

Subject Ref :- R18/127&115 Parcel CR4 SHLAA Ref 15231

Please consider the following items in objection to the proposed release of Green Belt land as proposed by Peel Holdings at Lady Lane, Croft.

Fundamentally the proposal requires the 're-draw' of Green Belt Boundaries to provide the potential for the re-development of the site. The statement and information provided by Peel states that the 're-draw' of Green Belt boundaries should be undertaken in this instance as it questions the sites contribution to the Green Belt. Whilst the site is identified as a single 'parcel' of land it is entirely distinguished as part of the Green Belt as it adjoins the wider Green Belt on its East boundary (Lady lane). The identity of the Green Belt is that it is constructed not only of large patches of land but also through smaller parcels which aid in breaking up urbanised areas. Whilst the site at Lady Lane can be seen as enclosed by roads this is insufficient in distinguishing it from the greater surrounding Green Belt. Peel refer to 'genuinely durable' Green Belt Boundaries. This argument lacks all substance as Green Belt boundaries by their nature are informal and natural in their layout. Parcels of land such as this define the Green Belt and rural settlements.

- Such a release of this land from the Green Belt would cause significant harm to the character of the village of Croft. Croft is a small rural village composed of historic farmsteads and post war residential developments. The release of the land proposed by Peel would fundamentally alter the character of Croft which would see the village triple in size. This is wholly inappropriate and unsustainable.

- Any Re-Draw of the Green Belt boundaries should be undertaken through full scrutiny and due care, with the intention of enhancing rural settings. The statement by Peel is developer biased and should not be considered without non-biased consultation which meets all the ecological and NPPF criteria.

- A principal concern regarding any proposed development to the site would be impact on transport and local facilities. Croft is not by any means a large rural village and lacks basic public amenities, such as local shops, libraries and doctors etc. The NPPF classifies these as vital public amenities. As such, any new residential development would see the entire new population wholly reliant on transport to neighbouring villages/towns such as Warrington, Leigh and Culcheth. Croft therefore cannot be considered as a sustainable location for such development.

- Lady Lane is a small rural route which simply links two capillary rural routes (Mustard Lane and New/Cross Lane). Both Mustard Lane and New/Cross Lane are not major travel routes and the increased strain from the Lady Lane development would place additional strain on these routes also. The proposed development would directly impact the vehicular use of Lady lane. Lady Lane has a single pavement on side of the road, is often used by cyclists and for equestrian purposes. The increased traffic due to the proposed development would place an incredible strain on Lady Lane and will likely cause notable safety concerns for the existing road users and pedestrians. Furthermore, whilst the M6 motorway junction is located 3km from the site the quickest/most likely to be used route through Croft and Kenyon along Heath Lane and Sandy Croft Lane are through small rural

areas and along narrow rural roads, wholly inadequate for heavy traffic to the motorway junction.

- Croft is accessible via a single bus route (no.19) which operates every 30min during the working day and every hour after 7pm and on Sundays, with no service after 10:30pm. For the proposed increase in dwellings this is wholly inadequate and will most likely result in almost all of the new residents entirely reliant on private vehicle to access local amenities (as there are none in Croft), schools and places of work. This is contrary to the principal policies of the NPPF which place great emphasis on sustainable rural development.

Ultimately, the site is wholly unsustainable for the proposed development. It lacks the necessary public amenities and transport, and would entirely reliant on the existing roads which are grossly inadequate for the scale of development.

Regards

[Redacted]

