
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: LDF
Subject: Objection to proposed removal of site 2901 from the Green Belt

To whom it may concern,

We are the owners of [REDACTED] Lymm and we are writing this e-mail to formally express our objection to the proposal to remove the fields to the south of Higher Lane from the Green Belt (site 2901, part of parcel LY22).

The site in question fulfils several of the criteria set out in the green belt policy as stated by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Of the five criteria listed, site 2901 acts:

- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

and

- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

The NPPF recommends that development should not take place in Green Belt land unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated, and I don't believe that the circumstances in this case could be considered very special.

The openness of site 2901 and parcel LY22 make a strong contribution to the Green Belt, and we as a family place great importance on the ability to use the right of way path that crosses site 2901 as a form of leisure and connecting us to our community, as the same path is popular with local walking groups, running groups and dog walkers. The presence of such impressive long line views over rolling countryside make this land such a valuable asset to the community as a whole.

One of the most iconic features of Lymm as a rural, historic village is the Grade 2 listed Water Tower, and the setting of the building is an essential part of the building's character. To lose the open and expansive countryside adjoining the grounds of the Tower would inevitably be a detriment to the Water Tower and Lymm as a historic village.

I also have concerns regarding the site access, with Crouchley lane being narrow and having hazardous bends, it already acts as an overflow parking area for people visiting Lymm Dam, and traffic is already due to increase with the impending expansion of Lymm Rugby Club. I fear that adding further traffic to the road would potentially further compromise its safety.

I feel that site 2901 and parcel LY22 should be protected from development now or at any time in the future.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

