

[REDACTED]

**REF: Local Plan R18/127 & 115, Parcel CR4 SHLAA Ref 15231**

Dear Sirs,

I wish to formally object to the above proposals, including the development proposed by Peel Holdings to develop the land adjacent to Lady Lane Croft and the associated land included in and as detailed in the above parcel. The building of an additional 220 houses in such a small village is totally unacceptable. The development plan only calls for up to 60 houses.

I specifically object for the following:-

**1. Greenbelt**

- a. The land is in Green Belt but maintained as "agricultural land" and presumably funded as such under EU Regulations. Therefore, conversion of agricultural land to development land would be a departure from long standing policy, and should only be allowed in very exceptional cases.
- b. The residents of [REDACTED] Croft, have been reassured by the Principal Policy and Strategy officer in 2011 in a letter responding to concerns re the Development Plan at the time:  
"This proposes to protect the Green Belt in its existing form until at least 2032 with sound reasoning as to why (and strong political and community support to do so) as well as evidence to suggest Green Belt land is not needed to meet our development needs. Whilst this does not prevent speculative applications on sites argued on the basis of very special circumstance it set out a very clear presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt."
- c. Building on this land would be a significant loss of Greenbelt, open landscape, ancient woodland, woodland wildlife habitats and rural character. It would only be for commercial gain of developers and would be to the detriment of the local environment

**2. Road / traffic**

- a. The road network in and around Croft cannot sustain the existing traffic volumes, the Peel proposal is for 220 houses is totally unacceptable, particularly when the plan only requires a further 60 houses in Croft

- b. The road network is very rural in places. It is impossible for 2 busses to pass each other in the centre of the village without mounting the pavement and several of the route into the village are categorised as “red routes” with higher than average collisions
- c. None of the proposed access routes into the development are wide enough to take increased traffic volume, particularly construction traffic. The roads on the existing housing estates are classed as 20mph. Any additional traffic would seriously undermine the safety of the residents and small children playing in the area.
- d. [REDACTED] the majority of the residents live in this road for that reason. Any development and proposal to join this road to the proposed link road would undermine the existing rural charm of this road
- e. 220 additional houses would realistically bring in and additional 500 cars to the village, the road network cannot sustain this growth
- f. Croft village is very busy during the morning and evening commuter periods, the addition of 500 extra cars would only exaggerate this issue and it is already difficult to get out of the housing estate side roads onto the main roads in a morning due to commuter traffic
- g. The health and safety exposure of the children walking to the local schools would be vastly increased, this is not acceptable. Pavements are very narrow in places
- h. The bend on Lady Lane adjacent to the Parish Church is dangerous and there have been numerous incidents on this stretch of road; one recently with the farmer managing the land for Peel Holding. This is the same location that Peel are proposing to locate an access route. This is totally unacceptable and dangerous.

### **3. Village amenities and facilities**

- a. Croft village suffers from lack on local amenities. It has 3 pubs and a picture framing shop and 2 schools which are both full.
- b. The peel holdings proposal suggests that Croft has good facilities but in fact there is no shop, post office, bank doctors and dentists, or any other critical amenities. These services can only be accessed in Culcheth and Birchwood
- c. The bus service is infrequent and run for limited hours, therefore the only way to access surrounding services is by car, thus increasing the burden on the already overburdened road network
- d. There are 2 primary schools in Croft. The community primary school was 21 pupils oversubscribed last year. Where are the children from the 220 news houses going to be educated? All schools in the area are usually oversubscribed.

### **4. Environment and sustainability**

- a. The Peel proposal, section 5 part 1, suggests that the existing trees, hedge rows and ditches will be preserved. I cannot believe this. Peel Holding started to remove the existing trees on the field adjacent to Lady Lane / Chadwick Avenue in March 2015. They have already removed in excess of 100 mature trees with no impact assessment regarding nesting birds and other habitats. They removed them with excavator buckets and chains with no regard to the damage they were causing. Many of the tress were 200 year old oak trees.
- b. This site has been “groomed” for the last 2 years for development, but both Peel and Mr Paul Taylor have vigorously denied this. Trees, shrubs and hedgerows have been removed. We were informed the field was to be used for sheep but no sheep have appeared and the field is open and unfenced
- c. The addition of approximately 500 additional cars will bring increased noise, pollution and damage to the existing wildlife. Owls and bats are currently present on the field and these would certainly leave and never return if the site is developed.

**5. Crime and security**

- a. Peel holdings submission, page 22 under Health and wellbeing, suggests that building the 220 new homes will help with crime in the area. I fail to see how this is possible. If you look at Winwick Park and Chapelford Village, crime is out of control.
- b. Surely anyone with an ounce of common sense will appreciate that building 220 premium new houses will attract and increase crime! The local police have recently been quoted as saying that the close proximity of Croft and Culcheth to motorways and the East Lancs Road make it a prime target for criminals

**6. Consultation**

- a. The general consultation process for the proposed local plan has been poor and inadequate. The council exhibitions in July 2017 were limited. There was no specific exhibition in Croft.
- b. The deadline for responses was initially very short. Even the extended deadline is unacceptable and still very short, not leaving enough time for comprehensive responses
- c. It is clear that these proposals are well advanced. The ability of local residents to have a meaningful input is limited. Who decided that Warrington wants to go for city status? I certainly didn't.

I strongly object to these development proposals and would like to be kept informed as the decision making process progresses. Please could you confirm receipt of this objection?

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]