



---

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to give my opinion regarding the latest Local Plan consultation.

I would like to give my strong support to the development at R18/111. Firstly, I have no connection to the owners of the land involved nor the developers; indeed I do not even know who they are.

I feel that the R18/111 plan has distinctly sought to offer so many thoughtful positives and deal creatively with any possible negatives. It offers infrastructure opportunities that help to spread the load of the otherwise saturated current infrastructure (doctors' surgeries, etc) and allows for a proper mix of housing across personal resources and ages. While on the south-east edge, it feels a natural development along the linear nature of the village; in how residents use that eastern side for access to and from, both for village areas and road and motorways access for work and leisure needs. It is creative in its view of using the green belt area needed, linking it to current well used walking/leisure breathing spaces such as Spud Wood. People, older and younger, also regularly walk as a matter of course, from the Oughttrington Lane / Sandy Lane areas to various points in the village via various roads and paths. This includes for leisure and for access to three schools. So R18/111 doesn't feel out on a limb. The plan still shows rather clever boundaries to the village plan, both through natural features and through a sort of 'directional persuasion', as I would phrase it.

The details and thoughtful assurances about the quality of life/housing/infrastructure in R18/111 seem incomparably superior when one looks at the plans suggested elsewhere. Plans for R18/068 and R18/120 seem rather casual in their approach and would compound the serious school traffic congestion and dangers. Plan R18/132 seems to have more detail than these yet also seems casual about some of the quality of life issues too; prominent among their plan examples are photographs of three storey house designs inappropriate to an 'Outlying Settlement' village of a 'Garden City'. Such seems to indicate the same casual attitude to the quality of the lived-in environment as shown in the attitude to the Warrington bridges; what could be a distinctive key style of the area looks just like casual neglect towards local opinion.

The various plans shown to the south-west of Lymm, running both to the west and to the south, seem strangely odd and distant from the village and its facilities. In spite of current dwellings to the north of these areas, the plan areas actually 'feel' remote from the village, they don't 'fit'. It is also not desirable for health reasons, given what we now know about pollution from heavy traffic, to put houses closer to a major motorway where fumes would be carried to the housing by the prevailing south-westerly winds. Such development would also threaten the 'Outlying Settlement' separation, regardless of the M6 boundary.

And lastly, re R18/111: the plan tackles the frighteningly dangerous problems of the Lymm High School traffic. Frankly, the current situation should not have been allowed to develop over the years. It's not a good enough excuse to say it just happened to develop historically and organically. I think Warrington Local Authority, Councillors and Planners would have to take some responsibility should a tragedy happen because of current conditions and because such an opportunity to drastically improve them be missed. I'd love it if some of you came several times to observe how the current dangerous situation and feel some weight of the responsibility.

Perhaps enough for now; R18/111 seems outstanding a plan for so many and for such a wide range of reasons.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.