

Objection to Proposed Housing Developments in Frodsham & Helsby

1. Inadequate Infrastructure and Strain on Public Services

The existing infrastructure in Frodsham and Helsby is already under pressure. Local roads are congested, schools are near capacity, and GP surgeries are overstretched. Proposing to add between 1,500 and 3,000 new homes, without a confirmed 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan' is irresponsible and unsustainable. Planning policies clearly state that developments must be supported by sufficient infrastructure - a condition that is not currently being met in this case.

2. Threat to Local Wildlife and Protected Landscapes

The proposed development areas are in close proximity to important ecological zones, including Local Wildlife Sites and the nationally significant Ince Marshes. Building here would disrupt natural habitats, threaten protected species, and breach biodiversity commitments outlined in the council's Local Plan (Part Two, Policies DM2 and DM46–DM50). These areas are ecologically sensitive and deserve strict protection - not irreversible damage.

3. National Planning Policy and Green Belt Protections

Helsby and Frodsham are surrounded by Green Belt land intended to limit urban sprawl and preserve countryside. The Cheshire West Local Plan confirms that 42% of the borough is Green Belt and specifies that only development requiring a rural location should be permitted. National guidance (NPPF) allows Green Belt development only in *exceptional circumstances* - criteria which have not been met here. No justification has been given to override these protections, and allowing this would set a dangerous precedent.

4. Loss of Town Character and Community Identity

Large-scale housing developments would fundamentally alter the rural character and cultural identity and charm of both Helsby and Frodsham. These are not blank spaces on a map; they are living landscapes with historic walking routes, market town charm, and cherished green spaces for nature enthusiasts. Dumping thousands of homes into this environment would strip away local walking routes, where dogs walk and children learn about their environment and so forth and just ruining what makes these communities special and significantly impacting residents' sense of place and well-being – as I'm sure you are aware mental health is especially important to factor in.

5. Misguided Reliance on Rail Access for Expansion

Although Helsby and Frodsham benefit from train stations, this alone does not make them suitable for major housing growth. Option C's focus on rail-linked development fails to acknowledge that transport infrastructure in the area is limited and no upgrades are planned. Relying on existing rail links without investment, risks creating unsustainable sprawl and diminishing the distinct identities of both towns.

6. Housing Needs Already Accounted for in Local Plans

Frodsham's Neighbourhood Plan — built on community consultation and formally adopted — demonstrates that local housing targets (around 250 homes by 2030) can be fully met without touching the Green Belt. This plan clearly reflects residents' wishes to protect countryside views, open fields, and green corridors. The housing argument simply doesn't justify Green Belt loss when current strategies already provide solutions.

Long-Term Consequences if Development Proceeds

Should these housing proposals be approved, Helsby and Frodsham face losing their character as independent, semi-rural communities. The towns risk becoming absorbed into an ever-expanding corridor of development — resulting in even more conti issues of already gridlocked roads, overstretched healthcare services, a heightened risk of flooding, and the destruction of vital natural habitats. These are not hypothetical concerns; they are well-documented outcomes when planning policy, ecological evidence, and local voices are ignored. Once the land is lost, there is no getting it back, and no residents within Frodsham or Helsby wish to be ignored, we live here and do not want this proposal to be accepted and us me undermined.

Final Summary

The Green Belt is in place for a reason and should stay that way. These proposals are inconsistent with planning policy, unsupported by infrastructure, and opposed by the local community. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify such irreversible change. The law does not support it. The people do not support it. And the environmental, social, and cultural costs would be permanent. Approving this development would mark a serious failure in responsible planning and governance.