

# Response 767

## Respondent Details

Information	
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

## PART A - About You

1. Please complete the following: Please note the email address (if provided below) will be sent a full copy of the submitted response and a unique ID number for future reference (pdf attachment).

Name of person completing the form: Mrs Lindsay Regan

Email address: [REDACTED]

2. What type of respondent are you? Please select all that apply.

A local resident who lives in Warrington

A person who works in Warrington

3. Please complete the following:

Contact details	
Organisation name (if applicable)	-
Agent name (if applicable)	-
Address 1	[REDACTED]
Address 2	[REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Telephone number	[REDACTED]

## PART B - Representation Form 1

1. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? From the drop down list please select one option.

Policy OS7 Lymm - Rushgreen Road

2. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph (s) or policy sub-number (s)? Please select one option.

None of the above

3. Do you consider the Draft Local Plan is: Please select one option in each row.

	Yes	No
Legally Compliant		X
Sound		X
Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate		X

4. If you have answered 'No' to any of the options in the above question then please give details in the box below of why you consider the Draft Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

Not Legally Compliant - Due to the proposal of building on historic settlement boundaries and overdeveloping a green belt area.

Not sound - Due to the infrastructure of Rushgreen Road being unable to support the increased volume of traffic. Pedestrian safety being at risk due to pavements being unsuitable and large vehicles having to mount pavements to pass. Speed of traffic not being monitored and as an outcome increased risk of accidents, particular concerns around children using this route as a direct route to Lymm High School with increased volume of traffic.

Not compliant with the duty to co-operate - Due to there being no mention of protecting the natural boundary on the west side of the site which backs on to Fletchers Lane. Here there is a natural boundary of mature trees which provides a natural habitat for Bats, Badgers and Pheasants amongst many other animals and also provides a natural screening from Tanyard Farm for the houses on Fletchers Lane. This area creates character and charm for our houses and provides us with the 'much desired countryside views' we have paid for with our properties. There is no mention of protecting these trees and the natural stream (registered with Chester Zoo) of which are vital to the character and subsequent market value of our houses.

It seems particularly unfair that 46.5% of your overall plan for Lymm will be situated on this site with access from a very heavily congested through road to Lymm.

5. If you answered 'Yes' to any of the options in question 3 then please give details in the box below the reasons why you support the legal compliance or soundness of the Draft Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

n/a

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Draft Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified above where this relates to soundness. (NB please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It would be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

To make this draft local plan legally compliant and sound i would suggest that you keep to the initial plan to build 64 houses only on this site. This will still put a strain on the infrastructure of Rushgreen road but could be considered a reasonable plan as 15% of the overall housing build plan for Lymm (430 houses) in comparison to the 46.5% you are proposing for this site .

I feel it is unnecessary to situate a health centre on this site as the amount of traffic this would invite to an already highly congested and dangerous road would be detrimental to the area.

As residents [REDACTED] we would like the natural boundary of mature trees and stream behind our houses to the West of the site to remain in its current state and not to be affected by the development. We do not wish to lose this natural habitat area for wildlife or for our houses to be devalued due to losing their green countryside views. We would like this area to remain untouched and for this to be stated in policy OS7. By keeping this area as a natural boundary and screen from the Tanyard farm development we feel it would still separate the historic settlements of Rushgreen and Oughtrington as well as protecting our houses character, charm and subsequent value.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? Please select one option.

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination (I understand details from Part A will be used for contact purposes)

**If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**  
This development has a direct effect on our quality of life, the value of my property, the views and character of where we live and the wildlife behind my house. The stress of not knowing full details of where the development will be situated in respect of my house and the West boundary is causing me an awful lot of undue stress and worry and i am concerned about the effects this is having on mine and my husbands health.

██████████

Dear Warrington Borough Council,

We are writing to oppose the planning proposal of 200 houses and a health centre on the Tanyard Farm site off Rushgreen road for the reason we feel it is unsound and fails to comply with the duty to cooperate.

The local plan speaks of protecting and enhancing the east and south green belt boundaries however there is no mention as to how you will protect the west boundary of this site. This area comprises of a natural stream (registered with Chester Zoo) and many mature trees which provide a natural boundary and screen between Fletchers lane and Tanyard Farm.

currently screened by the above natural boundary ; a stream (registered with Chester Zoo) and woodland area with mature trees. This acts as a natural habitat for Herons, pheasants, badgers, bats, bees and a wide variety of birds. This greenbelt area was the main reason we decided to buy our house

living in this quiet greenbelt area for our own wellbeing. We are concerned that the building of the 200 houses and a health centre on this site will dramatically change this landscape and as a result our quality of life, this development will have a devastating effect on the wildlife and their habitat and devalue our house significantly.

To support this argument I have contacted two local estate agents and enquired about the possible effect being overlooked by 200 houses and a health centre would have on the value of our house. Both estate agents have informed us that having mature trees and a wildlife habitat behind our house certainly adds to the charm and subsequent value of our property and without these unique and stunning features the value of our house could decrease by around 10%. This is a huge concern to us and is causing both myself and my husband a lot of stress and worry.

We did not oppose the initial building of 64 houses on this site as we are reasonable people and understand the need for more housing in Warrington. We were happy that this build would not affect the natural habitat of the wildlife behind our house as the plans showed it would be situated on the previous outbuildings used for various other businesses. We had some concerns around the amount of traffic this would create however again we have been reasonable and done our best to accept that changes will happen in our village.

Despite this we feel very strongly that increasing this proposal to 200 houses and a health centre would be devastating. This is an unreasonable amount of houses and cars (400+) for this area and would be adding to the hugely congested situation of Rushgreen Road. As it currently stands Rushgreen Road is highly dangerous. There are no speed cameras, sleeping policemen etc and cars regularly drive at 50mph+ on this road. Pavements are extremely narrow and allow only for pedestrians to walk in single file. Buses have to mount the pavement when they encounter each other on this road as the roads are not wide enough for two large vehicles to pass each other, this again endangers pedestrians. A neighbour of ours was in fact hurt by a lorry's wingmirror as he passed her so closely whilst she was walking on the pavement. As parents we worry greatly about our children using this road to walk to school, increasing the traffic by a minimum of 400 cars (plus the number of cars a health centre would generate) would be both wreckless and disastrous.

We feel that it is unfair to target the Tanyard Farm site to support 200 of the proposed 430 houses in Lymm by 2022 this is 46.5% of your proposed target on one site. A site that is unsuitable for this development due to the infrastructure of the roads, volume of traffic already in this area and the unsuitability of pavements for the safety of pedestrians.

To summarise our concerns we believe the plan to develop the Tanyard Farm site is not sound due to the following:

- There is no justification for this amount of growth in one very congested area.
- This area of greenbelt is highly valuable as a natural habitat for wildlife and would be destroyed by such a large development.
- Without this area of greenbelt the historic settlements of Rushgreen and Outrington would merge and encroach into the areas of countryside.
- Rushgreen Road is already a very dangerous and congested road which struggles to support current volume of traffic.
- This development would destroy the character and green areas of Rushgreen road which fortunately still has a countryside feel as a main through road to the centre of Lymm.
- Pedestrians would be in danger using unsuitable pavements with a much higher volume of traffic, especially children walking to the local primary and the High School down this main route.
- There has been no correspondence or clarity as to how this development would look and the effects it would have on the natural wildlife habitat behind our house.
- The development would devalue our house if mature trees were removed and Fletchers lane became overlooked as a result of this- this is causing us undue stress.
- Our health and wellbeing is being compromised by the prospect of this unreasonable development proposal and the possibility of destroying the natural wildlife habitat and greenbelt area behind our house.

Please note below are the areas of the Proposed Submission Local Plan that we feel have not been taken into consideration with regards to the West boundary of the site (behind Fletchers Lane):

*Natural Environment 11. The layout of the development should take account of existing landscape features, including trees, ponds, watercourses (including the Bridgewater Canal) and significant hedgerows and ensure the site contributes to the wider objectives of the Northern Forest.*

*Green Belt 12. The east and southern boundaries of the site define the Green Belt boundary. A landscape scheme will be required that retains and enhances the trees and hedgerows along these Green Belt boundaries, and enhances the setting of the Bridgewater Canal.*

We trust that you will consider the points we have raised in this letter and as a result will endeavour to protect existing residents, their quality of life and their homes.

I have attached some images to show the natural boundary behind our house.

Yours sincerely  
Lindsay and Paul Regan.

