

From: [REDACTED]
To: [External Email for Local Plans](#)
Subject: Proposed housing development Linthouse Lane WV11
Date: 17 December 2022 16:51:08

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 Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to the planned housing development of the land north of Linthouse Lane, Wolverhampton.

I have read the report and the Strategic Transport Assessment. I also attended the 'In-person Locality Session' on the 24th November. I object to the plans due to:

The loss of green open space

The loss of the greenbelt farmland will have a detrimental effect on the well-being of the residents of Wolverhampton. This amenity is needed for mental welfare. This was highlighted significantly during lockdown when residents needed the space for recreation and mental well-being. This green space also provides the natural lungs for the area – Wolverhampton does not have a lot of green spaces. Essington already has a country park.

Use of brownfield land first

This is the electoral pledge of Andy Street and the National Brownfield Institute, Jane Stevenson and Nathaniel Williams. This should be investigated further.

Significant increase in Traffic Congestion

3.3.3 and 3.3.12: State that Wood Hayes Road and Kitchen Lane are 30mph two-way roads. In the In-person Locality session we pointed out to the representatives that this is not the case – these roads have always been so narrow in parts that only one vehicle can pass at a time. The representative was not aware of this – a fact that was pointed out to South Staffordshire years ago! Therefore, this planned development will make the situation even worse. The lack of accurate data also questions the validity of the traffic study.

I also have doubts on the validity of the traffic congestion survey on Linthouse Lane during peak hours – how can this road cope with an extra 4000+ cars from 2,000 houses?

Increased traffic congestion will cause misery and inconvenience for all residents. Extra cars will also add to air pollution.

Overstretched public services of Wolverhampton

3.8.4 Is one primary school (460 places) really enough for 2000+ families? Will residents from the planned houses have to take up places in already overstretched Wolverhampton schools? Is that really fair for the residents of Wolverhampton?

3.8.5 There is no secondary school provision. Will the few Staffordshire secondary schools e.g. Cheslyn Hay, really have to increase their capacity for 2000+ families? Or again will the residents of the planned houses will have to try mainly Wolverhampton schools e.g. Wednesfield Academy and Coppice - again with no council contribution. Does this again highlight poor planning from Staffordshire Council?

3.8.10 The report references residents to using GP Griffiths Drive Surgery. This is already at overcapacity for Wolverhampton North residents.

Mitigating Proposal:

Why not move the planned 'country park' (P.49) to south of the railway line and put it on Linthouse Lane and move housing to north of the railway line? This will provide a green buffer zone between Wolverhampton and proposed housing development with enough space for housing.

Arguments for:

- Wolverhampton north residents still get use of green space to help mental welfare and recreation.
- Drainage facilities can be put in more naturally in the country park to protect north Wolverhampton from flooding e.g. to look like ponds and a natural permeable surface, rather than the artificial plans
- By not having houses north of Linthouse Lane it will prevent excess traffic congestion on Linthouse Lane, Kitchen Lane and Wood Hayes Road.
- The residents of Wolverhampton and the new residents will not see an urban development next to them as there will be a country park between them.
- Essington already has a country park and green spaces. Is it not fair if Wolverhampton should be compensated for the loss of beautiful farmland with a country park?

Yours faithfully

Joanne Gainey

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]