April 5 2012

Kathryn Powell,
Case Leader,
IPC,
Temple Quay House,
Temple Quay,
Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Ms Powell,

RE: A556 Link Road

I am a resident of Bucklow Hill near Knutsford , I am extremely concerned about the A556 Link Road and wish to be registered as an interested party.

I would like the following points to be considered:

1. **Unfair Consultation** The IPC require the HA to undertake "adequate public consultation". We believe this consultation to be unfair, does not meet the required standards set by IPC and is **not in the spirit of localism.**

- The Summary Document (SD) is, at best, **extremely misleading** in several respects; diagrams illustrate all Mere properties but do not acknowledge the homes to the West of the road; 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 IPC 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. We strongly suspect their consultation was only with the Mere community who persuaded them to move the road ***even further offline*** and to abandon their 2007 options in favour of the creation of Millington and Tabley Junctions. Clearly, they were successful.

- HA informed CBO that they would be contacting landowners and their representatives in advance of the public consultation. The principal landowner in Millington whose land will be most severely affected has never, to this date, been approached by HA.

- 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 our lives devastated when that traffic is driven through the heart of our communities. The scheme is being "sold" as desirable, again, for whom?

- Many people have expressed the view that the Options laid out in the SD are too numerous and too confusing.

2. **Millington Hall Lane to Chapel Lane Link Road**

- Extremely dangerous as the lanes are far too narrow to cope with the 2000-3000 cars **on average** per day which will be "fed" onto Chapel Lane, down Peacock Lane and on into High Legh. The junction will be yards from the most treacherous bend in the whole area and where the lane narrows to barely two cars wide.

- Jeremy Bloom and Mohammed Swapan both acknowledge that the lanes would be simply unable to cope with that level of traffic and have said that

if we ask them to remove the link road, they will. Why then does it appear on **all 4 Options?** Many of us selected Option Other because we were not presented with an Option which does not include this link road.

- The link road would not be necessary if the cuttings we were promised in 2007 were to be provided. Locals would continue to use Chapel Lane, Millington Hall Lane and Millington Lane as they have done for time immemorial passing over the new road in its cutting. The **removal of these cuttings is totally unacceptable** in terms of both vital local access to all amenities and environmental impact.

- 2000-3000 vehicles is an average estimate, locals know that when the M56 backs up beyond Junction 7, which it does on a weekly basis, and several times per week in poor weather, cars will exit at Millington Junction and use the lanes as a rat run. Gridlock and accidents are **guaranteed** and in icy conditions (which is most days in winter) some of these accidents could be fatal.

My husband and I travel down Peacock Lane eight times each day to see to our horse in Lymm, as well it not coping with an extra 2000- 3000 cars a day with the new junction, our end at Bucklow Hill will be cut off completely and we will have to travel the long way round on the link road in major traffic which will put an extra 20- 30 minutes on each journey.

Yours Sincerely ,

Carol Ross (MRS)