

IPC

- 7 MAR 2012

REF: _____

IPC

- 7 MAR 2012

REF: _____

Katherine Powell, Case Leader
Infrastructure Planning Commission
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN
24th February 2012
Ref A556 Road Scheme

Dear Ms Powell

Further to my letter dated 14th February, I would like to be kept informed of the progress and any developments in relation to the A556 road scheme.

Having investigated further I wish to register my further concerns and objections as I firmly believe this is a very **Unfair Consultation** particularly in view of the fact that the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) requires the Highways Agency to undertake an **“adequate public consultation”**

This consultation is very clearly flawed and is unfair, it does not meet the required standards as set by the IPC and it is certainly not in the Spirit of Localism.

The Highways Agency document which we were given, and described as “Improving the Environment” A556 “**Public Consultation Summary Document**” (PCSD) is **not just confusing, it is very misleading**. How can this be described as Improving the Environment?

The diagrams illustrate all of the properties at Mere but don't acknowledge the properties to the west of the road, and the numerous maps at the Public Exhibition confirm that **cuttings** were to be provided along the majority of the route (promised in 2007) which actually appear in the PCSD diagrams, **will not, actually** be, provided.

Despite the Highways Agency promising the public that they would “**minimise the Environmental impacts of the Scheme**”.

People who live elsewhere (non –locals) are actually being asked to complete the questionnaire which is based upon, **flawed and misleading information**, it leads people to believe that there will be little or no impact ,due to the lack of detail and what appear to be empty fields to the west of the road.

How can people and, the public make an informed decision?

They simply cannot without, having the correct information; therefore, the **IPC cannot consider the results shown in the questionnaires as representative due to the very misleading nature of the information provided.**

The following is even more distressing, the Highways Agency were required to deliver PCSD before the 23rd January 2012 when the public Consultation began, and in sufficient time to make people aware of the three exhibition dates.

There were six deposit locations one was as far away as Sandbach 20 miles distant yet they received their summary documents by Friday 30th January.

The deposit site for the people living the closest to the A556 and those most affected did not however receive their summary documents until 3.30 pm on

Friday 27th January a time when the majority of the pupils had already left the school this meant that the school were unable to distribute these documents so by the time they were distributed **the only weekend exhibition** for Saturday 28th January had passed and very little notice was available for the second exhibition of Tuesday 31st January.

The school were never even informed that they were to be a location for the distribution of the summary documents and did not even understand the purpose of the summary documents. Is this a fair and reasonable way to conduct such an important consultation?

Even more surprising was the statement from the Highways Agency that they put forward the “New Preferred Route” in 2010 as result of “Feedback “from **local residents and community groups in 2009?**

Who, exactly did they consult with? as from recent discussions and meetings with local residents and community groups in Millington, High Legh, Bucklow Hill, Hoo Green Hulseheath and Tabley, no one was, consulted perhaps, it was only the, Mere Community, who it would seem convinced the HA to **move the road even further offline and** completely abandon the 2007 options and to adopt the creation of junctions at Millington and Tabley.

The Highways Agency informed CBO that they would be contacting Landowners and their representatives in advance of the public consultation , yet the principal landowner in Millington whose land will be the most severely affected has never to date been approached by the Highways Agency ?

The attitude, language and the terminology used by the Highways Agency is **misleading and biased**, they now describe the scheme as “**Environmental Improvement**” yet this creates an Environmental Disaster for everyone including the Wildlife, West, of the A556, In his press release Mr Jeremy Bloom claims that “It will also improve life for people living along the existing route of the A55 by taking traffic away from local communities”, it improves life for only one community at least six other communities will have their lives

affected and devastated when the traffic is driven through the heart of these communities this scheme is being promoted and sold as a benefit who does it really benefit ?

The comments of most people regarding the options as laid out in the summary document are too numerous and far too confusing is this the intention?

The Millington Hall Lane to Chapel Lane link is a disaster waiting to happen the lanes are far too narrow to cope with the average of 2000 to 3000 vehicles per day which will be fed onto Chapel Lane, Peacock Lane and on into High Legh the junction will be yards away from the most dangerous bend in the whole area and where the lane is barely two cars wide, to this extent both Mr Jeremy Bloom and Mr Mohammed Swapan agree that the lanes would be unable to cope with the level of traffic and say that if they are asked to remove the link road they will do, so why does it appear on all **Four Options ?**. Most people selected the best option as "other" simply because we were not offered an option which doesn't include this link road.

~~This~~ link road would become unnecessary if the cuttings which we were promised in 2007 were actually provided local people would continue to use chapel lane, Millington hall lane and Millington Lane passing over the new road in its cutting, clearly the **removal of the cuttings** is totally unacceptable in terms of both the environmental impact and local access.

2000-3000 vehicles is an average estimate, people in the area are aware that when the M56 becomes congested beyond junction 7 which is a regular weekly occurrence and is even more frequently a daily occurrence in poor weather cars will exit at Millington Junction and use the lanes as a rat run chaos and **accidents are Guaranteed** and when the roads are icy which is most days during the winter some of these accidents could easily be fatal.

The road we are told will also have a 70 mph speed limit which reduces at the approach to the M56 roundabout to 50 mph that's assuming of course that the motorist pays attention and complies with the speed limit this could easily

become another accident black spot so why on earth don't the highway agency keep the traffic on the M6 and construct a sensible and better long term exit at Junction 20 of the M6 and control the amount of traffic which is allowed to exit onto the A556.

Yours Faithfully

H.P.Clough