

RO2038

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 18:40
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello

Please take this as confirmation that I support the comments made by RAFFD and GRAG.

My details are

Emma Nodwell
7 Ledger Road
Haydock
WA11 0DZ

Sent from my iPhone

RO2039

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 19:35
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Ecra with windle

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I Amanda O'Neill, 6 Sadlers lane, st helens wa11 7ht endorse the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA. It is completely unacceptable and unnecessary that building on green belt land should be permitted. Especially as st helens has numerous brownfield sites available. It is also apparent that the site 8HS is extremely important for wildlife and also for the mental health wellbeing of the residents of st helens that recreationally use the permitted footpaths.

Amanda O'Neill

Sent from my Galaxy

RO2040

[REDACTED]

From: Liam Waine [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 20:06
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: ECRA - Windle, St. Helens

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi,

I am Liam Waine from 5 Sadlers Lane, St. Helens, Merseyside, WA11 7HT.

I support the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA.

It is totally unacceptable to be taking more greenbelt land from St. Helens. There is more than plenty brownbelt land to go at for 20+ years from now. The greenbelt land is not only beautiful but is a necessity for the residents of this area who use the public footpaths for many reasons but the main being mental health. The number of people contacting the NHS seeking help for mental health problems is now at a record high.

Before we know it, there won't be a single piece of grass left in St. Helens because every field will be full of new build houses or trading estates.

Liam Waine.

RO2041

[REDACTED]

From: Callum Waine [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 20:54
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Re: ECRA - Windle, St. Helens

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Furthermore, the reason I am writing this from Chorley is that I often visit the Windle area due to having a lot of family in the area, where we enjoy the countryside walks.

Callum

From: Callum Waine
Sent: 11 January 2022 20:25
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk <planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk>
Subject: ECRA - Windle, St. Helens

Hi,

I am Callum Waine from 4 The Bowers, Chorley, PR7 3LA

I support the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA.

One of the many disadvantages of developing on the green belt land is the irreversible loss of open countryside and the negative environmental, social and ecological impact of doing so, when there is plenty of brown belt sites to develop on.

Before we know it, there won't be a single piece of countryside left in St. Helens because every field will be full of new build houses or trading estates and the issues this will cause cannot be undone.

Callum Waine.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

RO2042

[REDACTED]

From: Gemma Brennan [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 20:46
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: ECRA - Windle, ST.Helens

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello

I am writing to support the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA.

It is totally unacceptable to be taking more greenbelt land from St. Helens. There is more than plenty brown-belt land, without having to destroy our greenbelt. The greenbelt land is not only beautiful, but is a necessity for the people of St Helens for both health and wellbeing and also wildlife and habitats. It is also of a great importance for the sustainability of our environment, reducing carbon and climate change. Reducing our green spaces and greenbelt land will not solve the housing crisis and frankly is only a way of generating more money for developers at the expense of our greenbelt. These irreversible actions will be consequential and will carry momentum for our future.

I hope this email will be carefully considered.

Kind regards,
Gemma Brennan

RO2043

[REDACTED]

From: Laura Parkinson [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 21:08
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Bold & Clockface Action Group

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

Please accept my notification of support and endorsement of objection with regard to proposed developments and future projects that include modification to green belt land within the Bold and Clockface locations.

As part of public consultation I wish to have this notification lodged and recorded as an objection to the proposed developments.

I hereby give notification and support to the report produced and submitted on behalf of the Bold & Clockface Action Group,

Regards

Laura Parkinson

Sent from my iPhone

RO2044

[REDACTED]

From: Freda Hayes [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 21:34
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Local plan Main Modification Consultation MM011 ECRA with Windle - 8HS

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Councillor Baines

I support the proposals by Ecra with Windle 100%. [REDACTED] I have full knowledge of the area [REDACTED] It is ludicrous to even think about building on Eccleston land (8HS) having witnessed the flooding that has occurred. There is proof of various wildlife appearing on the land not to mention the enjoyment of the residents in being able to walk round our country side during the last two years, a point praised by Councillor Baines in one of his weekly reports last summer in the Star. It was stated in Parliament last year that no building was to take place on green belt until all brownfield sites had been exhausted. I understand that there is sufficient brownfield for St Helens Housing needs already and no doubt with businesses closing down at a steady pace there will be more. Also the road structure is totally inadequate to take any more traffic. It is almost impossible to get out onto Bleakhill Road during peak times. Houghtons Lane cannot possibly be considered a suitable road for anymore traffic. I agree entirely with all the points raised in Ecra's submission legal and otherwise. It is imperative St Helens Council listen to the residents of St Helens if they want a decent town and surrounds for future generations.

Freda Hayes
20 Stuart Road
Windle

Sent from my iPhone

RO2045

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 January 2022 22:02
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like to make it clear that I fully support the comments made by RAFD and GRAG.

Stephen Brisco
104 Hamilton Road
Garswood
WN4 0UE

Sent from my iPad

RO2046

[REDACTED]

From: Iain Bell [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2022 07:47
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Re: Local Plan Modifications

I wish it to be noted that I fully support the comments & submissions made by RAFFD and GRAG with regard to the Local Plan Modifications.

In particular I would endorse their comments with regard to Housing Land Allocation Ref: MM101; the waiting list for medical care – currently over six months at Garswood Medical Centre and the effect of substantially greater traffic volumes on roads that were never constructed with those densities in mind.

Iain Bell
14 Darvel Avenue
Garswood
WN4 0UA

[REDACTED]

RO2047

[REDACTED]

From: Marlene Atherton [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2022 09:27
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Supporting Plans made by RAFFD AND GRAG. MARLENE ATHERTON 53 STATION ROAD WN40SD.

RO2048

[REDACTED]

From: Emma Van Der Burg [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2022 09:33
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam

I am submitting my support of the comments submitted by RAFFD and GRAG regarding the Local Plan.

Regards

Emma van der Burg
3 Peach Grove
Haydock
WA11 0GB

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

RO2049

[REDACTED]

From: Angela Cooper [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2022 10:10
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear sir
This e-mail is to confirm that I
Angela Cooper of
38 Avery Road
Haydock
WA11 0XA
support the statement produced by RAFFD and GRAG.

Regards
Angela Cooper

RO2050

[REDACTED]

From: Andrea Astbury <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 10:15
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan Modifications Consultation
Attachments: representation-form-final (1).docx

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam,

in response to the consultation that is currently live for the Local Plan Modifications, please find attached my response

Kind regards
Andrea Astbury



**St Helens Borough Local Plan 2020-2035 (Submission Draft)
Proposed Main Modifications Consultation
Response Form**

Ref:

(For official use only)

Please ensure the form is returned to us **by no later than 5pm on Thursday 13th January 2022**. Any comments received after this deadline cannot be accepted.

This form has two parts;

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your Representation(s).

PART A – YOUR DETAILS

Please note that you must complete Parts A and B of this form.

1. Your Details	2. Your Agent's Details (if applicable) (we will correspond via your agent)
Title: Mrs	Title:
First Name: Andrea	First name:
Last Name: Astbury	Last Name:
Organisation/company: N/A	Organisation/company:
Address: 43 Tatton Way Eccleston St Helens Postcode: WA10 5AA	Address: Postcode:
Tel No:	Tel No:
Mobile No: [REDACTED]	Mobile No:
Email: [REDACTED]	Email:

Signature: [REDACTED]	Date: 12/01/2022
------------------------------	-------------------------

Please be aware that anonymous forms cannot be accepted and that in order for your comments to be considered you **MUST** include your details above.

3. Would you like to be kept updated of future stages of the St Helens Borough Local Plan 2020-2035? (Namely publication of the Inspectors' recommendations in their Final Report and then adoption of the Plan)

Yes (Via Email)

No

Please note - e-mail is the Council's preferred method of communication. If no e-mail address is provided, we will contact you by your postal address.

RETURN DETAILS

Please return your completed form to us **by no later than 5pm on Thursday 13th January 2022** by:

post to: **Freepost LOCAL PLAN,
St Helens Borough Council,
St. Helens Town Hall,
Victoria Square,
St Helens,
WA10 1HP**

or e-mail to: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk

Please note we are unable to accept faxed copies of this form.

FURTHER INFORMATION

If you need assistance, you can contact us via:

Email: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Telephone: 01744 676190

NEXT STEPS

All representations received within the representations period, will be passed on to the appointed Local Plan Inspectors, who will consider and use them to inform their final conclusions on the Local Plan Examination.

DATA PROTECTION

Please note that all representations received within the consultation period will be made public and passed on to the Planning Inspectors. This will include the names and addresses of representors being made public, although other personal details will remain confidential. Further clarity on this is available on the Local Plan Privacy Notice available on the Local Plan webpage (address below). The Council is unable to accept anonymous or confidential representations.

We process personal data as part of our public task to prepare a Local Plan, and will retain this in line with our Information and Records Management Policy. For more information on what we do and on your rights please see the data protection information on our website at www.sthelens.gov.uk/localplan.

Now please complete PART B of this form, setting out your representation/comment.

Please use a separate copy of Part B for each separate comment/representation.

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION

Please use a separate form Part B for each representation, and supply together with Part A so we know who has made the comment.

4. Which Main Modification does this representation relate to?

Main Modification Reference Number | **MM**

5a. Do you consider that this proposed Main Modification is legally compliant?

Yes

No

Please tick as appropriate

5b. Do you consider that this proposed Main Modification is 'sound' (in accordance with the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework)?

Yes

No

Please tick as appropriate

6. Please provide a reason for your response to questions 5a and 5b above.

I support the findings of the responses to the consultation submitted by Eccleston Community residents Association with Windle (ECRA) January 2022 and the assessment against the plan made by St Helens Green Belt Association.

It is vital that local wildlife is protected for both current and future generations and that we avoid creating an urban sprawl across our countryside. Protecting our countryside is paramount to maintaining the health and wellbeing of the current residents of the St Helens area – both in terms of improving air quality and supporting mental wellbeing. Being able to walk in and around Eccleston countryside during the pandemic was important to both myself and many other locals; as demonstrated by the number of walkers you can see in and around the area at any given time. Being responsible for the public health of its residents, I urge the council to take the factors of mental wellbeing and air quality into due regard. St Helens experiences high rates of both respiratory disease and mental health prevalence when compared to the England average, both of which contribute to our low life expectancy. The pandemic has made some of the most deprived boroughs even more susceptible to poor health outcomes, so it is vital that the council consider health in all policy decisions in order to try and mitigate this impact.

St Helens has a huge amount of Brownfield sites which do not seem to have been adequately assessed for development despite there being regional funds available to undertake this work. Without proper consideration to the development/improvement of the many thousands of brownfield sites across the town, we will find ourselves shackled to an industrial past in a futile attempt to create a better future. You cannot create a better future without addressing the legacy issues we have in St Helens. We must shift away from attempting to hit short-term targets and create a more strategic and holistic approach to the regeneration, and protection of the borough.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify the representation.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete and return this response form.
Please keep a copy for future reference.**

RO2051

[REDACTED]

From: Lynn Frod <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 10:23
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

In respect of the proposed building plan at Florida Farm South, I would like to state that I agree with the comments made by Residents against the Florida Farm Developments and Garswood Residents Action Group in respect of the Local Plan.

Mrs Lynn Frodsham
8 Springfield Park
Haydock
St. helens
WA11 0XR

Sent from my iPad

RO2052

[REDACTED]

From: Colin Marsh <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 10:37
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern ,

My name is Colin Marsh and I live at 58 Avondale Rd , Haydock , WA11 0HJ.

I strongly object to the proposed building of houses on Florida Farm , the infrastructure around Haydock will not cope with the added people and cars in the area , Drs surgeries, schools are already full without this added pressure , the destruction of green belt will seriously damage the environment for wildlife , there are far more suitable sites for this type of development.

I support comments made by RAFFD and GRAG.

Thanks Colin Marsh.

Sent from my iPhone

RO2053

From: Sheila Donovan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 11:41
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Re: Local Plan Modifications

I wish it to be noted that I fully support the comments & submissions made by RAFFD and GRAG with regard to the Local Plan Modifications.

In particular I would endorse their comments with regard to Housing Land Allocation Ref: MM101; the waiting list for medical care – currently over six months at Garswood Medical Centre (I have been on the waiting list since November and have been told it won't be considered until July) and the effect of substantially greater traffic volumes on roads that were never constructed with those densities in mind.

Sheila Donovan
14 Darvel Avenue
Garswood
WN4 0UA

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

RO2054

From: Carol Parry <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 15:07
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Sending this email to state that i agree with the comments made by Residents against the Florida Farm Developments and Garswood Residents Action Group in respect of the Local Plan re : Land at Florida Farm South

Carol Parry
2 Brookside Way
Haydock
St Helens
WA11 0BP

Regards
Carol Parry

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

RO2055

[REDACTED]

From: Michael <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 15:22
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Please be advised that as a local resident I support the comments made by RAFFD and GRAG groups in relation to the Local Plan.

Michael Murray
343 Liverpool Road
WA11 0UN

RO2056

[REDACTED]

From: Annemarie <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 15:27
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

As a local resident I support the comments made by RAFFD and GRAG groups in relation to the local plan.

AnneMarie Murray
343 Liverpool Rd
WA11 0UN

RO2057

[REDACTED]

From: Steph Hayes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 15:30
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Please accept this email as evidence that I support the comments made by RAFFD and GRAG.

Stephanie Maria Hayes
13 Melrose Crescent
Garswood
Wigan
WN40SL

RO2058

[REDACTED]

From: lesarnold <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 16:07
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Greenbelt

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I endorse the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA

Leslie Arnold
14 Fairclough road
Rainhill
Merseyside
L35 9JG

Sent from my Galaxy

RO2059

From: Joe Woodhouse <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 17:34
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Planning objection and endorsement of Saint Helens greenbelt association report

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I write to confirm my objection to any building on greenbelt land in Rainhill and any part of the Saint Helens borough due to the Expert report commissioned by Saint Helens greenbelt Association. I write to confirm that I endorse the issues raised by the Saint Helens greenbelt Association report.

Regards

Joseph Woodhouse
1 Lawton Road
Rainhill
L35 0PL

RO2060

From: Braycotton <[REDACTED]@[REDACTED].com>
Sent: 12 January 2022 17:50
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I support the statement produced by Residents Against Florida Farm Developments and Garswood Residents Action Group.

Jan Braycotton
67 Ashbury Drive
Haydock
WA110FA

Sent from my iPhone

RO2061

[REDACTED]

From: David van der Burg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 18:41
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sirs

I write to support the submissions raised by the Residents Against Florida Farm Developments (RAFFD) and Garswood Residents Action Group (GRAG) in respect of the latest draft of the Local Plan.

I should declare that I am a councillor for Haydock ward, but this submission is made in my private capacity as a resident of St Helens.

Kind regards

David van der Burg
3 Peach Grove
Haydock
WA11 0GB

RO2062

[REDACTED]

From: Anne Gornall <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 18:45
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Save Rainhill's Greenbelt

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear sirs,
I fully endorse the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA. Please save our greenbelt land.
I live at 16 Watling Way, Whiston, Prescot, Merseyside, L35 7NG.
Regards
Mrs A Gornall

Sent from my iPad

RO2063

[REDACTED]

From: Diane Joyce <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 19:13
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: ECCLESTON PARK GOLF CLUB - MULBERRY HOMES

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

We endorse the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA.

DIANE/ROBERT JOYCE
164 Rainhill Road
Rainhill
L35 4PJ

Sent from my iPhone

RO2064

[REDACTED]

From: Becky Shaw [REDACTED] >
Sent: 12 January 2022 19:11
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like to note my support for the comments made by RAFFD and GRAG.
As a long standing resident of the area I am particularly concerned with the lack of upgrades planned for the infrastructure, flooding, traffic, public services etc.
One bus an hour does not constitute a good transport network

Yours Sincerely
Rebekah Shaw
311 Garswood Road
WN4 0TU

RO2065

From: Colin Fletcher <[REDACTED]uk>
Sent: 12 January 2022 19:35
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello

I am emailing you to express my support of the Residents Against the Florida Farm Developments (RAFFD) and the Garswood Residents Action Group (GRAG) in their opposition to the proposed plans for housing on land situated between Smock Lane, Billinge Road and Garswood Road.

Regards

Colin Fletcher
137 Victoria Road
Garswood
Ashton in Makerfield
WN4 0UH

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

RO2066

[REDACTED]

From: paul stevenson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 20:03
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I endorse the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA.
71 Amanda Road
Rainhill
L35 8PW

Sent from my Galaxy

RO2067

[REDACTED]

From: Beverley Neil <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 20:19
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: P/2020/0791/HYEIA

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Re: St.Helens local plan main modifications response of SHGBA
P/2020/0791/HYEIA

To whom it may concern

I would like to state that I agree with the contents of this report and I endorse the issues raised on behalf of SHGBA

Regards
B Neil
35 Honeybourne Dr
Whiston
L35 7 NB

RO2068

From: Alicia Woodhouse <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 20:20
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Planning objection and endorsement of SHGBA report

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I write to confirm my objection to any building on green belt land in rainhill and any part of the St. Helens borough due to the expert report commissioned by St. Helens green belt association. I write to confirm that I endorse the issues raised by the St. Helens green belt association report.

Regards,

Alicia Woodhouse
1 lawton road
L350PL

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

RO2069

[REDACTED]

From: Sue Bottom <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 20:20
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Shgba

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I endorse the issues raised on behalf of SHGBA

Sue Bottom
19 Walsham Gardens
WA9 5UT

RO2070

[REDACTED]

From: Margaret Broughton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 20:41
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Endorse issues raised on behalf SHGBA

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Please task this as I endorse issues raised on behalf of SHGBA

Margaret Broughton
22 Porter Close, L35 6PY

Sent from my iPhone

RO2071

From: Carole Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 13 January 2022 10:17
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Florida farm south development

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

I am emailing with regard to the planned development of florida farm south and the plans for over 500 houses being built on it.

I strongly object to this development!!!

I support the comments submitted by RAFFD & GRAG regarding the local plan on FFS.

I live on vicarage drive and the amount of traffic speeding through over the speed bumps banging over them all day and night is terrible.

Since Amazon and Kellogs have gone up there is a lot more noise pollution, light pollution (at night it lights up the sky), and the amount of traffic is unbelievable!

You have to add more time to your journey if you want to get from the lights onto the east lancs road via vicarage Road, and it takes you ages to get through haydock Island with all the traffic queuing with the amount of extra wagons they have created.

That's not to mention parking in laybys and rubbish, it's disgusting!.

And there have been more accidents on the East lancs road since they went up.

Imagine how much more noise, traffic, fumes, accidents there will be if 500+ houses are built on [REDACTED]. Not to mention the increased numbers of people needing doctors appointments, children getting in schools etc.

Haydock is becoming one large concrete block, filled with noise, fumes and people. We hardly have any green space as it is, so stop developing on what we have.

From

Carole Smith and Jacqueline Smith
2 Vicarage Drive
Haydock
St Helens
Merseyside
WA11 0UG

RO2072

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2022 21:21
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I am emailing to confirm that I fully support and agree with the comments made by RAFFD and CRAG in relation to the Local Plan.

Regards

Michelle Bradburn
20 Avery Road
Haydock
St. Helens
Merseyside
WA11 0Xa

RO2073

[REDACTED]

From: Chris Bradburn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 21:29
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Fwd: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I am emailing to confirm that I fully support and agree with the comments made by RAFFD and CRAG in relation to the Local Plan.

Regards

Chris Bradburn
20 Avery Road
Haydock
St. Helens
Merseyside
WA11 0Xa

RO2074

From: alison hilton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 21:23
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Objection to Main modifications of the Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

Please accept my notification of support and endorsement of objection with regard to proposed developments and future projects that include modification to green belt land within the Bold and Clockface locations.

As part of public consultation I wish to have this notification lodged and recorded as an objection to the proposed developments.

I hereby give notification and support to the report produced and submitted on behalf of the Bold & Clockface Action Group.

Regards

Mrs Alison Hilton

RO2075

From: Rob Hilton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 21:26
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Objection to Main modifications to local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

Please accept my notification of support and endorsement of objection with regard to proposed developments and future projects that include modification to green belt land within the Bold and Clockface locations.

As part of public consultation I wish to have this notification lodged and recorded as an objection to the proposed developments.

I hereby give notification and support to the report produced and submitted on behalf of the Bold & Clockface Action Group.

Regards

Mr Robert Hilton

RO2076

From: Michelle Rice <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 21:24
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Objection to local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

Please accept my notification of support and endorsement of objection with regard to proposed developments and future projects that include modification to green belt land within the Bold and Clockface locations.

As part of public consultation I wish to have this notification lodged and recorded as an objection to the proposed developments.

I hereby give notification and support to the report produced and submitted on behalf of the Bold & Clockface Action Group,
Regards
Michelle Rice
Old bold hall farm
WA8 3XJ

RO2077

From: Neil Shaw <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 21:46
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan for Haydock

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning,

Really upset re the abhorrent proposed plan for Haydock. You should not be building on the last bit of green belt in Haydock. I support the comments made by RAFFD & GRAG

Neil Shaw
1 Avery Road
Haydock
St.Helens
Merseyside
wa11 oxa

You need to stop the planning proposal.

Yours Sincerely

Neil Shaw
07831 519138

RO2078

From: Ann Leyland <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 20:59
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: St Helens Borough Local Plan 2020-2035 (Submission Draft) Proposed Main Modifications Consultation Response Form
Attachments: ECRA representation-form-final 12012022 (Page 1).pdf; ECRA representation-form-final 12012022 (Pages 2 to 4).pdf
Categories: Green category

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Please find attached my completed form.

Regards
Ann Leyland

RETURN DETAILS

Please return your completed form to us **by no later than 5pm on Thursday 13th January 2022** by:

post to: **Freepost LOCAL PLAN,
St Helens Borough Council,
St. Helens Town Hall,
Victoria Square,
St Helens,
WA10 1HP**

or e-mail to: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk

Please note we are unable to accept faxed copies of this form.

FURTHER INFORMATION

If you need assistance, you can contact us via:

Email: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Telephone: 01744 676190

NEXT STEPS

All representations received within the representations period, will be passed on to the appointed Local Plan Inspectors, who will consider and use them to inform their final conclusions on the Local Plan Examination.

DATA PROTECTION

Please note that all representations received within the consultation period will be made public and passed on to the Planning Inspectors. This will include the names and addresses of representors being made public, although other personal details will remain confidential. Further clarity on this is available on the Local Plan Privacy Notice available on the Local Plan webpage (address below). The Council is unable to accept anonymous or confidential representations.

We process personal data as part of our public task to prepare a Local Plan, and will retain this in line with our Information and Records Management Policy. For more information on what we do and on your rights please see the data protection information on our website at www.sthelens.gov.uk/localplan.

Now please complete PART B of this form, setting out your representation/comment.

Please use a separate copy of Part B for each separate comment/representation.

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION

Please use a separate form Part B for each representation, and supply together with Part A so we know who has made the comment.

4. Which Main Modification does this representation relate to?

Main Modification Reference Number | **MM**

5a. Do you consider that this proposed Main Modification is legally compliant?

Yes | No

Please tick as appropriate

5b. Do you consider that this proposed Main Modification is 'sound' (in accordance with the definition in the National Planning Policy Framework)?

Yes | No

Please tick as appropriate

6. Please provide a reason for your response to questions 5a and 5b above.

It has been proven that there is absolutely no justification for the number of additional new homes the council says are required in St. Helens. There is a requirement for some new affordable homes but as we have seen from the new housing developments in the area in recent years (Eccleston Grange, St. Berthold Gate and the former Christ Church hall site) the majority of homes could not be classified as affordable, even the smallest town houses are valued in excess of £190,000.

The proposed site runs adjacent to the A580 East Lancashire Road which is one of the busiest roads in the North West and is one of the main routes connecting Liverpool and Manchester. Therefore, given the growing concerns over air pollution and it's effect on public health, how can the council justify building a huge housing estate within a stone's throw of so much busy traffic?

In addition to this the increase in traffic to and from the proposed site would cause a huge amount of disruption to the local area and a big drain on resources. Bleak Hill Primary School already has a 3 form intake each year and has undergone major building work to extend it sufficiently to cope with the current demand for places. If the council's housing plans go ahead, it has been suggested that the school be split into separate junior and infant schools to cope with the even greater demand from families moving into the area.

St. Helens is an industrial town with plenty of brownfield sites available for development but of course these areas are considered by many to be less desirable than Windle and Eccleston and therefore, the price tags of each property will be considerably less, as will the rateable value...

My biggest concern, as an Eccleston resident of 22 years, is that the proposed housing development won't serve those St. Helens residents in need of affordable housing, but instead will attract people from outside of St. Helens who won't treat the town as their home and will continue to use the shops and services they currently use in places such as Liverpool. Therefore, they won't contribute much at all to local businesses, or to the town in general, as suggested by the council.

I am also worried that the levels of serious crime will increase and people moving into the new development, away from areas of high criminal activity, will unintentionally (or in some cases intentionally) bring it with them.

There is no doubt that Windle and Eccleston are two of the best areas to live in St. Helens with relatively low crime rates, good schools, flanked by greenbelt that is home to an abundance of wildlife, all of which will be ruined and never replaced if this development goes ahead.

The vast majority of local residents are opposed to the council's plans and it's not because we're all middle class NIMBYs as we have been portrayed in the local media, but because we want to live in a decent area and bring our children up in a relatively safe and pleasant environment. I was brought up in a very different part of the town so I fully appreciate what a beautiful area this is to live in and I will do everything I can to protect it.

St. Helens needs better areas for people to live in not more overcrowded, crime ridden estates.

I completely understand that the central government's policy of "Austerity", which has been in place for over 10 years now, is bleeding public services dry all over the country, but I appeal to our Labour councillors to grow a spine and stop letting the Tories walk all over us! Enough is enough. We won't let you destroy our town piece by piece.

Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify the representation.

**Thank you for taking the time to complete and return this response form.
Please keep a copy for future reference.**



**St Helens Borough Local Plan 2020-2035 (Submission Draft)
Proposed Main Modifications Consultation
Response Form**

Ref:

(For official use only)

Please ensure the form is returned to us by no later than **5pm on Thursday 13th January 2022**. Any comments received after this deadline cannot be accepted.

This form has two parts;

Part A – Personal Details

Part B – Your Representation(s).

PART A – YOUR DETAILS

Please note that you must complete Parts A and B of this form.

1. Your Details	2. Your Agent's Details (if applicable) (we will correspond via your agent)
Title: Mrs	Title:
First Name: Ann	First name:
Last Name: Leyland	Last Name:
Organisation/company:	Organisation/company:
Address: 3 Clarkes Crescent, Eccleston, St. Helens, Merseyside	Address:
Postcode: WA10 5EA	Postcode:
Tel No: [REDACTED]	Tel No:
Mobile No: [REDACTED]	Mobile No:
Email: [REDACTED]	Email:

Signature: [REDACTED] Date: 12/1/2022

Please be aware that anonymous forms cannot be accepted and that in order for your comments to be considered you **MUST** include your details above.

3. Would you like to be kept updated of future stages of the St Helens Borough Local Plan 2020-2035? (Namely publication of the Inspectors' recommendations in their Final Report and then adoption of the Plan)

Yes (Via Email) No

Please note - e-mail is the Council's preferred method of communication. If no e-mail address is provided, we will contact you by your postal address.

RO2079

From: joredhead75 <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 22:15
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Objection to Build on Greenbelt land I St Hwlens

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir /Madam

I wish to put on record that I strongly object to your incredulous plans to allow building on greenbelt land in the Borough. In this time of climate crisis you are quite frankly deluded to believe this is a good idea. There is an abundance of brown field sites which can be built upon and you must make these your priority and save the greenbelt land which is the lungs of our Borough and are only chance of fighting climate change.

I wish to state on record that I Joanne Redhead residing at 12 Sudbury Gardens Nutgrove St Helens Wa9 5FS agree with the contents of the expert report commissioned in response to the main modifications to the local plan and I endorse the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA.

Please kindly acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours sincerely

Joanne Redhead

Sent from my Galaxy

RO2080

[REDACTED]

From: liz Ward [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 January 2022 22:44
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I endorse the issues raised by the shgba regarding the main modifications to the local plan.

Elizabeth Ward
7 Elderswood
Rainhill
L35 4QY

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

RO2081

From: Geoff Ward <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 22:45
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local plan modifications

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi

I spoke like to endorse the case put forward by the SHGBA regarding the main modifications to the local plan.

Regards

Geoff Ward
7 Elders wood
Rainhill
Merseyside
L35 4QY

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

RO2082

[REDACTED]

From: Greg Childs <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 23:07
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Modifications to the local plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like to register that I endorse the the issues raised on behalf of the SHGBA in their Expert report, and am strongly opposed to development of local green belt land.

Regards

Greg Childs

1 Newmarket Gardens
WA95FR

RO2083

From: Ken Lawrenson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 12 January 2022 23:35
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Response to the "Main Modification to the Local Plan process"

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

As a resident of St Helens:
I would like to endorse the issues raised to the Main Modification to the Local Plan process
on behalf of the St Helens Green Belt Association (SHGBA).

My address is 86 Foxwood, WA9 5uj

[Sent from Sky Yahoo Mail for iPad](#)

RO2084

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 January 2022 00:13
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

I support the comments made by RAFFD and GRAG regarding the Local Plan.

Christopher and Laura Seddon
10 peach grove
Haydock
Wa110gb

The following is the submission from RAFFD and GRAG:

-----IMPORTANT-----

Comments on the proposed Main Modifications to the St Helens Local Plan

RAFFD was started on 1 June 2016 as Residents against the Florida Farm Development, to object to the planning application by Bericote Properties Ltd to construct warehouses on approximately 91 acres of Greenbelt at Florida Farm North, Haydock.

In November of that year, when details of the St Helens Local Plan were released the name was changed to Residents against the Florida Farm Developments to reflect our opposition to proposed housing at Florida Farm South and to Greenbelt Development throughout the Borough.

GRAG was also set up in November 2016 in response to the proposals in the St Helens Local Plan.

The combined Groups have a membership of approximately 1900.

We have read the responses to the Main Modifications made on behalf of the St Helens Green Belt Association (SHGBA), Bold and Clock Face Action Group, and ECRA and fully support those responses.

To save the Inspectors having to read the same comments twice this document should be read as an Appendix to the St Helens Green Belt Association submission with reference to the specific sites detailed below.

These comments are in respect of proposed developments within the existing Wards of Blackbrook and Haydock and the Garswood area of the Billinge and Seneley Green Ward.

Employment allocations 4EA, 5EA, 6EA.

Housing Allocations 1HA, 2HA and 1HS.

The document indicates the Main Modification Reference together with a copy of the St Helens Borough Council proposal and then details the response..

General Comments

It is believed the Local Plan is unsound as it is not based on conclusive and vigorous evidence and needs modification.

The amount of land being advised as being needed for development is overstated, there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant changing Greenbelt boundaries as previously developed land, Brownfield and contaminated land have not been thoroughly examined. The Greenbelt reviews are erratic and partisan. Economic hypotheses are over-egged.

The Main Modifications do not adequately allay fears in relation to developments 1HA and 1HS until there is guaranteed social infrastructure/infrastructure improvements. Without guarantees the impact on the local community would be catastrophic

The 'renewed focus on a Brownfield-first policy' – identification and remediation of Brownfield/contaminated land over the plan period would negate the need for safeguarded land for development and no exceptional circumstances to remove land from the Greenbelt have been proved.

'Suitable' Greenbelt sites have been selected on the basis that the land parcels are 'well contained with strong boundaries'. That is not an exceptional circumstance and reason to remove from the green belt.

Reasons given for safeguarded land are inconsistent.

Site Specific comments

Reference - MM007

Employment land allocations

Site - 4EA – Land south of Penny Lane, Haydock

4.12.26 This site forms a relatively small part of a larger parcel of land that the Green Belt Review (2018) found to make a 'medium' contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt, with 'good' development potential. It should be noted that the parcel of land assessed in the Green Belt Review included the land to both the north and south of Penny Lane. In this context, a significant part of the assessed Green Belt parcel (11.05ha) has an extant planning permission for employment development, of which the majority has now been developed. This is the land to the north of Penny Lane. The site forms a natural extension to the Haydock Industrial Estate. Indeed, given the development of land to the north of Penny Lane, this site is now surrounded by built development of the Haydock Industrial Estate to the north, east and south, and the M6 to the west. The site is also located in close proximity to an area that falls within the 20% most deprived population in the UK. Therefore, its development for employment use would help to reduce poverty and social exclusion. The development would also reduce the need to travel by making best use of existing transport infrastructure due to its location close to a high frequency bus service.

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

This site is adjacent to a major tourist destination in Haydock, ie the Mercure Hotel and is in very close proximity to Haydock Park Racecourse.

The hotel has already suffered badly from the inappropriate development of the Briggs Plant Hire Company to the immediate West of its grounds, not what was envisaged for the site by the glossy brochure issued by the developer for what is known as Empress Park.

This parcel of land should be deleted from the proposals and should remain as part of the Greenbelt.

Site - 5EA – Land to the West of Haydock Industrial Estate, Haydock

4.12.27 The Green Belt Review (2018) found the sub-parcel of land reflecting this site to make a 'medium' contribution to the Green Belt purposes. The site adjoins the large built up area of Haydock, but is relatively well contained and strategic gaps between Haydock and elsewhere could still be maintained following the release of this

site from the Green Belt. The Review also found the site to have 'good' development potential. The removal of this site from the Green Belt in conjunction with site 6EA, and the now developed employment land at Florida Farm North presents the opportunity to provide a stronger, more robust boundary in this location. The site is located within 1km of an area falling within the 20% most deprived population in the UK. Its development for employment use would help reduce poverty and social exclusion and help reduce the need to travel through making best use of existing transport infrastructure due to its location close to a high frequency bus service.

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

This parcel of land, together with 6EA below and the already developed Florida Farm North constitute an area of some 160 acres (65 hectares). It is difficult to understand how an area of this size in a rural location can be classified as only having a medium contribution to the Greenbelt. The whole area should have been looked at as one and not divided into smaller parcels.

An application to develop this land for warehousing was rejected by the Council on 23 July 2019 as being inappropriate development within the Greenbelt. Only three members of the Planning Committee voted in favour of granting the application and the developer did not appeal the decision. The developer was so confident that his application would be granted that prior to the planning committee hearing, and without planning permission, he erected a sign stating that the warehouses would be coming soon.

Some two and a half years later that illegal sign is still on the site despite complaints being made about it and the Council stating that they would take enforcement action.

6EA – Land West of Millfield Lane, south of Liverpool Road and north of Clipsley Brook, Haydock

4.12.28 The Green Belt Review (2018) found the sub-parcel of land reflecting this site to make a 'medium' contribution to the Green Belt purposes. At the time the Green Belt Review was undertaken, this site did not adjoin a large built-up area, but was considered in part to prevent ribbon development along Liverpool Road. Since that time, employment development at Florida Farm North has taken place adjacent the southern boundary of the site. This site would form a natural extension to the Haydock Industrial Estate, and its development would provide a stronger, more robust Green Belt boundary. The site is located within 1km of an area falling within the 20% most deprived population in the UK. Its development for employment use would help reduce poverty and social exclusion

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

The first paragraph of the comments about site 5EA above also applies to this proposal. There don't appear to be any concrete proposals as to how this site would be accessed and in the past there have been woolly comments about a link road from Liverpool Road to Haydock Lane through this site and site 5EA above.

Should these sites remain in the Local Plan and subsequent planning permission is granted see my comments later in respect of planning and highways agreements to mitigate the effects of these two developments and the need for the council to manage and monitor the construction in a way that causes the least disruption to residents and highway users.

Housing Land allocations

Reference - MM010

1HA – Land south of Billinge Road, East of Garswood Road and West of Smock Lane, Garswood

4.18.24 The Green Belt Review (2018) found the parcel of land corresponding to this site to make a 'low' overall contribution to the Green Belt purposes. In summary, all sides of the site have strong boundaries, and it is therefore well contained. The strategic gap between Billinge and Garswood could also be maintained notwithstanding the release of this site from the Green Belt. It also found the site to have 'good' development potential. The site is in a sustainable location within walking distance of a local shop and public transport links, including the nearby railway station. Safe access to the site can be provided, and a suitable sustainable drainage scheme also. Indeed,

development of this site could help solve flooding issues in the surrounding urban area. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) found development of the site would result in a high number of positive effects.

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

The main criteria mentioned for the selection of 'suitable' Green Belt sites remains that parcels are "well contained with strong boundaries". This cannot be an exceptional circumstance for removal from Green Belt.

The perceived benefits of development are over-egged and we object and reject the statement that 'The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) found development of the site would result in a high number of positive effects.'

As far as the comment about 'within walking distance of a local shop' – much of the area has footways/safe walking routes on only one side of the road.

'Transport links'

The 156 bus service was diverted to accommodate the Florida Farm development – making journey times much longer and less frequent now at one per hour

157 bus service is one per hour no early or late availability (0940-1744 hours).

Train service is one per hour – no access to Liverpool bound platform for those with mobility issues due to 56 stairs, 4 landings, a bridge and no lift.

No proposed additional social infrastructure: doctors – already has a waiting list and not accepting new patients due in part to the national shortage of GPs, there is no dentist in the area, school places, etc.

Effects of Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone are as yet unknown as being on the extremity of the borough and abutting Greater Manchester, the area is likely to become even busier as traffic tries to find ways around the charges. This has not been taken into account.

Should this site remain in the Local Plan then the Highways Service needs to ensure by way of Section 278 Highways Act Agreement that adequate footways are provided in the vicinity of the development and elsewhere in Garswood as there are many highways that only have a footway on one side.

There should also be a provision for a substantial contribution towards the upgrade of Garswood Station, including the provision of a lift.

2HA – Land at Florida Farm (South of A580), Slag Lane, Blackbrook

4.18.25 The Green Belt Review (2018) found the parcel of land generally reflecting this site to make a 'low' overall contribution to the Green Belt purposes, with strong permanent boundaries and not having a sense of openness or countryside character. In summary, there is existing residential development on three sides of the site, and the East Lancashire Road (A580) on the fourth side. It also found the site to have 'good' development potential. The site is in a sustainable location with good levels of accessibility to key services and jobs (including at the Haydock Industrial Estate). The site presents no technical constraints that cannot be satisfactorily addressed. Indeed, the provision of flood mitigation measures for the site could have the beneficial effect of helping alleviate flooding in the wider area. The SA found development of the site would have a mixed impact on achieving SA objectives, with a high number of positive effects, including good access to public transport and employment opportunities.

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

It is difficult to see how this land, consisting of some 57 acres (23.19 hectares) of farmland in this semirural location, could warrant a description of having a "low overall contribution to the Greenbelt". Having strong, permanent boundaries is not an exceptional circumstance for the removal of land from Greenbelt.

The proposal for yet another left off/left on access on the A580, a high speed highway is an accident waiting to happen, particularly as it is in close proximity to the 4-way junction at Haydock Lane. Vehicles can be held at these

lights for lengthy periods and we have experienced at first hand the speeds that some vehicles attain as they race away from the hold up. The Highways Service should ensure, by way of a Section 278 Agreement, that the developer makes a 100% contribution towards the costs of introducing a 40 mph speed limit along this length of the A580, if it has not previously been introduced.

They should also ensure that they receive adequate funding via the Section 278 Agreement to mitigate the effect of this development on the existing highways network, including a commuted sum for the culvert that will be required at the junction of Vicarage Road/Liverpool Road and a sum to cover any contingencies that may arise.

Having experienced the problems caused on the A580 and surrounding highways during the Construction of the Florida Farm North warehouses it is imperative that the Council carefully monitors the site during the initial construction phase of the main access at the junction of Vicarage Road and Liverpool Road, in particular by ensuring that an adequate wheel wash system is installed and used. A rumble strip and a fleet of road sweeping vehicles spreading mud like buttering bread, is NOT an acceptable method.

The Council should also address the need for social infrastructure such as doctors and dentists and in particular school placements.

Housing safeguarded sites

Reference MM011

1HS – Land south of Leyland Green Road, North of Billinge Road and East of Garswood Road, Garswood

4.24.10 The Green Belt Review (2018) found the sub-parcel of Green Belt land containing this site to make a ‘medium’ contribution to the Green Belt purposes and has a ‘medium’ development potential. The site is within walking distance of a local convenience shop and is readily accessible by bus and rail. There are not considered to be any technical constraints to delivering development on this site that cannot be satisfactorily addressed over the necessary timeframe. However, as the site projects further into the countryside than housing allocation 1HA, it is considered to be a less logical extension to the village within the Plan period. On that basis, site 1HA is allocated for development within the Plan period, and this site is safeguarded for development subsequent to that, beyond the end of the Plan period to meet longer term needs, creating a logical phased extension of the village both within and beyond the Plan period.

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

We agree with the comments of the St Helens Green Belt Association at MM006 Section 5. Greenbelt release and the identification of Safeguarded land is not necessary.

Reference MM034

All proposals for development will be expected, as appropriate having to their scale, location and nature, to meet or exceed the following requirements:-

- 1.a) Maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the local environment ...
- b) avoid causing unacceptable harm to the amenities of the local area ...

Comment by RAFFD & GRAG

In respect of Garswood the development of the sites 1HA and 1HS will change the character of the village with the loss of open aspect views and farmland habitats.

In respect of site 4EA – land south of Penny Lane, the proposed development will cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of the Mercure Hotel.

RO2085

[REDACTED]

From: Nicola Sawyer <[REDACTED]uk>
Sent: 13 January 2022 00:46
To: planningpolicy@sthelens.gov.uk
Subject: Local Plan

CAUTION: This email may be from an unknown source. Do not reply, click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I support all comments & objections put forward by the RAFFD & GRAG for the proposed developments at Florida Farm South.

I fail to see any benefits, at all, to the local area & to the existing residents of Haydock.

In my opinion it is absolutely & utterly ridiculous & irresponsible.

Nicola Sawyer
7 Avery Road
Haydock
St Helens
Merseyside
WA11 0XA

Tel: [REDACTED] or
[REDACTED]

Sent from Samsung Mobile on O2
Get [Outlook for Android](#)