

Lymm Parish Council
2018/33298 Lymm Hotel, Whitbarrow Road, Lymm, WA13 9AQ
Cllr Mrs Anna Fradgley

I wish to submit an objection to the planning application 2018/33298 Lymm Hotel on Whitbarrow Road, Lymm, WA13 9AQ for the following reasons:

1. Demolition of a building listed as a Historical Asset.
2. Overdevelopment of a brownfield site in a Rural Residential Area.
3. Waste collection and Service Areas
4. Residential Amenity.
5. Poor design.
6. Non-compliance of the required number of Parking Spaces.
7. Significant Uplift in the Rate Of Traffic Movement.
8. Inadequacies of the Adjoining Roads.
9. Deficient Public Transport Links.
10. Proximity to The Green Belt.
11. Neighbourhood Plan.
12. Health Care Provision.

1. DEMOLITION OF A HISTORICAL ASSET

I ask for the original building to be kept.

The original building dates back to the mid-19th Century and was formerly the Plough and Railway Hotel serving the Lymm railway. It is listed on as a *Historical Asset* on page 178 of the Local Plan (adopted 2014). It is the only remaining heritage link, apart from the signalling house, that the village has with the old railway.

I totally disagree with the statement in the proposal:

"..whereas the building is locally listed, it does not contribute to the significances of the Borough's historic environment and furthermore appears not to satisfy the criteria for local listing. Therefore, plans to clear the site and redevelop it with new retirement home, care home and nursery therefore offer an opportunity to enhance the aesthetic value of the area, as well as contribute the significant public benefits the scheme will provide."

The planned designs will not enhance the aesthetic value of the area. Lymm is an historical village and should retain as much of its historical heritage as possible.

2. OVERDEVELOPMENT IN A RURAL RESIDENTIAL AREA

I believe that the site is still overdeveloped and I feel that too little has been done to reduce it. The nursery building is not necessary.

There has only been a reduction of:

- 52 units retirement home to 45 units
- 72 bed residential care home to 66 beds
- 120 capacity childcare nursery down to 90 capacity

The site is 1.2 hectares, yet the proposal:

- Increases floor space by **273%** (almost triple)
- Increases footprint by **62%**
- Reduces parking by 9%
- Reduces amenity by 11%

a. 45 Unit Retirement Home

This apartment block is overdeveloped, overbearing and each unit is too small. It should ideally be two storey and with greater space for each unit.

1) Still overbearing

- i) 3 storeys, plus roof void means the building is still overbearing.
- ii) It exceeds the current building height of the original building.
- iii) There is no other precedent in Lymm for a four-storey building.
- iv) From Whitbarrow Road, this will be aesthetically overbearing and far too overdeveloped for the current street scene.
- v) Stepping the design and putting extra doors in to make it look like a row of terrace houses is a very lazy, poor design solution to the problem of scale.

2) Units still too small

- i) There will be 45 apartments each between 43m² and 69m² which is still very small for 1 or 2 bedroomed accommodation.
- ii) McCarthy and Stone properties average 110m².
- iii) There should be less units, with more space per unit.

b. 66 Bed Residential Home

This residential home should ideally be one or two storeys, with more space per room and access to a balcony or terrace for all residents.

1) Army barracks

- i) The design of the building still resembles a 'prison' or an 'army barracks'.
- ii) Whilst an attempt has been made to step the design of the retirement home apartments, nothing has been done to this building.

2) Small units

- i) I am concerned for the residents who would be living here, as each room is between 20.7m² and 26.3m².
- ii) Relate this to prison cells which are 16m². Residents will have very little living space, and this is unacceptable if they are infirm.
- iii) The rooms are regimented, all in a row, lacking character and are no different to the building that is currently there serving as a hotel.

3) Outdoor space

- i) Whilst there is access to a terrace or out door space for the ground floor residents, residents upstairs only have a window and a shared terrace.
- ii) This is a bad design and still needs to be re-thought.

c. 90 Capacity Childcare Day Nursery

The position of the nursery is still too close to residents of Statham Avenue and will greatly affect their amenity. This nursery is not required and is one building too many. It should not be included in the plan.

1) Street Scene

- i) The nursery would be *two storeys* with pitched roof and is adjacent to a single storey, dormer bungalow, 86 Statham Avenue, so would not be in keeping with the street scene.
- ii) Even though it is now 35m away from the house, it is still too close and is still there.

2) Noise

- i) The main concern for this building is noise from the children.
- ii) An acoustic fence will not rebound this amount of noise, particularly in Summer when windows are open and children are playing outside.
- iii) The site is in a quiet, rural, residential area. Currently, there is limited noise from the hotel.
- iv) The noise will affect existing neighbours on Statham Close and Statham Avenue, (in particular 86 Statham Avenue).
- v) More importantly, the noise will affect those living in the retirement home and residential home who are seeking peace and quiet.

3) Surplus to requirement

- i) The nursery building is not required.
- ii) There are 8 nurseries in Lymm, so there is enough supply.
- iii) The Village Hall pre-school closed after 40 years, due to the reducing demand for childcare places.
- iv) The developer has undertaken market research; *what evidence is available to suggest this?*

3. SERVICES DELIVERY AND WASTE STORAGE/COLLECTION

Because the site is so overdeveloped, the planning for services delivery and waste collection is very poor and may be contrary to lawful requirement.

Waste

- i) Bike storage for nursery and retirement care home is adjacent to the waste storage – unhygienic.
- ii) The storage of waste for the nursery will back onto the main street – Statham Avenue – concern for public health.
- iii) The retirement care home workers will have to wheel the waste paladins to the entrance of the retirement home on the day of collection and are then responsible for wheeling them back the same day. Not acceptable for the following reason:
 - (a) Having storage bins left for collection at the entrance of a building for elderly residents and their families and care workers is *not acceptable* for neither public safety nor health.
 - (b) Giving the responsibility to care workers to move bins which will be catering to 45+ people is unacceptable. This should not be their job.
 - (c) The communal lounge and garden of the retirement home is adjacent to the bin store and bin ramp which is a concern. This is unhygienic for residents.

Service Delivery

Any service vehicles, both small and long rigid vehicles, such as mail delivery vans, food delivery vans (including waste collection) would have to use the same access as residents, care workers, visitors, parents and children. This is unacceptable for the following reasons:

- i) Safety of pedestrians – having to manoeuvre round a vehicle.
- ii) Frequency of vehicles – because there are in affect three buildings on site, then there will be a lot of large vehicles visiting the site, disrupting normal life.
- iii) Unhygienic – particularly food delivery moving in between working and living life.

4. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The residential amenity to the existing homes has not been addressed by the developer. The following homes will be affected by overlooking and the lack of privacy:

11 Whitbarrow Road

- The new build will impose 16 windows, plus a balcony, which will overlook their home and garden.

86 Statham Avenue

- This dormer bungalow will be overshadowed and overlooked by the children's nursery.
- This building will still be overbearing on this property, despite it being moved to 35m away.
- Rear windows directly overlook the gardens of this property and the neighbouring properties.
- They have benefited from a peaceful, quality of life, which is what they purchased when they first bought the property.
- It is unnecessary to put a children's nursery there when there are 8 others in and around the village. This is completely in the wrong location.

19 Statham Close

- Their property will be directly overlooked by the care home.
- This is more prominent as 19 Statham Close is on an incline and the new build is three storeys.
- Therefore, every aspect of their privacy will be invaded; both home and garden.

5. POOR DESIGN

Very little has been done by the developer to take into consideration the poor design.

- i) The existing, original building does not warrant being completely demolished and replaced it.
- ii) This is lazy design and will only benefit the developer, not the local residents and generational heritage.
- iii) This design does not complement the character of the area.
- iv) Replacing timber windows with black powder coated aluminium windows to give a 'contemporary' look is inappropriate.

6. NON-COMPLIANCE OF PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENT

The number of car parking spaces planned still falls short of the requirement of the "Warrington Borough Council Standards for Parking in New Development, March 2015" by 51 spaces.

	Proposed by the Developer	Required by WBC
Retirement Home	47	38
Residential Care Home & Nursery	45	105
Total	92	143
Deficit		51

What is STILL deficient:

- i) No safe drop-off point to day-care nursery.
- ii) No mini-bus or ambulance parking area for either the Retirement Home or Residential Care Home.
- iii) No additional 51 spaces required as a minimum.
- iv) No safe, isolated delivery point for the catering kitchen.

Consequences of the above

1. Children and parents'/guardians' safety at the nursery.

- a) There is no drop-off point for the nursery children, which will be operating between the hours of 7am and 6.30pm.
- b) There is limited parking for parents to safely take out their children from the car and no 'parent and toddler' parking provision.
- c) Pedestrian access with prams is lacking in the plans.
- d) There is limited parking for visitors for the care home and residential homes.

2. Off-road Parking

- a) As a result, car parking will extend onto the road.
- b) It is not acceptable that the developer has assumed that on-street parking is perfectly adequate for what they are proposing.
- c) The adjacent car park along the Transpennine Way is for tourists and walkers only.
- d) The NPPF clearly states that a proposal should be discounted if "residual cumulative impacts of development are severe".

A robust, internal transport assessment is required.

7. SIGNIFICANT UPLIFT IN TRAFFIC AND HIGHWAY MOVEMENT

Impact on highway network

- i) This proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and contravenes policy MP7 of WBC Local Plan (adopted 2014).
- ii) The proposal will introduce a significant number of additional vehicular movements to the locality which would in turn have a significant impact on the operation of the local highway network and amenity of existing local residents.
- iii) Access to bus facilities is over estimated in the assessment (see point 7); more trips will be by car.
- iv) As a result of all this, significantly more trips will occur than that suggested in the transport statement.

8. INADEQUACIES OF THE ADJACENT ROADS

The developer fails to acknowledge the current highway constraints with the local network and the resulting safety concerns that are already prevalent around the hotel. An increase the traffic by 300% (from original Transport Assessment) would SIGNIFICANTLY have an impact on this area.

Whitbarrow Road North/West

This road narrows to a single lane at the bend with cars needing to slow to allow each other to pass. Many vehicles, depending on size, must either mount the pavement or reverse in order to allow another vehicle to pass. It is also a road used by parents taking their children to Statham School (westerly direction). Increasing traffic would reduce the flow rate of this road, cause traffic delays, will affect the amenity of residents and will make it considerably unsafe for pedestrians walking along these pavements.

Statham Avenue

This road is in effect a cul-de-sac with an un-adopted road bordering Barsbank Road/Star Lane. So, there is only one exit in and one exit out, as the top exit is very rarely used. As no drop-off point is provided on site, parents would have to drop children off onto the street, then manoeuvre in and around Statham Avenue and Statham Close to return back to Whitbarrow Road. This would have a significant impact on the traffic flow of this residential area and prove hazardous for pedestrians and road users; as well as affecting residential amenity. The Transpennine Way crosses Whitbarrow Road immediately after the junction with Statham Avenue. This is a cycle path and footpath used by visitors, residents and school children. It is a crossing that is already a hazard for those on bicycles and on foot, which would be exacerbated by this development.

Brook Road

This is a residential cul-de-sac. Residents have already reported hazards in exiting from this road onto the distributor road (Whitbarrow Road) due to visibility and passing vehicles. Many cars park along Whitbarrow Road due to Brookfield Surgery closing its car parking space availability and because of the increase in parking charges on the village car parks. As a result, vehicles coming down the hill must drive down the right-hand side of the road to overtake parked cars. The road is also a convex bend. As a result of this combination, cars coming out of Brook Road are compromised, particularly when turning right as moving vehicles are on their side of the road. To increase vehicle numbers within this area will have a tremendous impact on residents in Brook Road.

Dane Bank Road/Whitbarrow Road north

This junction is already constrained due to parked cars, the slope of the road and private hedges. In turn, this reduces visibility, causing cars to approach the junction with care, slowing down the flow of traffic. As there is no pedestrian crossing along this road, pedestrian accessibility is compromised at this junction.

Pedestrians and Cycles

Due to all of the above, pedestrians and cycle safety is already compromised in this area.

Yellow Lines

A local consultation is underway following my request for double lines along Whitbarrow Road, due to the road safety issues identified as a result of parked cars on the blind bend. I ask for this to be taken into consideration

9. DEFICIENT PUBLIC TRANSPORT LINKS

Unacceptable distance to bus stops and infrequent buses

Public transport is an extremely important provision for sustainable development. The developer has indicated the bus routes available to residents, care workers and visitors. Requirements are that access to a bus should be within 400 metres walking distance.

These are the discrepancies:

No. 191 bus

- The only bus stop which is within 400 meters away.
- But it is a mid-morning local shopper and is only available 3 times a week; Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.
- Not available at the weekends.

No. 47 bus

- Eagle Brow and Barsbank Road bus stops are 690 meters away and are up a steep incline.
- Operates Monday to Friday only.
- Last bus each day at this stop is at 1.48pm.
- No buses running at the weekend.

No. 5 and 5A buses (run on same route)

- The most reliable buses.
- The nearest stop is Star Lane.
- Three walking routes to the bus stop are indicated by the developer:
 - Albany Road – 800m – Longest route through narrow alley, but then safe residential road
 - Transpennine Way - 700m– nice walk in Summer, hazardous in the Winter months, particularly at night with no lighting.
 - Statham Ave – 650m – Shortest route and road is acceptable until the very end where it is an un-adopted road and is uneasy underfoot.

650 to 800 meters is neither an acceptable nor sustainable distance for the residents to walk.

10. PROXIMITY TO THE GREEN BELT

The development is in close proximity to the Green Belt; diagonally opposite. As such, the design and overdevelopment of the site would have a significant visual impact on the vista. Previous applications have been refused by the Inspectorate due to this material consideration. (Retirement homes on Rushgreen Road, Lymm).

11. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Needs of Lymm residents are yet to be identified

The needs of the residents are being assessed and documented as part of the Lymm Neighbourhood Plan due in 2019.

From this, we will be able to analyse with robust quantitative and qualitative research the needs for Lymm. Lymm has a resounding need for gym and health facilities. The previous application in 2010 (2010/16647) was for a hotel and leisure facility. It seems that the community would welcome this.

The community is disappointed that the only hotel within walking distance in the village is being removed. Lymm is a village visited by tourists and its economy depends on leisure and tourism. There is concern that losing this facility will affect the economy.

12. HEALTH RESOURCES

Strain on already full resources

Brookfield Surgery and Lakeside Surgery have indicated that they are now at capacity. There is a need for doctors and dentist in Lymm and an additional 150+ is going to put a strain on resources. Provision needs to be made by the Council for this.

REFUSAL

Please refuse this planning permission on the basis that it is overdeveloped, overbearing, poorly designed, lacks car parking provision, detrimental to heritage, in the wrong location, not required and will severely disrupt the highway with road clutter and increased vehicle movement.

Cllr Mrs Anna Fradgley

Chair of Lymm Parish Council

Borough and Parish Councillor – Lymm

34 Cyril Bell Close, Lymm, WA13 0JS

01925 753631