

Mrs Catherine Saunders

3rd May 2013

SOUTH LAKELAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
LAND ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD)

Mr Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI.

Dear Sir ,

Please find below my concerns with regard to the inclusion of site R689ULVM, land north of Urswick Road, Ulverston, in the Land Allocations DPD.

This land is currently used by a tenant organic farmer at Swarthmoor Hall Farm. Due to the location of the land, and the situation of the farm, between Ulverston and Swarthmoor, with houses surrounding it, there is limited land available for grazing and winter feed production. To build on this land would affect and threaten the viability of the farmer's herd, through a shortfall of suitable organic grazing pasture, both his and his employees livelihoods would be threatened.

I therefore suggest that the following modifications will not be adhered to should this land be built on:

Red text: from SLDC's documents.

Black text: my observations.

Main Modification

MM002

12

1.23

POLICY LA1.0 PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:

Purpose

To reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and for the avoidance of doubt.

.....TO SECURE DEVELOPMENT THAT IMPROVES THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS IN SOUTH LAKELAND.....

Should the land north of Urswick Road (R689ULVM), currently high quality, organic farm land, be built on, the economic and social conditions for the current farmers and their employees, would be made unsustainable, risking loss of jobs and local food production*(see attached letter from the Morphet's -tenant farmers, and note 1 below)

Main Modification

MM007

21

2.23 More detailed criteria are the following:....

.....Heritage considerations including the potential impact of development on listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and gardens, conservation areas , including impact on setting and on potential archaeological value.....

also ...1B08Local Factors influencing the location of development. 5.6 Key local factors influencing the location of new development in Ulverston are:.....Preserving and enhancing Ulverston's built heritage including the Ulverston Conservation Area, 147 Listed Buildings including the Grade II* listed Barrow Monument, the Church of St Mary, Conishead Priory and **Swarthmoor Hall**;

The development of R689ULVM will leave only one field between the housing development and the historic home of Quakerism, Swarthmoor Hall. This land is currently a designated green gap. To build on this land would encroach on the outlook of the hall, compromising the ethos of this religious site.

Landscape and Settlement considerations including the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size, whether the site preserves the separate identity of settlements and the impact of development on site features such as trees, watercourses and buildings; ...

SLDC's documents seem to contradict each other with regard to the green gap between Ulverston and Swarthmoor. Please see *note 2 below.

R689ULVM is currently part of a green gap between Ulverston and Swarthmoor. If this land is built on there is also a high chance of the remainder of land alongside Urswick road being developed on in a ribbon fashion, as Hall Field and Quaker Fold estates have already been built in this way.

.....Community Infrastructure including impacts on the local highways, water, sewerage and energy networks, the delivery of future infrastructure needs, impacts on Green Infrastructure and local community infrastructure needs and the potential regeneration benefits of development;.....

as far as I can see, no provision has been made for improved sewerage (currently inadequate and full to capacity, having to be regularly pumped out by tanker at the junction of Birket Drive and Urswick Road).

No provision has been made for highway infrastructure, especially due to the **cumulative impact** of traffic coming from the proposed housing developments at **Cross-a-moor/Swarthmoor**, the **Croftlands** developments, and developments on **Urswick Road**, which will all feed a vastly increased volume of traffic on to the A590 at Cross-a-Moor.

This is already a congested junction, especially at peak times, such as the school run, for Pennington C of E Primary School, which is just off the junction at Cross-a-Moor. This will make this junction extremely dangerous.

519B Existing Employment Areas

5.32 South Lakeland has a shortage of available employment land and premises.

Ulverston is a key employment location. This means that the 'churn' of employment within existing industrial areas, will accommodate significant elements of the town's needs.

Employment areas have been analysed using the criteria set out in Paragraph 2.41 and existing employment areas have been safeguarded.

Throughout SLDC's documents, they refer to employment land, but seem to disregard good and productive agricultural land that is used by successful and entrepreneurial farmers. May I suggest that this also is employment land? and too should be safeguarded.

Notes and letters:

Here's a link to "Land Allocation Apposal.docx" letter from the Morphets, in my Dropbox: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/09c28w4fbasnuox/Land%20Allocation%20Apposal.docx>

*note 1

CUMBRIA LOCAL

ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP BUSINESS PLAN

PRIORITY SECTORS

ENERGY MANUFACTURING FOOD & DRINK VISITOR ECONOMY

KEY UNDERPINNING SECTORS

Construction Digital Media & Creative Logistics & Transport Services Business Services
Low Carbon & Renewable Energy Agriculture (Land & Sea Based)

4 ENVIRONMENT

USING CUMBRIA'S ENVIRONMENT AS A KEY ECONOMIC ASSET

Working with partners, utilising the very strong Cumbria and Lake District brands even more effectively in selling products and services such as higher added value agri-products, leisure and hospitality, and food and drink, and supporting businesses to do so.

Swarthmoor Hall Farm is diversifying and is now producing it's own cheese, supplies local ice cream producers as well as milk supplied locally throughout Cumbria to as far as Penrith and down the west coast, including more local milk rounds, also local shops and supermarkets. I believe that Swarthmoor Hall Farm is fulfilling the statement in paragraph 4 above. Developing on site R689ULVM would take away this productive farm land from the present tenant and destroy the business that they have spent 30 years building up, and which they hope to continue building up, employing future generations, and local people. Surely this is something we should be supporting.

*note 2

202BGreenspaces and Open Spaces....

5.47 Core Strategy Policy CS2 states that the Council will designate Green Gaps as required to prevent the coalescence of settlements. West of Ulverston, there is a need to ensure that surrounding communities do not lose their distinctive identities. For this reason **a Green Gap is proposed** between Ulverston and Swarthmoor.

4B3Swarthmoor

5.72 Swarthmoor is a predominantly 20th century settlement with a population of around 1,050. It lies close to Ulverston on the A590 and has good road and public transport links. It has a public house, garage and community hall. **It is separated from Southern Ulverston by an important Green Gap.**

As I understand, the green gap between Swarthmoor and Ulverston already exists, and should be safeguarded. These two paragraphs seem to contradict each other, from Swarthmoor the green gap exists already, yet from Ulverston, the green gap, "is proposed".

I do not believe that the modifications have answered concerns put forward by the previous consultations.

I also have concerns over the way the results from previous consultations have been interpreted by SLDC. For instance, I have been put down as "supporting in part" for the land R689ULVM. However, I do not support, nor understand how SLDC has come to this conclusion. I also know of one other person who also has has their comments interpreted as supporting in part, when clearly they do not support at all. Also the letter from the tenant farmer does not seem to be taken into account at all. If this is just one paragraph of a very large document, and there are 3 misinterpretations (that I know of) about this particular

piece of land, what percentage of the results of the consultations have been misinterpreted by SLDC, therefore not painting a true picture of the consultation process. If you could look into this I would be very grateful.

Should you wish to look at my correspondence with SLDC about this matter, please do get in touch. (They have now finally corrected my entry.)

Thank you for taking time to read this letter.

Yours Sincerely

Catherine Saunders (Mrs)