

Reference: 12/3551/FUL

Address: Land at rear of 2A Church Street, Kelsall, Tarporley, Cheshire

Proposal: Residential development for 34 new dwellings , associated access and the demolition of two dwellings

Applicant: Bloor Homes

Page 1 of 16

Kelsall Parish Council Objections to Bloor Home Planning Application

Kelsall Parish Council (KPC) has objections to the following Planning Application:

Reference: 12/03551/FUL

Address: Land at rear of 2A Church Street, , Kelsall, Tarporley, Cheshire

Proposal: Residential development for 34 dwellings, associated access and the demolition of two dwellings

Applicant: Bloor Homes

A summary to our objections, in no particular order although the ones in **bold** are of significant importance, are summarised below:

Objection 1. Development is against the Kelsall Parish Landscape and Design Statement (a Supplementary Planning Document).

Objection 2. The proposed development is unsustainable.

Objection 3. Harmful precedent setting.

Objection 4. Character of proposed development.

Objection 5. Design issues.

Objection 6. Traffic / pedestrian issues.

Objection 7. Impact on schools, especially primary school.

Objection 8. Affect on public realm.

Objection 9. Unacceptable impact on Folk Festival.

Objection 10. Lack of playground provision.

Objection 11. Removal of valued habitat

Objection 12. Services/utilities.

Objection 13. Poor community consultation.

Objection 14. Development is against an emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan

Objection 15. **Local Plan**

All of these objections are material considerations. The agreement of CWAC with just one of these objections is grounds for refusal of the planning application. However, since all apply and some relate to extremely significant issues and go against the requirements of the community and would result in unsustainable development, CWAC is urged to rule that the site, and those that surround it (since the most significant objections apply equally to those sites), are not fit for sustainable residential development (unless the community considers otherwise in a Neighbourhood Development Plan).

Further details for each objection follow:

Objection 1. Development is against the Kelsall Parish Landscape and Design Statement (a Supplementary Planning Document).

The proposed development is not in agreement with the Kelsall Parish Landscape and Design Statement (July 2007), itself a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Although prospective developers are arguing that the Local Development Framework of CWAC could be considered “absent, silent, inadequate or out of date” according to the NPPF, the Kelsall Parish Landscape and Design Statement SPD is none of these things. Rather, it is a comprehensive and totally up-to-date document that clearly expresses the needs of the Parish and what proposed development should be and bring. The proposed development pays scant regard to the Statement and consequently does not address the vast majority of issues contained within it. In addition, clear and achievable aspirations of the Parish for this site were made and there is no evidence that these have changed; rather, due to the ongoing growth of Kelsall and the area, as well as the superb achievements of the Community Primary School, the need to adopt the aspirations for this site for more sustainable community recreation (allotments) and amenity uses are greater than ever (e.g. need for additional graveyard facilities. Both local churches are in the process of closing their existing graveyard provision.) The use of this site for such uses is enshrined within the NPPF (para 55) as “to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.” The proposed development will not “enhance or maintain the vitality”, but do exactly the opposite.

The fundamental reasons that the “Village Green” site, that is, all the land from Chester Road to Flat Lane is understood to be enshrined as community, recreation and cultural space within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD, is because it is the only space left in Kelsall for playing field provision (i.e. relatively flat), community recreation facilities and local amenity requirements. and the site provides the same unique combination of advantages as a recreation area i.e.:

- Size, capable of accommodating full-size and junior football pitches, cricket pitch, children’s play area and informal recreation space;
- Central location;
- Easy accessibility from all parts of the village, whether on foot, by bicycle (important for older children) or (for adult users and visiting teams) by car;
- Open aspect (attractive in itself and also a deterrent to vandalism);
- Adjacent to informal recreation space in the form of Kelsall Green;
- Adjacent to the school so provides opportunities for expansion and also pupils to easily use any facilities; and
- Safe location away from a busy road, so suitable for children to play.

The scheme also goes against the wider CWAC Local Development Scheme Policy ENV 24 “Development in the rural area will only be permitted where it would respect the key features of the landscape and not be detrimental to its character.”

As a result, the planning application should be refused.

Objection 2. The proposed development is unsustainable.

The NPPF has at its core two principal documents; firstly, Resolution 42/187 of the United Nations General Assembly, which defined sustainable development as “meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”. Secondly is the UK Sustainable Development Strategy ‘*Securing the Future*’, which set out five ‘guiding principles’ of sustainable development: i) living within the planet’s environmental limits; ii) ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; iii) achieving a sustainable economy; iv) promoting good governance; v) and using sound science responsibly. The NPPF expands on these ideas to define what ‘sustainable development’ is for England as a balance of the previously mentioned ‘pillars of sustainability’ (i.e. the total and even balance of community,

environment and economy) and then clearly states that developments that are not sustainable (i.e. against the NPPF) should not be granted permission.

Residential development on this land has long been considered inappropriate whilst the Parish has considered that there is a better use for this whole area for public recreation, amenity and school expansion. Therefore, the proposed development is at odds with Resolution 42/187 since the development of this site for residential development “compromises future generations” since valuable land is taken away from other, more productive and sustainable uses. In addition, many aspects from ‘*Securing the Future*’ are not met. For these reasons, the NPPF sustainability considerations are, by default, not met.

In addition to the above, the Landscape and Design Statement SPD had a sustainability assessment within it to further define what ‘sustainable development’ is for Kelsall (see Appendix 7 within the document). This was based upon the same principles that have been used to define the NPPF and so is considered to be sound and must be considered over and above the considerations of the NPPF. The document was adopted after lengthy involvement with the community including statutory and other consultation.

The proposed development does not meet nine of the eleven sustainability considerations judged to be so important for sustainable development in Kelsall, as follows:

1. To protect and enhance biodiversity, geo diversity and local environmental quality.
2. To protect and maintain the quality of inland water resources.
4. To protect and enhance historic, cultural and archaeological value.
5. To promote high quality building design.
6. To protect and enhance the quality of landscape and townscape.
7. To ensure access to goods, services and amenities.
8. To deliver rural / urban renaissance.
9. To safeguard and improve the viability and vitality of the village.
11. To protect and improve land quality.

The reasons why these crucial sustainability considerations for Kelsall are not met are expanded upon in detail elsewhere within this objection.

Of crucial importance is the fact this area of development is land locked (section 7 NPPF) and would therefore not be safe (a haven for burglars as the area would be empty during the day with no through pedestrian or vehicular traffic).

One part of the site is currently a green field site and the whole site has been previously been identified as a non development area. The fact that access to the site will require the demolition of two perfectly good properties does little for the community.

This area of land could be put to better use as part of the green heart of the village for allotments; burial ground and habitat and wildlife. Other uses for the site are inherently more sustainable.

The fundamental reasons that the land between Chester Road and Flat Lane site is desired as community, recreation and cultural space within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD is because it is the only space left in Kelsall for playing field provision (i.e. relatively flat) and the site also provides the same unique combination of advantages as a for allotments, burial ground etc i.e.:

- Size, capable of accommodating full-size and junior football pitches, cricket pitch, children’s play area and informal recreation space;
- Central location;
- Easy accessibility from all parts of the village, whether on foot, by bicycle (important for older children) or (for adult users and visiting teams) by car;
- Open aspect (attractive in itself and also a deterrent to vandalism);

- Adjacent to informal recreation space in the form of Kelsall Green;
- Adjacent to the school so provides opportunities for expansion and also pupils to easily use any facilities; and
- Safe location away from a busy road, so suitable for children to play.
- This area of land could be put to better use as part of the green heart of the village for allotments; burial ground and habitat and wildlife.

If such a use for the site were to occur, more of the Landscape and Design Statement SPD sustainability considerations would be met, which, by default, makes it a more sustainable use and hence the proposed development an unsustainable use.

Since the proposed development cannot be considered sustainable, either by the United Nations, UK, NPPF or the Landscape and Design Statement definitions, planning permission should not be granted.

Objection 3. Harmful precedent setting.

There is a real danger that this proposed development would inevitably set a harmful precedent to allow other inappropriate developments within Kelsall and the wider CWAC area as follows:

- The proposed development is at odds to the CWAC priority development areas of Chester, Ellesmere Port and the Salt Towns and only partly on the rural area;
- No exceptional need has been demonstrated for the site;
- The proposed development is at odds to “Policy TR19: New Developments”, which only allows development where additional traffic can be accommodated safely and satisfactorily within the existing or proposed highway network or satisfactory arrangements made to accommodate the additional traffic;
- The scheme also goes against the wider CWAC Local Development Scheme Policy ENV 24 “Development in the rural area will only be permitted where it would respect the key features of the landscape and not be detrimental to its character” since little, if any, of the following is met:
 - *“Development should respect the key features of landscape character areas, as set out in the Chester District Landscape Assessment and Guidelines, and should contribute to the appropriate conservation, restoration and/or enhancement of these features and the public’s enjoyment of them. In considering proposals for buildings in the rural area the Council will require developers to give attention to setting, scale, density, height, massing, layout, use of vernacular materials, design and detailing, landscape treatment, access and the Council’s design guidance. In considering proposals for the change of use of land the Council will require developers to clearly demonstrate any effect which the development, associated works or operations might have on the landscape, access, features of nature conservation, historic or archaeological value and local amenity.”*
 - Several of the requirements CWAC “Policy HO5: Criteria for Assessing Proposals for Residential Sites not Allocated in Local Plan” are **not** met, namely:
 - *“It is of a scale and type appropriate to its proposed location”*
 - *“That there is sufficient capacity of existing and potential infrastructure to accommodate further development”*
 - *“It is of a suitable density and provides a suitable mix of housing types and tenure” and*
 - *“It maintains or improves, where possible, the standard of the environment in terms of design, scale, height, mass, density, type of materials, layout and landscaping”*
 - The NPPF also states that local planning should (para 17) “contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution ... development should prefer land of lesser environmental value.” This site is not “land of lesser environmental value” since it has apparent amenity, countryside, agricultural and ecological characteristics.

○ the site is also considered to be unsafe (section 7 & 8 NPPF) on the grounds that there is no through pedestrian or vehicular access through the site. The Developers have already indicated the removal of the proposed footpath/cycle link to Church Street due to privacy issues and their alternative pathway is through a secure infant's playground area, not public open space as implied in the application. Access into the playground from the proposed development has significant safety issues. Kelsall Parish Council owns this land and will not allow access. There is no way to bypass it. **(See attached photographs of playground and proposed access):**

As a result, the planning application should be refused and CWAC should rule that this site (as others in the vicinity, since they are subject to the same issues) should never come forward for residential development (unless the community considers otherwise in a Neighbourhood Development Plan) in the future.

Objection 4. Character of proposed development.

The proposed development, by reason of its size, height, mass, materials and bland design, result in it appearing as a prominent and visually disconnected feature when viewed from any angle, but especially from the corner of Church Street and Chester Road. The development of this land with such houses is at odds with the proposed location as the "scarp foot" (as defined by the Landscape and Design Statement SPD), should not be subjected to such development.

The proposed development is out of keeping with the design and character of Kelsall as a whole. The Landscape and Design Statement SPD has been paid scant regard. Instead, standard bland and locally unsympathetic property designs that result from a national volume house builder will be incorporated into this scheme. No attempt has been made to try to raise standards to incorporate local building materials nor to higher Code for Sustainable Homes levels other than the bare minimum of Level 3. The Landscape and Design Statement SPD gives support for more energy efficient properties and has at its basis the protection and use of local sandstone features and building materials but this has been ignored by the prospective developer.

The scheme also goes against the wider CWAC Local Development Scheme Policy ENV 24 "Development in the rural area will only be permitted where it would respect the key features of the landscape and not be detrimental to its character."

This is not a market led application, so is not in line with NPPF, as there is not a market in Kelsall at the moment for such properties as shown by the 60 + houses of similar standard for sale.

○ There are numerous "luxury" properties for sale at the moment within Kelsall and most have been on the market for a considerable time period, including several new-build properties. If such mature and individualistic properties cannot sell, then copycat, immature and unsympathetic properties are also not going to sell. This is also emphasised by numerous other developments around Kelsall, such as Ashton Hayes, Utkinton, Tarporley, Tarvin and Mouldsworth, where properties are not selling.

○ The poor uptake of properties from the recent Rookery Close development shows that there is limited need for affordable properties in Kelsall. No sale/let of the properties was made to Kelsall residents or those from Kelsall who have not been able to previously find properties in the village. In addition, it has not gone unnoticed that the affordable properties of the proposed development will only be offered for a short period of time before they are released onto the open market. This is considered a cynical attempt by the applicant to exploit both Kelsall and CWAC and is simply a ploy to maximise profits, whilst minimising Planning Contributions, as it is obvious that the developers themselves recognise there is no affordable demand within this area.

Both of the above highlight that 34 properties developed in one go are not currently needed in Kelsall and such a development has no demand and is not sustainable and in addition, the NPPF seeks that plans are "market driven". Since little market knowledge has been applied to the subject site, permission should not be granted.

Numerous villages within CWAC have been subjected to sudden significant expansions, including Kelsall. There is a clear understanding of the significant detrimental effects that this influx of people, traffic and other related issues can have on village life, as exemplified by Councillor Mike Jones in his Chester Chronicle article (4 February 2010) and repeated at a meeting organised by Stephen O'Brien MP on 18 May 2012. The Councillor went on to state that rural communities should only grow at a rate of some 5-10% over the life of the Local Development Framework and not instantly as this is unsustainable.

It, of course, must be noted that later on in the development plan other developers will be interested in the areas and further development will happen, so causing much greater increases in village sizes. KPC agree that a slow but steady expansion of Kelsall is needed and the village through its Neighbourhood Development Plan should be afforded the opportunity to work with developers to agree the design, size and need of new houses in locations that would be beneficial to the village as a whole.

As a result, the planning application should be refused.

Objection 5. Design issues.

The proposed development does not push forward the objectives of sustainability far enough to warrant consideration of this development. All buildings only comply with the minimum requirements of Building Standards, although exactly how this will be achieved is not clear from the application. The developers have failed to consider Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 4-6, which raise standards of up to 100% carbon dioxide emission savings to try to make this an attractive proposition for the village.

Few other details are presented. However, as this application is by a national volume house builder, it is considered highly unlikely that any development will improve the character of Kelsall, since the patchwork of fields and residential development in this part of Kelsall makes the village blend into the countryside without stark boundaries.

This promotes the rural feel of the village, which is promoted within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD. The NPPF states that (para 8) "well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities", which is a crucial element of the NPPF's "achieving sustainable development". Further, the NPPF continues under Section 7 "Requiring good design" that (para 28) "good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people." The development will only form stock housing from the developer's portfolio not including locally source building materials. There are no proposals to include a range of property types, so enhancing the 'higgledy-piggledy' nature of Kelsall where no one vernacular or building type dominates, which again provides local distinctiveness and so is against the NPPF (para 60).

As a result, the planning application should be refused.

Objection 6. Traffic/pedestrian issues.

The effect on traffic flow on Hallows Drive and Church Street – a narrow road with considerable traffic and parking issues - in light of the shops, doctors' surgery, planned veterinary practice, school bus stop and domestic parking will make these roads more dangerous than ever.

Traffic is also likely to flow from Church Street into Willington Lane and Flat Lane that will also add to their existing problems.

An increase in traffic associated with 34 properties (conservatively 68-70 vehicles, but likely to be more as a result of more expensive properties) all using these accesses during the rush hours will exacerbate the issues further. The quoted trip movements within the accompanying documentation are woefully understated.

It is also considered that the road is not of an adoptable standard as it appears to be too narrow for 34 houses to share and also may not allow refuse collection vehicles to safely access the development to collect from refuse bins. This could have a profound impact on the residents of Hallows Drive should vehicles not be able to access the development.

As a result, the planning application should be refused, and CWAC should rule that this site (as others in the vicinity, since they are subject to the same issues) should never come forward for residential development (unless the community considers otherwise in a Neighbourhood Plan) in the future.

Objection 7. Impact on schools, especially Kelsall Primary school.

Kelsall Community Primary School is currently at capacity and is likely to be so for the foreseeable future. It is already proving difficult for some local residents within the Parish boundary to get their children into the school. The proposed development will shrink the catchment area even further.

The proposed development is for 34 residential properties and will have a significant impact on children being able to attend school. .

Therefore, it is considered that Kelsall Community Primary School could not handle the intake from this development even if this was split over several years. As a result, two things could happen immediately:

- Priority would be given to those closest to the school, so those children in other parts of Kelsall whom have lived here all their lives (and possibly their parents and wider families) wouldn't be able to go to their local school; or
- Priority would be given to those with siblings already at the school, so those children living closest to the school on the proposed development wouldn't be able to go to their local school;

Both of these scenarios have the same result, which is an increase in traffic, which means that the traffic assessment is wholly inadequate. Significant extra demand on a school that is already over-subscribed would also have a severe impact on transport issues and pedestrian safety, which have not been considered by the applicant.

In addition, and more importantly, the school is considered to be "outstanding".

Little consideration of cumulative effects seems to be made by CWAC or the proposed developers, and CWAC should amend their policy to reflect children in actual developments, so at least the right contribution from developers should be made. This will mean for rural areas with the difficulties already facing an at-capacity school, and the further difficulties with the expansion needed at the school it is not seen how the school could expand sufficiently enough on a restricted site to meet the demands of new housing within a reasonable timescale.

Notwithstanding all of this, any piecemeal expansion will affect learning standards.

As a result, the proposed development should be refused.

Objection 8. Affect on public realm.

Kelsall Green is a much-loved and well-used asset for the community. The development of the play area through a voluntary committee and donations shows how important the Green is for the village. Part of the local distinctiveness of Kelsall is the unique Green with commanding views of the Cheshire Plain and the Welsh Hills. This local asset would be significantly affected, particularly from the corner of Church Street and Chester Road, by the obstruction of the wonderful views by the proposed development made even worse by the proximity to the Green boundary.

The views afforded to Kelsall residents are a crucial foundation in the Landscape and Design Statement SPD and the proposed development has not considered these issues. Such removal of local distinctiveness is at odds with the NPPF (para 60) and this will affect future generations so is not considered to be sustainable.

Views are a significant element considered by the community to make Kelsall a special place. As a result, it by default would form a significant element of any sustainability consideration. As a result, the proposed development would not be considered sustainable according to the NPPF.

The scheme also goes against the wider CWAC Local Development Scheme Policy ENV 24 "Development in the rural area will only be permitted where it would respect the key features of the landscape and not be detrimental to its character."

As a result, the proposed development should be refused.

Objection 9. Unacceptable impact on Folk Festival.

The Folk Festival is an annual event that has been held in the village for more than 30 years. It is a much loved event by the 'folk community', as well as the Kelsall community, since it brings a lively weekend of fun that is not restricted to the paying attendees; locals can enjoy various street acts, novel shopping opportunities and further entertainment laid on at village venues such as the pubs and clubs. This influx of revellers also brings a significant amount of business to the pubs and local shops. However, its organisers have informed KPC that if any proposed development were to occur in the "Village Green " areas, its future may be in jeopardy due to the close proximity of a significant amount of new residential properties and a rise in objections to their annual planning application by those who are new to the village.

As a result, the organisers would reluctantly have to seek alternative sites and to withdraw from Kelsall. This would be unsustainable for Kelsall and would affect village life. Causing the cessation of the Folk Festival is against the NPPF, since this seeks to deliver thriving communities as part of its Core Principals as well as prosperous rural economy (Section 3).

As a result, the proposed development should be refused.

Objection 10. Lack of playground provision.

CWAC "Policy SR5: Play Areas" states that for every 15 dwellings or more at least 100sq.m must be made for toddlers play areas. This is not being met by the proposed development. The recent addition of the play area at Kelsall Green shows how important the provision of such facilities are to the village as this was delivered solely through community planning, volunteering and donations. Subsequent maintenance and repair of defects is done by KPC. However, the existence of this facility does not mean that the proposed development should be immune from this Policy. Rather, the close nature of the proposed development makes it look like an 'ownership' for the proposed future occupants. This will increase the use of the facility, which was only designed with the present levels of children in the village in mind plus a reasonable increase. This would also significantly increase maintenance and repair costs for KPC.

As a result, the proposed development should be refused.

Objection 11. Removal of valued habitat.

Woodland features form a key component of the local distinctiveness and are named as a crucial element to retain within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD. However, the proposed development seeks the complete removal of the current natural habitats to the rear of Church Street. This area, although not large in size, adds to the local distinctiveness and rural feel so lacking in this part of Kelsall. It also forms a dense and, hence, undisturbed habitat for nature. Many wild flowers are present, whilst birds, bats, ground based mammals, and insects and other invertebrates are known to use this habitat.

The nearby pond is also a crucial element to retain within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD and comes from historical land uses and should not be lost or damaged.

The introduction of housing development close to the pond, will remove the "natural" make-up of the pond and reduce its potential for nature.

Although the site is classed as 'Best and Most Versatile' agricultural land when such land is in a 'fallow' period, it can form a valuable habitat and resource for nature. The ecological study accompanying the proposed development was poor and was not sufficiently detailed to either identify these issues or, as a result, consider the impacts of the prospective development, or consider how they can be mitigated.

As a result, the proposed development should be refused.

Objection 12. Services/utilities.

CWAC Policy GE4 "Availability of Utility Services" seeks to permit proposals only if utility services are available or can be provided without placing unacceptable pressure on existing capacity, or causing unacceptable environmental harm and is not met.

While there may be adequate gas, electric and water supply available, foul drainage as part of the water utility, is identified within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD as a serious issue and describes the existing situation. In particular it states that "the Council has the responsibility to constrain further development until an adequate foul sewer is provided. New buildings should only be permitted where there is effective catchment and use of roof water, effective attenuation for storm water on driveways and where development will not further overburden the existing sewer system." The proposed development site in inclement weather suffers from standing water due to poor drainage. Should this development be agreed the surface water will only result in further exacerbation of the current flooding problems in the village.

This is still the case and is even more important due to the recent significant expansion of Kelsall and future issues of climate change.

Previous experience has taught KPC that without major strategic improvements to both the foul sewerage and surface water disposal without attenuation, the problems we have experienced in the past will only be exacerbated, as shown in the photographs taken very recently on 19/20 April 2012. These are not just surface / runoff waters, but due to the combined sewerage system, are made up of both runoff and raw sewerage. This underlines the extent of the problem and reinforces the urgent need to deal with the drains, both foul and surface, before considering any further developments, especially of such significance as the proposed development, in Kelsall. The flooding of raw sewerage is a significant human health and environmental issue and is anticipated to worsen due to the effects of climate change.

As a result, the proposed development should be refused.

See attached photographs of flooding taken on 19/20 April 2012.

Objection 13. Poor community consultation.

The applicant has conducted a poor and inappropriate public consultation over such a substantial proposed development.

An uninformative letter drop (that did not go to all local residents, including many within 250m of the development) and a poorly advertised public exhibition lasting only a few hours does not make a satisfactory public consultation. Several of the questions were leading questions where it was difficult to actually oppose the question being asked, although this had little to do with the actual proposed development.

Other questions look to be obtaining the views of residents but have absolutely nothing to do with the need for the proposed development or not. Regardless of the glossing up of this 'consultation', little, if any, of the feedback (which was overwhelmingly negative) has been shown to be incorporated into the proposed development.

The removal of some expensive properties does not reflect the overwhelming negative approach to this proposed development.

A real consultation starts with a 'blank canvas' and a starting point of 'what do most stakeholders want?', is then widely advertised and conducted over several events and methods, it takes on all the views submitted to reach the end point that most stakeholders are happy with. This has not been done. The 'consultation' was merely a developer 'going through the motions' and really seems to have been a developer saying "this is what we're doing; now we'd better consult on it".

Since an appropriate public consultation is now at the heart of the NPPF and Localism Act, especially for this type of development and this cannot be shown to have occurred, the proposed development should be refused.

Objection 14. Development is against an emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan

KPC is in the process of developing a Neighbourhood Development Plan in line with the recently enacted Localism Act as at the heart of the NPPF. A core starting point of the NDP will be the Landscape and Design Statement that already benefits from approval post consultation and has been formally adopted into a Supplementary Planning Statement.

Key priorities outlined in the Landscape and Design Statement SPD are affordability and choice of property type, with most need of starter and second step of ladder (small family) homes, as well as 'downsizing' and sheltered properties for elderly people; recreation provision through green space and commercial units; and enhancement of the school. These are already backed up by a sustainability assessment within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD.

In addition, if any re-use of the site were to occur, the site of the proposed development has already been earmarked by the local community as further recreation, amenity and green uses, together with potential for school enlargement. It is considered that these views are unlikely to alter in any Neighbourhood Development Plan. This use must be made of the site since it is unique within Kelsall to offer a combination of advantages as a recreation area i.e.:

- The only remaining site close to the built-up part of Kelsall Parish that is relatively flat so could accommodate recreation uses;
- Size, capable of accommodating full-size and junior football pitches, cricket pitch, children's play area and informal recreation space;
- Central location;
- Easy accessibility from all parts of the village, whether on foot, by bicycle (important for older children) or (for adult users and visiting teams) by car;
- Open aspect (attractive in itself and also a deterrent to vandalism);
- Adjacent to informal recreation space in the form of Kelsall Green;

- Adjacent to the school so provides opportunities for expansion and also pupils to easily use any facilities; and
- Safe location away from a busy road, so suitable for children to play.
- This area of land could be put to better use as part of the green heart of the village for allotments; burial ground and habitat and wildlife.

It is our view that inappropriate developments such as this that do not subscribe to our adopted landscape and design criteria with all the associated benefits (sustainability, visual amenity and sense of wellbeing, ecology, highways and transport, school provision and general needs of the current demographic) will seriously undermine the enthusiastic initiative of this Parish Council.

The Parish cannot be accused of NIMBYISM, since significant development has occurred in Kelsall in the past and a constant stream of developments have occurred recently adding new residential developments on infill land and also by the demolition of existing buildings and their replacement by several new properties. In addition, other large sites have been identified within the Landscape and Design Statement SPD that are considered more sustainable than the proposed development. It is considered that these views are unlikely to alter in any Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Kelsall Parish Council is not adverse to development and has welcomed the draft Local Plan consultations. The Parish Council wishes to work with developers to enhance the village and requests that this be afforded to the Parish Council to ensure any developments within the village meet the future requirements of the village as a whole and are located on sites that are both beneficial to Kelsall as well as the local businesses and the developers.

Since the direction of any 'hard' development in Kelsall, as well as community recreation, amenity, and cultural enhancement, including for this site, are already widely known the proposed development should be refused. Such 'intent' is widely used in planning (e.g. the way the NPPF was referred to substantially before its introduction by both Government, local authorities and in particular developers). However, this intent and the views of the community have been ignored by the prospective developer.

As a result, the planning application should be refused.

Objection 15. Local Plan

Kelsall Parish Council is not adverse to development and has welcomed the draft Local Plan consultations that will support the development of their neighbourhood plan. The Parish Council wishes to work with developers to enhance the village and requests that this be afforded to the Parish Council to ensure any developments within the village meet the future requirements of the village as a whole and are located on sites that are both beneficial to Kelsall as well as the local businesses and the developers.



This is a secure infant children's playground, not public open space as implied by applicant. Access into playground from the proposed development has significant safety issues. KPC own this land and will not allow access. There is no way to bypass it.



The Children's Playground Bloor Homes proposes to access in the far corner.



The proposed point of access, this is the only boundary with the application site onto Kelsall Green so there is no way to bypass the playground.



Bloor originally also proposed that the above entrance from Church Street could also be used as a footpath/cycle link but removed it from the planning application after concerns about privacy for the residents



Photographs of flooding taken on 19/20 April 2012.