Agency, I believe the consultation to be unfair, does not meet the required standards set by National Infrastructure Directorate (NID) and is not in the spirit of localism.

The Summary Document (SD) is, at best, extremely misleading in several respects; diagrams illustrate all properties to the east of the road but do not acknowledge any of the homes to the West; The maps at the Public Exhibition confirm that cuttings to be provided along the majority of the route (promised in 2007), which appear in the SD diagrams, will actually **not** be provided after all, despite the HA’s assurances to the public that they intend to “minimise the environmental impacts of the scheme”; Non-locals are being asked to complete a questionnaire based on flawed and misleading information, believing the scheme to have little or no impact since there appears to be little more than empty fields to the West of the road. The public cannot possibly make an informed decision and therefore NID cannot consider the results of the questionnaires.

- HA were required to deliver Summary Documents before 23rd January when the public consultation began, and in time to alert people to the three exhibition dates. There were six Deposit Locations, one as far away as Sandbach (15-20 miles), all received their SDs by Friday 20th Jan. Little Bollington School was the deposit for people living closest to the A556, they did not receive their SDs until 3.30pm on Friday 27th Jan, when most of the children had already left and the school were unable to distribute them. By the time they were sent out, the **only weekend exhibition** (Sat. 28th) had passed and very little notice was given for the second exhibition on Tues 31st. The school were never even told that they were to be a Deposit Location and did not know what the documents were.
- HA state they put forward the new “Preferred Route” in 2010 as a result of “feedback from local residents and community groups” in 2009. Who, exactly did they consult with? We are unaware of anyone in Millington, High Legh, Bucklow Hill, Hoo Green, Hulseheath or Tabley who were consulted.
- HA’s language, attitude and terminology are **biased and misleading**. The latest incarnation of the scheme is termed “Environmental Improvement” although this spells environmental disaster for everyone West of the A556. In a press release Jeremy Bloom states “It will also improve life for people living along the existing route of the A556, by taking traffic away from local communities.” It only improves the lives of **one** community, at least **six communities** will have their lives devastated when that traffic is driven through the heart of their communities.

Many people have expressed the view that the Options laid out in the SD are too numerous and too confusing. The Highways Agency put forward 4 different junction options and, within 3 of these options, there were 3 sub options. The public were therefore being asked to consider and express a preference for one of 10 possible options. I believe this was unnecessarily complicated and that it is impossible for respondents to know which combination of options would best suit them and their neighbours. This is particularly distressing to some of our elderly residents, as they are making decisions which they know will divide them from their oldest friends and neighbours, they feel the community is already being severed. HA are seeking to divide and conquer.

Finally. I trust that you give this matter your attention and undertake any necessary action to remedy this apparent injustice.

Yours Sincerely,

Peter Marsland

C.C. Mr.K.Melling & Mr.M.Jones both Cheshire East