

[REDACTED]

28th September 2017

Dear Sirs

GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE LOCAL PLAN

1. The total number of new homes planned is based on a formula provided by Central Government and linked to a policy decision by WBC to go for a devolution bid. Devolution is no longer an active Government policy.
2. There is a clear mismatch between the number of homes projected and the population projections. The total number of homes required need to be recalculated based on the latest population projections not some out of date formula.
3. There is an assumption by WBC throughout the Plan that Warrington should become a City. Where is the evidence to support this assumption? None is provided in the Plan
4. WBC's last plan was produced in 2014 but was rejected in the High Court in 2015 as a result of a case brought by developers. Given this fact it is perhaps understandable that the latest plan seems to be heavily developer and landowner led at the clear expense of residents views. Indeed local residents were hardly involved at all when WBC called for landowners to offer their land for development in 2016. Only 78 responses in total were received between 24th October and 5th December 2016 which suggests that the Council did little to bring this phase of the plan to the attention of local residents.
5. There is some evidence the latest Plan that an integrated approach has been adopted in developing the 4 'City Centre' projects. The same cannot be said for the 'Outlying Settlements' which seem to have no plan other than they reflect the land offered by landowners in 2016.

PLAN FOR LYMM

1. There is a requirement in the latest Local Plan for 500 houses to be built in Lymm. No evidence is presented as to how this number was calculated. Would it perhaps be a reflection of the amount of land offered?
2. The Local Plan indicates that 500 houses can be accommodated with no requirement for additional infrastructure. Is WBC unaware that Lymm High School is full as are a number of primary schools in the area in part due to recent new housing developments in Foxley Close and Scholars Green? NHS GP surgeries are also full. Local roads leading on to Higher Lane are crowded at morning and evening rush hours. Higher Lane itself is at capacity during the rush hours. Despite this it is proposed that 500 new houses can be accommodated with no additional spending on the infrastructure (2000 more people, 1000 more school children and up to 1000 cars). This is not a plan in any reasonable meaning of the word.
3. The village of Lymm is rated highly in a number of national surveys (including The Times) as a high quality place to live because of its village atmosphere, green belt and quality of life. The WBC Plan makes no reference to any of this but appears content to allow it to be destroyed.
4. WBC's own Landscape Charter Assessment 2007 states that " recent housing expansion of Lymm

however into greenfield sites has fundamentally altered and reduced the rural character of the area for which it is renowned" (p273). This was in 2007 before several housing developments took place. Now WBC wants an additional 500 houses in Lymm taking yet more green belt and further destroying the character of Lymm. Again this is not a plan in any reasonable meaning of the word.

LAND EAST OF CROUCHLEY LANE SHLAA SITE 2901/ GREEN BELT PARCEL LY22/ R18/076

I wish to submit the following Reports which have been commissioned by myself and 34 other residents from Lymm as evidence as to why this land should not be released from the Green Belt. "The Site makes a strong contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt." These are not my words but the assessments of both ARUP in 2016 and Warrington Borough Green Belt Assessment in July 2017.

Report 1. Prepared by Walsingham Planning and submitted to WBC on 25/9/17

Report 2. Prepared by [REDACTED] Planning and submitted to WBC on 22/9/17

Report 3. Prepared by [REDACTED] and submitted to WBC on 28/9/17

Report 4. A Highways Report to be submitted to WBC on 29/9/17

The key findings of these reports are:

1. This parcel of land makes a strong contribution to the Green Belt and should not be released. This view is supported by WBC's two site reviews, one before and one after the Berry Review on behalf of the landowner.

2. The WBC's Landscape Charter Assessment 2007 describes Lymm as having few internal views of note with Lymm Water Tower and St Peter's Church being the exceptions. The combination of the open rolling landscape and unrestricted views of this site (LY22/R18/076) provide a high quality landscape which helps to retain the rural character of this part of Lymm.

3. This land is, and has been, used as high quality agricultural land for a long period of time.

4. A significant number of houses on the South West side of Higher Lane (including my own) were built in Victorian times and are identified in the LCA as key cultural elements of the landscape. The map for 1875 included in the Walsingham Planning Report indicates that this parcel of land has remained virtually unchanged since this time and is therefore key to the lasting character of Lymm.....exactly what the Green Belt was designed to protect.

4. There is a public right of access across this land enjoyed by runners and dog walkers. A walk through a housing development is not the same.

5. The release of this land would destroy this visual amenity for Lymm. All existing housing in Lymm (except a small strip dating back to Victorian times) are situated to the North of the A56. This road is in effect the boundary of Lymm village. To the South open countryside. Release of this land would destroy this historic amenity. There would then be nothing to stop the release of more land as there are no permanent boundaries until the M56.

6. There are key road and access issues to this site which are ignored by the Berry Report on behalf of the landowner.

- Crouchley Lane is too narrow to allow the free flow of vehicles. It is a country lane except where it widens to join Higher Lane. There are no pavements and it is used every weekend by runners and cyclists.

- There would be significant issues in the flow of traffic to and from the site. Turning right to join Higher Lane would be very congested and turning left to get to the M56/M6 would lead to a significant increase in traffic flow on narrow lanes unsuitable for such flows.

- There are safety issues with traffic from the site and children attending St Mary's School.

- The proposed vehicular access to the site is too narrow for safe use.

- The proposed pedestrian access via Tower Lane is too narrow for prams/buggies/wheelchairs.

- The proposed emergency access road to Higher Lane is offset from Woodland Avenue and has poor visibility.

- There is no ability to alter the opening on to Higher Lane as one side is a working electrical substation and the other is private land not owned by the landowner of site LY22.

- The Building Regulations Requirement B5 (2000) concerns 'Access and Facilities for Fire Service Section 17 Vehicle Access' includes the following " there should be a minimum carriageway width of 3.7 metres between kerbs" The existing opening is 3.4 metres in total.

In summary I consider the "strong contribution" made by Parcel LY22/R18/076 to the Green Belt should it be removed is totally unacceptable. Its removal would be in contravention of both NPPF Policy and WBC's own Green Belt Assessment Criteria. The Berry Plan on behalf of the landowner also give rise to major safety concerns regarding access for both private and emergency vehicles and pedestrians.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.