

To whom it may concern.

6TH Sept 2017

I would like to give my views on the Local plan – specifically for the village of Lymm

I went to your presentation in the Lymm Village Hall – and I thought it was shambolic. I could only find one map that seemed to be relevant to Lymm. I would have thought as the presentation was primarily for the residents of Lymm, you could have made a bit more effort to explain the issues – and the options. The Borough Council official I spoke to (Transport Planning Manager) seemed unfamiliar with the problems of Lymm, and was a poor representative of the council. He spoke in such jargon that I found it difficult to understand what he was talking about.

I want to make the following points:-

1. Growth assumption

It seems foolhardy to base the need for all the new houses on the assumption that employment growth will continue at the same rate as in the recent past. A lower rate would have a major effect on the need for new houses. Why not initially assume a lower rate of growth and as policy, use only the brown field land until the future becomes clearer.

2. The map that showed where developers would like to build in the Lymm area.

This seemed to be a wish list that ignored totally the concept of the Green Belt. I seem to remember a report produced recently by WBC that ‘parcelled’ into smaller areas all the Green Belt around Warrington. Each parcel was graded according to its value to the local community. I recall that most parcels in Lymm were graded as ‘strong’ – the highest rating on a three point scale. What was the point of this report if it was going to be ignored within months of publication? Why encourage developers to think they can build anywhere regardless of the ‘strength’ of the Green Belt? Would it not have been more sensible to say that developers had to take account of your grading of the various parcels of green belt, and only allow (at least initially) them to consider parcels that were ‘weak’?

3. Infrastructure

As far as Lymm is concerned, the main emphasis of the local plan seems to be to build houses – willy-nilly. There was little consideration given to ideas or plans on the development of the local infrastructure. Surely there needs to be, simultaneously, plans for the infrastructure in conjunction with any future house building. There was no mention on how the roads are going to be developed to cope with the additional households. How the parking problems are going to be solved? At the moment, the doctors’ surgeries are full, the primary schools are full and the high school is also full. And yet in the plans these issues are barely mentioned.

4. City status

Why keep mentioning the word ‘City’. Warrington is a town not a city.

5. Official questionnaire

I found this very difficult to fill in, and did not feel it was meant for ordinary ratepayers. Consequently I have not completed it.

[REDACTED]

email:

[REDACTED]