

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

For the attention of the case officer

Dear sir/madam

Reference:

https://www.warrington.gov.uk/info/201368/local_plan_review/2274/local_plan_review

Croft development areas including R18/129, R18/115, R18/127, R18/155

Proposed erection of hundreds of houses on green belt land in and surrounding the village of Croft.

I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the development of these houses in this location.

Croft is a dispersed settlement where development proposals should be considered very carefully: infilling could ruin the character of the village while estate development would overwhelm it. The proposals would more than double the size of the village. The protection of Crofts visual, historic and archaeological qualities is also supported by paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. So far very little detail has been expressed and unless conditions are carefully agreed prior to granting the site development permission the 'suggested' use could be exploited to the severe detriment of the village and community.

Furthermore, there is no need for this kind of open market housing in the village. Warrington has more than five years' supply of housing land to meet the requirements of its emerging Local Plan's policy H1.

The council's decision not to pursue the development of the brownfield land at Fiddlers Ferry power station is a missed opportunity for job creation and housing development. Given both the International and government drive and the very real need to move towards renewable energy it would make economical and political sense to close the power station and move to renewable energy resources. With the increase in electrical cars demand for electricity will rise steeply. These demands must be met with renewable energy otherwise we are simply moving the pollution from one area to another.

Another option could be with the scale of development being proposed at R18/129, that a land gap between croft and a new development could be maintained as is already in existence between Croft and Culcheth. Although only small this gap allows both Croft and Culcheth to feel very separate

whilst being geographically very close. This would allow for the creation of a new settlement which would not then harm the village community of Croft. (The proposal already allowed for the creation of a new primary school and this would allow for clear boundaries to be maintained.)

In reference to the development of the land at the site R18/155, R18/115 and R18/127 I am concerned that no analysis has been made of the flood risk this would create as there would be increased water runoff and the land here is already susceptible to flooding and the introduction of non-porous surfaces and buildings will increase this. If building was to move ahead here guarantees of flood defence and management must be in place along with the contractors taking out indemnity so damage to existing properties due to future flooding would be covered by their policies. There would also be increased flood risk for the surrounding farm land damaging their business. The Peal deal identifies that there should be understanding of the impact that their proposed development would have and yet there is no mention of, or assessment of this risk.

In addition to this the development at R18/155, R18/115 and R18/127 has roads leading through already built up areas where the speed limit is 20mph. These roads will increase the traffic running through these built up areas. I am very concerned that this would lead to a greater chance of children being knocked down by this increased flow of traffic. It would be far more preferential and safer if the traffic from these sites was directed to Lady lane where they would be joining a 30mph limit road with access to the two main roads through Croft without putting children at risk.

The land at R18/155, R18/115 and R18/127 has been used extensively by villagers without prohibition since the 1970s and locals talk about football matches played out across the battlefields. I believe the village has acquired the right to access now and that before any further discussion about development takes place, this claim should be properly investigated. I believe that the development of this land and the sudden and recent attempts to block it off is a belated attempt to claim back this right from the village, so that they can start to develop it.

In the Peal deal they claim that there are a range of shops, services and facilities. This is a blatant lie, and suggesting that Croft has the sort of facilities to service a large town is misleading. All villagers would have to travel even for the most minor item and this will lead to increased traffic. They also mention the bus services that run through Croft. These buses are not frequent and so it is unlikely that many residents would use them for their commute; therefore their existence is of very little relevance to their consideration as a service for the village.

If this application is to be decided by councillors, please take this as notice that I would like to speak at the meeting of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let us know as soon as possible the date of the meeting.

Finally, please note that our submission is in respect of the proposed development. While we have taken every effort to present accurate information for your consideration, as we are not a decision maker or statutory consultee, we cannot accept any responsibility for unintentional errors or omissions and you should satisfy yourselves on any facts before reaching your decision.

Yours Faithfully

