

Date 20/11/25

Planning Department
Halton Council

Re: Objection to Planning Application 25/00107/OUT per your mail listed below.

Site : Hill Top Farm for 94 Dwellings.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the above planning application for the construction of 94 new houses at Hill Farm Preston on the Hill.

1. Impact on Traffic, Road Safety & Parking

The proposed development will significantly increase traffic in the area, which is already congested.

Concerns include:

- Insufficient parking provision
- Increased risk to pedestrians and children
- Narrow roads unsuitable for additional traffic
- Lack of safe access/egress for vehicle
- Knock on effect to the A56 Chester Rd which is far too congestive especially with HGV traffic.

This raises serious road safety concerns.

2. Overdevelopment of the Site

The scale and density of the proposal represent overdevelopment, which is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

The houses will:

- Appear out of scale
- Reduce open space
- Harm the semi-rural/rural/suburban character (choose one)

3. Harm to Residential Amenity

The development will negatively affect neighbouring residents through:

- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Overlooking
- Noise and disruption
- Construction impacts

This is contrary to typical Local Plan policies protecting residential amenity.

4. Environmental and Wildlife Concerns

The site may contain important wildlife, including [e.g., bats, birds, hedgehogs], and the proposed development risks habitat loss.

The application does not demonstrate adequate ecological surveys or mitigation.

5. Lack of Local Infrastructure Capacity

Local services are already under pressure. The development will increase pressure on:

- . Schools
 - GP surgeries
 - Public transport
 - Drainage and sewer systems
 - Local parks and community facilities

No adequate mitigation has been proposed.

6. Flooding and Drainage Issues

If the area is prone to flooding or surface water issues:

The development poses a risk of increased flooding due to loss of permeable ground, inadequate drainage proposals, and known existing issues in the area.

7. Inadequate Consultation / Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with key sections of the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, including those relating to sustainable development, character, and amenity.

Additionally, consultation with residents has to be held via the Parish Council and Preston Brook residents.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I request that planning permission be refused. The proposal would result in significant harm to the local area, residents, and environment, and fails to comply with local and national planning policies.

Yours faithfully,

Date 25 November 2025

Planning Department

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to formally object to the proposal that would allow surface water to be discharged into Kickwick brook at Preston brook CGJ2/49 and for the planning Application from HBC for the Morris Homes developments at Preston Brook

Albeit HBC have conducted a survey on the Wharf properties for drainage plus an additional topographical survey of the brook to be completed Date yet to be confirmed.

1. Environmental Impact & Water Quality Concerns

Allowing untreated or insufficiently treated surface water to enter the stream poses a significant risk of pollution. Runoff commonly contains oils, chemicals, sediments, and contaminants from roads and hard surfaces. These can harm aquatic ecosystems, reduce biodiversity, and degrade water quality for downstream users.

2. Increased Flood Risk

The stream already experiences [state current conditions, if applicable—e.g., high winter levels, recent flooding, erosion issues]. Adding new surface water volumes could increase peak flows, raise flood risk for nearby properties, and exacerbate bank erosion causing land slides. Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) should limit discharge to pre-development rates, not introduce new burdens on the watercourse.

3. Non-Compliance with Sustainable Drainage Principles

Modern planning policy emphasises onsite water attenuation, infiltration, and sustainable drainage. Direct discharge into natural watercourses should be a last resort, not a first option. The application appears to lack [state what's missing: infiltration tests, SuDS hierarchy assessment, capacity analysis, ecological survey, etc. The logical and cost reduction would be to discharge into the main sewer system, with cost down to the developer.

4. Ecological and Habitat Protection

The stream supports local wildlife, including Insects, birds rodents, fish, foxes, badgers, Increased runoff, siltation, and fluctuating water levels can destroy habitats, disrupt spawning areas, and reduce overall ecological health.

5. Alternatives Not Fully Considered

The applicant has not demonstrated that alternatives such as main sewer, soaksaways, swales, rain gardens, or controlled discharge rates have been fully explored. These methods not only reduce environmental impact but align with national and local drainage policies.

Conclusion

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the council refuse permission for the proposed surface water discharge unless the applicant can clearly demonstrate:

- robust SuDS measures
- no increase in flood risk
- no ecological harm
- full compliance with planning policy and regulations.
- Also full assurances from HBC that they will cover the cost of any damage coursed by the following.
- Flooding to gardens and properties, subsidence into the brook from the banks into the Stream that causes any blockage to the brook.
- Three options were proposed for the Developer to review and choose an option, 1- Drain water into the canal however Peel Holdings rejected that option. 2- The Brook which is still under HBC investigation plus our objection, 3- The main sewer system for which is still the easiest option but been avoided by the developer for which no explanation as been given..
- Out of the above three options 2 and 3 are still available, with option 3 being the best option but more expensive than the other.
- Network rail and the Environment Agency have booth confirmed they have not approved for the water discharge of any surplus water into the brook.

The objection has full agreement from all the residents on the Wharf.

Thank you for considering my objection. I would appreciate confirmation that this letter/mail has been added to the planning file

Yours faithfully,