




Dear Sir/Madam

Reference 'Call for Sites' responses - Croft Warrington R18/127

I am writing in response to the above submission and wish to register my objection to the proposals contained within the above document.

Croft village has around 871 households and within the last 2 years has seen the development of 25 new houses (3%) within the village. On the back of this, there were no changes/enhancements to the road network, which, beyond the main road connecting Winwick to Culcheth, through Croft, consists of predominantly country lanes and housing estates. In addition 25 affordable housing units have been built within the last 8 years (on the site of a former nursing home). I would estimate that Croft has therefore seen an increase of around 6% in its housing stock during that period.

The proposal is to increase in the number of dwellings in Croft by around 25%, on designated Green Belt, which in itself raises real cause for concern in terms of scale and loss of Green Belt land.

I am concerned that the proposals, whilst on the face of it are detailed, contain some material inaccuracies which additionally undermine the arguments for the development.

The proposals indicate that the 3 fields that are proposed to be developed, are used for agricultural purposes and the photographs within the report appear to support this. However, the area known as 'the Battlefield' has not been used for agricultural purposes for at least [REDACTED] years [REDACTED] and from talking with neighbours who have lived there for [REDACTED] years, it has never been used for agricultural purposes at all. Until 2015 the land consisted of a significant number of trees which were bulldozed by the owners in that year. The land is regularly used by dog-walkers, cyclists and horse riders, and could arguably be considered a community amenity.

The Turley report stipulates that the village is well-served by local amenities - since the report was presented, the local convenience store has closed and has a dearth of local amenities. Shops are only accessible by car or bus. There is a bus service which, from Warrington ceases before 7pm and from Leigh at 7.30pm. Undoubtedly therefore, an additional 200+ houses will significantly increase the traffic flow through the village. The proposed entrance/exit to the housing development opposite Christ Church, on Lady Lane, would require a significant reworking of the junction as the road is narrow and has a sharp bend at the planned egress from the development. The route through Chadwick Avenue would significantly increase traffic flow through Wadeson Way and Eaves Brow Road, and would also create an additional hazard as rush hour traffic would seek to exit on to New Lane from Eaves Brow Rd, at a point where a number of School buses pick

up and drop off (Culcheth High School and Winstanley College). New Lane is increasingly busy with much of the traffic ignoring the 30mph speed limit.

The report indicates that the new houses would have pleasing views of green spaces - whilst at the same time closing off the views of existing properties, hardly a fair exchange for those residents who have lived in Croft and supported the community, in many cases for many, many years.

With regards to claims that the Health & Wellbeing of residents of Croft will be enhanced through the provision of new footpaths and cycle paths, there are already numerous public footpaths (including across the land in question from Lady Lane to Abbey Close) and walkways - another 300+ cars will hardly 'enhance Health & Wellbeing'. I would also question how developing the land will reduce crime, disorder and the fear of crime. For those residents who will be adjoining the new houses, the accessibility to the rear of their properties will be enhanced thereby increasing the fear of crime.

Whilst the main body of the report indicates there are 2 schools in Croft (which is correct), the Spacial Distribution Analysis indicates there is only 1 school (another inaccuracy).

I think the above demonstrates that the scale and location of these proposals are flawed. I am sure the Council will receive a significant number of objections to this and additional proposals for developments in Croft - and many of the arguments I have made are applicable to those proposals too. In that respect it is interesting that the land that this proposal appears to designate as a wooded wildlife area is actually the subject of a separate development proposal (R18/115).

Notwithstanding the fundamental objections for the reasons stated, the lack of attention to detail in respect of the area knowledge provides a real cause for concern that the developer will pay little heed to the wishes of the residents of Croft (who currently make a significant Council Tax contribution) in creating a scheme that is sympathetic to the existing village culture of Croft.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.