

From: [REDACTED]
To: [External Email for Local Plans](#)
Subject: Local Plan Publication Plan
Date: 23 December 2022 12:37:39

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION-THIS EMAIL WAS SENT FROM OUTSIDE THE COUNCIL. DONT OPEN LINKS OR ATTACHMENTS UNLESS YOURE SURE YOU CAN TRUST THIS SENDER!

Dear Local Plans Team,

Unfortunately I couldn't log in in time and as a consequence you will no doubt exclude my response to the Local Plan Consultation. However I would wish to reaffirm my comments in relation to the Consultation Plan with regards to the development north of Penkridge.

The focus on the policy in relation to this site focusses on the A449 whereas there are opportunities to create a new route across the Penk which would provide a safe and convenient route to the High school and Middle School reducing the propensity of local residents to drive their children too and from school. Hopefully the Neighbourhood Plan will be able to look at this in more detail.

Secondly I understand that Staffordshire County Council has submitted proposals for the creation of a "new village".to the west of Penkridge. I wish to make a number of critical points which may be of assistance in your response to this proposal.

- The railway line and M6 provide a defined boundary to the settlement of Penkridge
- The scale of development proposed will be incapable of delivering a long distributor road which would include two rail crossings and a river crossing. All of which are likely to be expensive. It's likely that major government funding will be needed to deliver the route and given the directness of the A449 it's difficult to see how this could be justified.
- The route of the distributor road is unlikely to prove attractive to any traffic travelling north and south on the A449 and would simply separate the new village to the west in a similar fashion to the A449 does now.
- The development will not deliver a bypass at the outset so the existing poor routes under and over the railway will have to be used in the interim. All off the routes are difficult to improve.
- If development does occur on land to the west of the Penk there is no distinct boundary.
- The development will be far in excess of the walking distance to the station and schools and as a consequence will generate a significant amount of east-west movement in a network that is constructed for movement east of the railway line.
- The roads in the settlement provide access to businesses and other localities so the proposal to down grade the A449 fails to take this into account. Large tractors, trailers and HGV pass through and the geometry of the A449 accommodates this. What is needed are more pedestrian crossings.

I can expand own these if needed as I have experience in the development and promotion of major highway schemes. I am also concerned that the County Council is acting both as your transport advisor in relation to the plan and is also promoting a development which revolves around the notional benefits of a bypass scheme. Isn't this a clear conflict of interest?

Thank you for your work on the Local Plan and I very much hope that the Neighbourhood Plan for Penkridge will provide greater local detail that can be picked up in future planning applications.

Regards

Peter Davenport. B.Eng, MICE MIHT

