



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 26 March 2025

Site visit made on 26 March 2025

by S Brook BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/W/24/3355587

Pear Tree Farm, Well Lane, Stretton Warrington WA4 4PA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jack Thwaites against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 2023/00621/FUL.
 - The development proposed is an agricultural building and the laying of a farm access track.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an agricultural building and the laying of a farm access track at Pear Tree Farm, Well Lane, Stretton, Warrington, WA4 4PA, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 2023/00621/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. Both main parties have had an opportunity to comment on the revised Framework and so have not been prejudiced by this change. It was agreed by the main parties that the revisions to the Framework did not materially impact on the consideration of the proposal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in determining this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i. Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to any relevant development plan policies and the Framework, including where relevant, the effect on openness.
 - ii. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area, which includes the Greenway Network.
 - iii. Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, or any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. The appeal site comprises part of a field located to the east of Summit Close and to the north of Well Lane, with Pear Tree Farm located to the northeast and the M56 motorway located to the north. A section of the field close to Well Lane is laid to grass and is separated from the wider field by post and wire fencing. The field beyond is ploughed. A public right of way (PRoW) crosses the field from Well Lane to Summit Close. To the south of the motorway, land predominantly comprises agricultural fields, albeit there are clusters of housing along parts of Well Lane, Common Lane and Northwich Road (the A559). Land levels in the area are generally flat, with some undulation.
5. Policy GB1 of the Warrington Local Plan 2021/22-2038/39, adopted December 2023, (LP), sets out that in accordance with national planning policy, within the Green Belt, planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development, except in very special circumstances, while certain forms of development, defined in national planning policy to be an exception to inappropriate development within the Green Belt, will be supported, subject to meeting other relevant policies and any relevant Supplementary Planning Documents.
6. Paragraph 142 of the Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Certain buildings and other forms of development will not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, where they meet the exceptions set out in paragraph 154 of the Framework.
7. Exception a) of paragraph 154 relates to buildings for agriculture. The plans before me show a building of typical agrarian appearance and materials. The floor plan indicates that the proposed building would be used for the storage of crops or hay, with some additional storage of farm machinery and implements. The appellant's Design and Access Statement (DAS) indicates that the farm holding comprises 56.2ha, with the majority of land cropped with cereals and potatoes on an annual basis, with the remaining land down to grass, used for grazing up to 200 sheep, or cropped for hay. However, I heard from the appellant that additional land had since been acquired at Antrobus, and so the farm holding now totals approximately 104ha.
8. For a number of reasons, interested parties have questioned whether the proposed building is for agriculture. These include reference to the conversion of a former agricultural barn at Pear Tree Farm to residential use¹ and the appellant's intention to provide a garden for this barn conversion in the existing farmyard; use of a remaining barn at Pear Tree Farm for the storage of steam engines; an unimplemented planning permission for an agricultural building² at Stretton View Farm (part of the wider farm holding); and the submission of an application for prior approval for the change of use of existing barns at Stretton View Farm for storage/distribution (B8 use class)³, albeit this application was withdrawn. I also

¹ Reference 2018/32292

² Reference 2021/39442

³ Reference 2018/33815

heard from interested parties that there is a lack of any significant agricultural activity at Pear Tree Farm, and that planning permission has already been obtained for a further agricultural building on the wider farm holding at Stockley Lane, Antrobus, which lies within a neighbouring Council area.

9. The Council's Officer Report (OR) acknowledged a number of these matters, and I also heard from the Council that an enforcement warning notice has been issued relating to the storage of steam engines within the existing barn at Pear Tree Farm. Nevertheless, at the Hearing, the Council maintained its position that the proposed building would be for agriculture and so it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
10. While these issues cast some doubt on whether the proposed building would be for agriculture, some of these issues arose a number of years ago, and I understand that planning permission for the approved agricultural building at Stretton View Farm has now lapsed. More recently, the appellant has doubled the land holding associated with the farm, and so I have less reason to question the need for a further building to expand the farm operations. Further, while the appellant may have pursued other options for locating the building, I heard that the appeal site is the preferred location for security reasons. The available evidence at this time, leads me to conclude that the proposed building would be for agriculture and so it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
11. The main parties agreed at the Hearing that the proposed farm access track is an engineering operation. Engineering operations are not inappropriate development under paragraph 154 h) ii) of the Framework provided that they preserve Green Belt openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.
12. The Council's OR sets out that the proposed farm access track would run across relatively flat land and so it would have limited above ground presence. On this basis, the Council stated that the spatial aspect of openness of the Green Belt would be maintained and this position was confirmed at the Hearing. Having considered the proposed plans, I agree with the Council. The proposed farm access track would not have a spatial impact on openness.
13. Visually, the proposed access track would introduce a narrow, albeit notable length of hard surfacing across, rather than around, this open and undeveloped field. I note the requested conditions of the Highway Authority relating to the sealed surfacing of the track for its first 5m, pedestrian visibility splays and the setting back of the existing gates, which would also have visual implications, over and above those shown on the proposed plans.
14. The plans include a cross section of the track, which indicates a hedge and fence to each side. I heard from the appellant that the proposed fence would be a post and rail type, albeit no details are before me. The Council accepted at the Hearing that the visual impact of the access track would be largely removed by the hedge planting, that it would be possible to see through fencing of the type proposed, and that any visual impact of the fencing would be diminished by the backdrop of the hedge, albeit this would take time to mature. Nevertheless, the Council maintained that the resulting 'narrow driveway' created by the hedge and fence would appear at odds with the open field.

15. The proposed access track, as well as any yard associated with the proposed building, could be seen from the public right of way and from the existing gate at Summit Close. It would be a physical and visual change from the existing open field, albeit the relatively flat land would limit the extent to which this change in surfacing would be visible.
16. Hedge planting, if positioned along the track as suggested, would largely screen this part of the proposal in wider views, with the exception of glimpsed views from the entrance at Summit Close. The green quality of this hedging would ensure that the proposed track and yard would not encroach into the visual perception of openness of the Green Belt at this location, or the relief afforded by it. Nor do I consider that the fencing of the type proposed would harm openness, given that it would be possible to see through and over it, and it would have hedging behind. The introduction of the access track and hedging would give the appearance of two smaller fields rather than one larger one, with the track cutting through, and so the overall visual quality of openness would be maintained.
17. Farm machinery presently crosses this field. Although the formation of a formal track and construction of the proposed building could result in an increased use by farm vehicles, nevertheless, the proposed access track is intended to accommodate farm vehicles. Any farm vehicles passing along the track would be moving and intermittent, not stationary, and farm vehicles associated with Pear Tree Farm are likely to pass through this part of the Green Belt presently, on the adjacent highway. The level of use would not be akin to a new road because it would be a private way, serving farm vehicles associated with the farm enterprise. Within the Design and Access Statement (DAS), it is confirmed that the building itself will adequately store machinery. Therefore, this aspect of the proposal would not harm the visual aspect of openness.
18. As such, I find that the proposed access track would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and it would not conflict with the Green Belt purpose to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, or any other Green Belt purpose. Consequently, the proposed farm access track would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
19. To conclude on this first main issue, for the above reasons, I find that the proposed agricultural building and farm access track would both meet the exceptions listed in Paragraph 154 of the Framework and so neither aspect of the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, I find no conflict with LP policy GB1. Nor have I identified any conflict with LP policy DC6 in this regard, which is included in the first refusal reason on the Council's decision notice, and which is primarily concerned with the principles of good design.

Character and Appearance

20. The appeal site and its surroundings have a predominantly rural character and appearance, resulting from the number of open agricultural fields, interspersed with hedgerows lining narrow country lanes. However, housing along parts of Well Lane, Common Lane, Northwich Road and Summit Close, forms part of the character and appearance of the area, and the presence of the motorway to the north is apparent by the noise it generates, rather than by having any significant visual influence.

21. The design and materials of the proposed agricultural building are typical of farm buildings and would not be dissimilar to the existing barn at Pear Tree Farm. At the Hearing, the Council acknowledged that the proposed building would be positioned close to the existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm and that it would be similar in size and scale to these existing buildings, and I agree. The existing farm buildings at Pear Tree Farm are clearly visible from Well Lane, a point also accepted by the Council. Given the proximity of the proposed building, it would appear as an extension to this existing farmstead, in a location where farm buildings are an established part of the street scene. While the proposed barn would have a separate access, this would not be particularly obvious to the passerby given the hedging along this part of Well Lane, and so it would not obviously appear as a separate entity.
22. I heard from the Council that the position of the proposed building would result in a linear pattern of ribbon development, rather than a cluster arrangement. However, further development off the existing farmyard is somewhat constrained by the presence of Pear Tree farmhouse and the converted barn, as well as the alignment of the PRoW running from Well Lane to Summit Close. Given the proximity of the proposed building to existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm, which presently front onto Well Lane, and the presence of housing opposite, I do not consider that the addition of the proposed building to this side of Well Lane would be at odds with the existing pattern of development, or the appearance of the area. A further agricultural building would not appear incongruous in an area of rural character.
23. I note the appellant's inclusion of tree planting between the proposed building and Well Lane and while this would provide some screening for the building, it would not be necessary to make the development acceptable in visual terms.
24. The proposed access track would change the present appearance of this open field by introducing a manmade feature. However, farm tracks are not an unusual feature in rural areas and the proposed hedging if positioned around the track and yard, would soften and screen its appearance. The plant species used for this hedging would be important in ensuring that it had a rural, rather than a domestic appearance. This, along with the precise positioning and extent of the hedging and any boundary fencing, could be controlled by the imposition of suitable conditions. As discussed above, the introduction of the proposed access track would give the appearance of two smaller fields rather than one larger field, and while this would represent a change, it would not be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area.

Greenway Network

25. It is clear to me from the representations made by interested parties both in writing and at the Hearing, that local residents value the rural landscape that extends south from the motorway. I heard that open land to the north of the motorway has been allocated for residential development and so remaining areas of open space are increasingly important. One way to appreciate such areas is through the use of public footpaths that comprise part of the 'Greenway Network'. While not of high landscape value, the area is nevertheless an attractive rural area to walk through.
26. The proposed agricultural building and yard would run alongside the PRoW where it extends north from Well Lane across the field containing the appeal site. The

proposed track would then divert away from the PRoW, towards the existing access at Summit Close. The PRoW joins Summit Close slightly further north.

27. I understand that the proposed plans were amended at the planning application stage to show that the proposed yard and track would be physically separate from the line of the PRoW. Correspondence from the appellant also confirmed that the proposed track would not connect to the existing yard at Pear Tree Farm or cross the public footpath, or create a through route from Summit Close to Well Lane.
28. However, both main parties agreed that the proposed plans do not clearly show that it would not be possible for vehicles to cross from the proposed track and yard to the existing yard at Pear Tree Farm, but that it would be possible to control this by the imposition of suitable conditions. Conditions are proposed and agreed by the main parties that require details of boundary treatments and gates to the track and yard to be approved by the Council, and which restrict vehicles from moving between the proposed track and yard and the existing yard at Pear Tree Farm.
29. At present, when joining the PRoW from Well Lane, the land is open to the north and west. Nevertheless, it is clear that the PRoW traverse's farmland, with the existing barn, field gate and yard immediately to the east. Houses along Well Lane and Summit Close are visible. When approaching from Summit Close, users of the footpath would initially pass through the open field, albeit Pear Tree Farm and the housing on Well Lane would be visible ahead.
30. The appeal scheme would introduce further built form to the west of the PRoW when first joining from Well Lane. As such, the experience for users of this footpath would change. Users would be more likely to feel that they were passing through the farm complex and the open aspect to the west when first entering the field, would be lost. However, this would be for a short duration only and once passed the proposed building, the view would open up, and the track would divert away from the alignment of the PRoW, while the proposed hedging would provide screening. The PRoW is signposted and so this arrangement would not necessarily deter users. The present route of the PRoW takes in existing farm and residential buildings along Well Lane and Mosshall Lane, and so this presently forms part of the experience for users of the footpath. As such, while the proposal would result in some change in experience for users of the public footpath, this change would not be significantly different to the present experience.
31. The appellant confirmed at the Hearing that it was now his intention for a combine harvester to cross from the proposed track and yard onto land at the rear of the existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm and out onto the highway via an existing field access further east of Pear Tree Farm, where Well Lane becomes Mosshall Lane. This would involve the combine harvester crossing the public footpath at some point, albeit this is not defined on the proposed plans.
32. I heard from the appellant that the proposed hedging to the track would more clearly define the route of the public footpath and despite safety concerns from local residents, the Highway Authority confirmed that the amendments made to the plans would ensure that the safety of the PRoW was maintained. I also heard from the Highway Authority that it would be possible to provide a safe route for a combine harvester to pass from the proposed track and yard across the public footpath and along the rear of existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm, as suggested by the appellant. It was agreed between the main parties that the suggested

condition requiring details of the boundary treatments and gates to the proposed track and yard, would direct the route of the combine harvester.

33. The proposed plans are unclear in terms of the position and extent of any boundary treatment and gates to the proposed track and yard, and how this would suitably manage the movement of farm vehicles in the context of the PRoW and the safety of its users. However, I agree with the main parties that this could be addressed through the imposition of suitable conditions requiring full details of the type and position of fencing and gates to the track and yard, and through the inclusion of a condition restricting vehicle movements between the proposed track and yard and the existing yard at Pear Tree Farm. While the intention remains that a combine harvester would cross the PRoW from the proposed track, the existing route of the combine harvester crosses the public footpath at present, and so any risk to the safety of users of the public footpath would be unlikely to change to any significant or harmful degree.
34. To conclude on this second main issue, for the above reasons, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area, including the Greenway Network. Consequently, I find no conflict with LP policies DC6 and DC3, which collectively and amongst other matters, require that new development makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, having regard to matters including layout, scale, height, massing, and materials, contributes positively to the public realm, and protects and improves existing green infrastructure and the functions it performs.

Whether Other Considerations Amount to Very Special Circumstances

35. At the Hearing, there was extensive discussion of a number of other considerations relating to the proposal, in particular, the need for the proposed farm access track as a result of difficulties experienced by the appellant when crossing the field, particularly with large machinery such as a combine harvester; whether Well Lane afforded an alternative route for such machinery given its narrow width; and whether utilising Summit Close for farm related vehicles provided an improvement over Well Lane, including at its junction with Northwich Road.
36. However, for the above reasons, I have concluded that the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Further, I have not identified any harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the Greenway Network. In these circumstances, it is not necessary for very special circumstances to be demonstrated to justify the proposal, and so I do not need to consider these matters further in this respect.

Other Matters

37. Tanyard Farmhouse, which lies opposite Pear Tree Farm, is a grade II listed building. I am required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of this listed building. I understand it is in residential use and is no longer associated with any farm, albeit I heard from the appellant that Tanyard Farmhouse was historically the farmhouse associated with Pear Tree Farm.
38. The existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm and the houses along Well Lane, are within the setting of this listed building, along with the surrounding open fields. Views of this listed building are possible from along Well Lane and from the public

right of way. Given that agricultural development is an established part of the setting of this listed building and that the proposal would relate well to existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm, the proposal would preserve the setting of this listed building.

39. A number of other matters have been raised by interested parties. These include the need for the proposed access track, partly because the farm has operated without it for a number of years, partly because the proposed building could be accessed from the existing entrance, and also in response to the appellant having highlighted problems with particular machinery crossing the existing field or accessing via Well Lane. The Highway Authority and interested parties have also questioned whether problem areas within the field could be stabilised by other means.
40. However, the Framework's test for whether engineering operations are inappropriate development or not within the Green Belt, does not include a test of need for the development. Further, the Council's refusal reasons do not direct me to any local plan policy requiring a need for the proposed access track to be demonstrated. Consequently, I give limited weight to this matter.
41. The proposal would result in some loss of agricultural land, however, I heard from the Council that this would not be substantial. I have no reason to disagree, and so this is a matter that would carry only limited weight against the proposal.
42. At the Hearing, the Highway Authority raised no highway safety concerns with the proposal in terms of any increased use of Summit Close. I note a number of conditions are suggested by the Highway Authority that would modify this existing access, including the setting back of the existing gates by 5m to allow farm vehicles to pull clear of the highway, the provision of pedestrian visibility splays, and the provision of a bound surface for the first 5m of the track to prevent mud and debris being brought onto the road. This 5m distance was clarified at the Hearing. As the proposal would be likely to increase vehicular use of this existing field gate, the imposition of these suggested conditions would be reasonable and necessary. Subject to the imposition of these conditions, I have no reason to disagree with the advice of the Highway Authority, that highway safety on Summit Close would not be harmed.
43. I am advised that the proposed agricultural building would be positioned approximately 19m across from the house opposite, which is Well House. The gable end of the proposed agricultural building would face towards this house at an angle, with the longer side of the building extending away from it. This gable elevation would be 9.2m wide and 7.7m to the ridge of the roof. This would no doubt change the outlook for occupiers of this property, as presently the outlook is over the open field, with only an oblique view of existing buildings at Pear Tree Farm. Nevertheless, at 19m separation, the introduction of this building into the view in the manner proposed, would not be overly dominant and so I agree with the Council that a reasonable outlook would be maintained for occupiers of this property.
44. For the occupiers of other properties along Well Lane, views of the proposed barn would be more oblique. Presently, the outlook from Tanyard House, is predominantly of the existing barn at Pear Tree Farm. While the proposed building would introduce further development into the open aspect to the west, views to the

west between the existing and proposed building would still be possible. Considering this, and the separation distance, a reasonable outlook would be maintained for occupiers of this property also.

45. Tree planting has been suggested between the proposed building and Well Lane in response to concerns raised by the Council and interested parties. Over time, such planting could afford some screening to the proposed building. However, it is not necessary to make the development acceptable in relation to the outlook of existing residents.
46. I have no reason to consider that a building for agriculture would result in any privacy issues for existing residents, and while there may be some noise and disturbance during the construction phase, this would be of short duration. The proposed building for agriculture would be positioned next to an existing farm building, on an established farm, and there is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that it would give rise to a greater level of noise or disturbance than the established farm operations.
47. It has been suggested that the shading from any trees planted adjacent to the hedgerow along Well Lane could impact detrimentally on biodiversity. It has also been suggested that the proposal could increase flooding. However, I have not been provided with any compelling evidence that this would be the case, sufficient to give these matters any significant weight in the planning balance.
48. Reference has been made to traffic survey data provided as part of a previous proposal, however, that information is not before me, and I must determine the appeal based on the evidence presented. I have also been referred to the removal of a passing place for emergency vehicles, however this does not fall within the scope of this appeal.
49. Some interested parties expressed concerns that the appellant would not use the track and building for their intended agricultural purpose. While I take these concerns seriously, I must determine the appeal based on the development applied for, and not what might happen in the future. The Council has powers to pursue any future breach of planning control.
50. These other matters do not lead me to a different overall conclusion that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

51. A list of suggested conditions was included within the Council's Statement of Case and these were discussed in detail at the Hearing. Where I agree that the conditions are necessary, I have amended the wording, in the interests of precision and clarity, and to comply with advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
52. In addition to the statutory condition controlling the timescale within which the development must commence, a condition is required to specify the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. The Council agreed at the Hearing that it was unnecessary for this condition to reference the DAS and an email of the 20 September 2023, as these two documents provide contradictory information, and because other conditions achieve the same purpose. I have included the Landholding Map as this denotes the red line of the application site.

53. Conditions are imposed to secure the external materials of the proposed building and the surface materials of the access track, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Conditions are also imposed to secure details of landscaping and boundary treatments. The former is necessary in the interests of Green Belt openness and the character and appearance of the area. The latter is necessary to control the route of any farm vehicles from the proposed track and yard onto surrounding land, in the interests of safety for users of the PRow. Given that these details are to be agreed, this should address any concerns the Council or Highway Authority may have in terms of accommodating any overhang of the combine harvester.
54. In addition to those conditions discussed above to ensure highway safety on Summit Close, a final condition is imposed to ensure that the proposed development does not result in the creation of a through route between Summit Close and Well Lane, also in the interests of safety for users of the PRow.

Conclusion

55. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Brook

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby approved shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents: Planning Application Form, Proposed Floor Plan, Proposed Sides, Proposed Elevations, New Farm Hardcore Track, Location Plan (Amended 20 September 2023), Site Plan (Amended 20 September 2023), Landholding Map.
- 3) The building hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the external materials specified on the submitted application form.
- 4) No surfacing of the farm access track and yard hereby approved shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the surfacing of the access track and yard have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Prior to first use of the development hereby approved, a scheme of landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This scheme shall include details of the position and extent of hedging to both sides of the access track and to the yard, and the type of plant species to be used for this hedging. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the commencement of the use of the development, or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 6) Prior to first use of the development hereby approved, boundary treatment details for the access track and yard shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include the position and extent of fencing to the access track and yard, the type of fencing to be used, and the position and type of any gates along the route of the track and yard. The boundary treatment shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is brought into use.
- 7) Prior to first use of the farm access track hereby approved, that part of the access extending from the nearside edge of the channel line of Summit Close for a minimum distance of 5 metres into the site shall be paved in a bound material such as tarmacadam, concrete, block pavements or other material approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 8) Any gate or other form of barrier across the farm access track hereby approved shall be positioned at least 5 metres back from the nearside edge of the channel line of Summit Close, and shall be constructed so as to open into the site only.

- 9) Prior to first use of the farm access track hereby approved, pedestrian visibility splays of 2 metres by 2 metres shall be provided on each side of the associated vehicular access. The depth shall be measured from the back of verge; and the width measured outward from the centreline of the access. The splays shall be created clear of obstructions to visibility at or above a height of 0.6 metres above verge level. Once created, the visibility splays shall be maintained clear of any obstruction and shall be retained at all times.
- 10) There shall be no vehicular access between the proposed farm access track and yard and the existing yard to the front of Pear Tree Farm in either direction.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Jack Thwaites Appellant
Mr Alan Thwaites

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Gary Earnshaw	Team Leader	Warrington Borough Council
Mr Phil Peak	Principal Engineer	Warrington Borough Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mrs Kirsty Parrington	
Mr Julian Parrington	
Mr Anthony Dove	
Mrs Dove	
Mr Brian Jones	
Mrs Linda Jones	Stretton Parish Council