

Town Clerk:  
Viv Tunnadine

Deputy Town Clerk:  
Claire Benbow

Council Leader:  
Cllr. Tom Harvey

Civic Mayor:  
Cllr. Liz Lewis



Council Offices  
Main Street  
Grange-over-Sands  
Cumbria, LA11 6DP

Tel: (015395) 32375

Website: [www.grangeoversands.net](http://www.grangeoversands.net)  
e.mail: [council@grangeoversands.net](mailto:council@grangeoversands.net)

V.A.T. Reg.No: 152 7101 43

Open to public:  
Mon, Tues, Wed & Thu. 10am–1pm

**2 May 2013**

## **Grange-over-Sands Town Council Response to:**

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

#### **Public Examination –**

#### **Consultation on the updated Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications to the DPD.**

#### **Introduction**

Since 2008, Grange-over-Sands Town Council have made unaddressed representations on the matter of the Local Plan. The Town Council considers that the LDP process remains unsound, producing strategies that do not take sufficient account of local circumstances, of the perceived need locally, or the ability of the infrastructure to cope.

Grange Town Council continues to have serious reservations about the evidence base for the conclusions reached by SLDC in its decision to allocate over 500 new houses to the town and almost 800 for the area as a whole. It does not reflect the priorities expressed by the Grange community:

#### **SLDC Core Strategy**

“You told us that...

- Grange should have a tourism/leisure emphasis.
- Grange town centre already struggles to cope with traffic and service pressures.
- The development emphasis for Grange-over-Sands should be tourism, leisure and the promotion of culture and heritage.
- For Grange, the emphasis should be on regeneration and environmental enhancement.”

The Local Plan does not reflect the comments expressed in the Grange-over-Sands Regeneration Study November 2007, Douglas Wheeler Associates:

“The preferred regeneration approach that has emerged from the research, analysis, consultations and workshops is clear that the key to the success or failure of a Grange-over-Sands in the future will be to invest in the unique quality of the built and natural environment, infrastructure and public facilities alongside promoting enterprise and business development. It only requires one element to be below standard to reduce the overall appeal of the place.”

**The Town Council remains opposed to the proposed level of development, as after 5 years there is still no clear evidence of the infrastructure to accommodate the additional demand on resources caused by the housing and employment development proposals, that the plan is viable, and committed to by all providers.**

The NPPF para 177 requires planners to understand infrastructure needs and provide for them before the Plan is finalised:

“It is equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion. To facilitate this, it is important that local planning authorities understand district-wide development costs at the time local plans are drawn up. For this reason, infrastructure and development policies should be planned at the same time, in the Local Plan.”

**The main modifications are not evidence based and lack detail on infrastructure provision. The Local Plan therefore remains aspirational but not practicable.**

**There is no evidence for impact assessments for infrastructure, nor any infrastructure improvement delivery plans to support developments.**

**MM002: page 12, policy LA1.0 para 1.23 jg**

*Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development (based on requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework)*

*“...taking a flexible approach to high quality enabling development where it can be shown to be essential to the delivery of employment sites and premises where compatible with the overall vision for the site and where compatible with maintaining the District’s supply of employment land and premises...”*

*“...it will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in south Lakeland...”*

**Comments:**

The Core Strategy (p170) states that one of the aims for Grange is to “incorporate moderate new housing development”. We do not consider that an increase of housing provision by the amounts proposed (around 30% of the existing housing stock) can be described as ‘moderate’.

It is also not sustainable to build 100 dwellings to generate at best 35 affordable where we have brownfield which can be used to supply the local need for affordable. It is being profligate with land in a small town that has very little developable land left.

**The statement “the Local Plan is strongly supportive of economic growth” is unsound because it is not evidenced.**

Supporting economic growth in Grange consists of improving the pedestrian experience and enhancing and promoting the character and landscape to develop the tourist offer. There is no plan for this, apart from a path from Lindale to Grange in the Infrastructure report. The path is not near the developments nor the tourist areas.

**The statement is ineffective because the scale of housing development proposed hinders the economic growth of Grange.**

The NPPF states that “Plans and decisions need to take local circumstances into account, so that they respond to the different opportunities for achieving sustainable development in different areas” (Intro 10). Neither MM002, nor the Land Allocations in general take account of the rural character and future needs of the local tourist economy in Grange. We realise that this section is included to demonstrate conformity with the NPPF, but sustainability can also require refraining from building and we would like that acknowledging.

The wording of MM002 on judging each site application on its individual sustainability ignores the impact of the cumulative effect of several site applications in the same area. Where sites are individually too small for significant infrastructure contributions, and are phased sequentially, the need for and cost of infrastructure may pass down the line to the last site(s) to be developed, so Grange remains choked with traffic and lacking foot and cycleways.

**MM002 does not acknowledge that landscape can be the economic base of an area.**

Grange sits directly between the Arnside and Silverdale AONB and the Lake District National Park. It shares the same high quality landscape with them and the same customer base, but has little of their protection from over-building. The economic vision for Grange in the Core Strategy is of a high quality tourist resort, as evidenced in our opening paragraph.

Over the period of the Local Plan Housing Allocations, Grange's main economic need is to develop its tourist industry, in the face of a recession that was not present at the time that the housing figures for the Core Strategy were set down. The sustainability of the Grange tourist economy depends on retaining, enhancing and providing better access to high quality landscape, congenial and tranquil foot and cycleways, and retaining the 'feel' and character of a 'small rural seaside resort' as described in the Fact file.

**Grange is a key tourist destination in the Limestone and Wetlands N.I.A. and in the Local Nature Partnership area currently being formed. This is not recognised in the Local Plan, nor are types of appropriate development specified (NPPF 11.117).**

Recent statistics from a 2013 survey by Morecambe Bay Partnership Research Team illustrate the key reasons tourists come to the area: the top three reasons are; 1. "Enjoying views and landscape", 2. "walking" and 3. "nature, wildlife / bird-watching". This confirms and emphasizes the utter centrality of landscape to economic sustainability here; this is about views, openness, tranquillity and immediate access to rural surroundings as integral to Grange's economic survival, not just an issue of amenity for residents that can be mitigated or compensated for elsewhere.

This centrality is not acknowledged as an issue in the Plan's economic policy or strategy, nor in the housing numbers. It is a core planning principle in the NPPF that planning should "recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and support thriving rural communities" and "support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside" (3, 28).

30% extra housing in a coastal strip of 1.5 by 1 mile damages our economy by affecting tourist perceptions and degrading the quality of the resort: it is detrimental to views in and out of the area, removes the open spaces, pushes rurality and wildlife to the outermost edges, and reduces tranquillity by over-densifying. All in a context where the town already has a 100% increase in traffic throughout the summer and very little manoeuvre-room to manage it.

**The Local Plan fails to correctly assess the negative economic impacts 30% extra housing would have on Grange, over and above damaging amenity for residents.**

- Negative impact on core economy: The direction of growth needs to be to upgrade / provide tourist facilities, and develop a range of local quality leisure activities and destinations that encourage longer stays and higher local spend. We also need to improve the pedestrian experience in the town to help individual retail businesses survive and thrive.
- The Town Council has already taken over the Tourist Information Centre and the Public Conveniences from SLDC, to keep them open to retain the tourist trade. It is now in the process, alongside community groups, of upgrading the Promenade Recreation Area, and in conjunction with SLDC, refurbishing the Lido, in order to increase visitor numbers and length of stay. None of this requires any extra private housing.
- 30% extra housing will further stifle the retail area with traffic and discourage people from visiting. It will work directly against all the improvements Grange Town Council and SLDC are making to attract tourists. There is a lack of holistic planning here, just a numbers-led formula being applied.

- Negative economic impact of encouraging second homes: a proportion of the new build will go as second homes, as there are no local occupancy or 'main residence' conditions specified in the Modifications. Empty properties during the winter months means fewer people to use local businesses. Second homers who are used to urban / metropolitan facilities tend to shop outside the area or on the internet. They reduce social integration, make little contribution to the life of the town, and bring consumerist expectations to facilities.
- Declared second homes in Grange as of April 2013 number 197 out of a total 2391 households. As cheaper areas within the National Park become saturated with second homes and holiday lets – 80% in Elterwater, 50% plus in Coniston - buyers may increasingly look to Grange and the Cartmel peninsula just outside the National Park .The Local Plan is silent on the need for a quota or other containment strategy.
- Negative economic impact of new properties being bought as 'buy to rent'. This drives up rents for local families and low-paid workers, who can least afford it – there are already very modest Victorian two-bedroom terraces charging £600.00 per month, around 150% the cost of housing association rents, and we assume new-build will attract a premium. Buy – to – rent also takes money out of the local economy as owners often do not live locally, and import cheaper tradesmen to work on refurbishments.
- 30% growth in housing will do nothing to secure economic growth. If this policy had been applied elsewhere, Arnside in the AONB, or Hawkshead in the LDNP, for example, it would be seen as seriously inappropriate, yet we share the same tourism economy, visitor base and landscape assets. 30% growth would not be seen as 'moderate', or as contributing to the economy, nor "good management of environmental assets". We realise that because Grange is not in an AONB or the National Park, we have fewer planning constraints, but the development still needs to be proportionate and positive for the area.

**We would like to see 4.8% of Grange's housing numbers removed directly, plus a notional extra % to cover the remainder of the Plan period, to conform to 2013 Household Projections for South Lakeland.**

**We would like to retain affordable housing sites on brownfield:** Berners, Guide's Lot – and to retain an element of private housing on the Berners site to fund the refurbishment of the Lido. Providing good numbers of affordable housing without relying on the 35% in private development provides some insurance against the scenario where developers claim sites are not viable without reducing affordable provision. It also means lower numbers of private houses can be achieved because that is not the only way affordables can be produced in this locality.

**We would like to see reduced housing numbers on site MN25M,** retaining the affordable quota and the existing employment capacity. The plan should set rural densities and design to preserve openness and character and specify provision for improved highway, footway and cycle paths.

#### **MM004: page 14, policy LA1.1 jg**

*Development boundaries are defined for the following settlements*

*"...Allithwaite, Cark/Flookburgh, Cartmel... between 2010 and 2025 the development needs of these settlements will be met within the development boundaries defined on the (proposals - deleted) policies map..."*

**This section is unsound because the development boundaries are now based on out of date figures for projected household growth. The DCLG Household Interim Projections for England 2011 – 2021 are now available. They show a 4.8% drop on the previous projections for South Lakeland, and a similar trend downward for all neighbouring authorities.**

This must in turn be applicable to numbers of households for Grange over Sands.

Another factor for household projections for Grange, which has not been taken into account, is the raising of the retirement age to 67, and subsequent further rises based on life expectancy figures. This is beginning to take effect now in the generation that would have left work at sixty to an active retirement in Grange. It is reasonable to assume that the demand for housing will drop in the next five to ten years as the traditional retirement buyers have to spend another 5 to 7 years at work. The demand may drop by a pro rata equivalent to the number of workers having to work longer. Projected figures for this have not been taken into account in setting housing targets for Grange. The Viability Study includes no allowance for it.

Household projections for Grange may decrease over the life of the Plan because of other quantifiable factors such as the continued rise in petrol prices. Last month's figures from the motor industry show the purchasing of fuel-efficient cars increased, while sales of petrol were down by 25%. Many of the baby boomer generation expect to travel extensively and may choose to live nearer the conurbations to avoid reliance on the car. While this is speculation at the moment, there is a case for moving some sites in Grange into the 'broad location' category and bringing them forward later if the trend reverses.

Household projections for Grange may trend downward as assumptions about Grange as a good place to retire are affected by changes in the Health Service; a decision on where to retire to at 67 may be based more on stroke and heart attack response times, ease of mobility scooter use, easy travel access for family members / carers, availability of sheltered/serviced housing. Grange is not attractive on any of these criteria.

Moreover, the Housing Viability Study specifically omitted to include any allowance for Extra Care housing in its costings, nor did its modelling include such accommodation. Even with a high and rising proportion of elderly in Grange's population, there is no incentive for developers to venture into Extra Care housing projects if the viability study is silent on competitive returns for this type of housing. The Allocations for Grange are therefore ineffective as they fail to meet the needs of the population.

**This Modification is based on out of date figures and does not reflect the trends above. We want the development boundaries for Grange revised to reflect at least a 4.8% reduction in housing numbers for the area, and preferably more.**

#### **MM007: page 21, para 2.23**

##### *Criteria for site selection*

*"...General criteria such as the capacity of the site, the appropriate density at which it could be developed, the ease of accessing the site, the impact of topography and relief and the scope to meet identified needs, particularly for affordable housing..."*

*"...transport, walking and cycle links, the scope for renewable energy and local energy networks, the risks of flooding and contamination, air quality issues and exposure to noise and smells (see Core Strategy Policy CS1.1)..."*

*"...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..."*

*"...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; Other demands on the site including the scope for alternative uses or mixed use, access and maintenance requirements to watercourses, pipelines, railway lines etc. and land reserved for new road construction or other infrastructure projects and the implications of development for the existing and future use of neighbouring sites..."*

**The criteria above are very important but not evidenced in the infrastructure proposals for Grange. The NPPF requires that appropriate infrastructure requirements be incorporated into the Plan at the same stage as the Land Allocations. We have major unaddressed concerns about highway capacity and the impact on Grange's economy.**

Insufficient weight is given to the problem of the inadequate main road system through Grange, which already has to cope with commercial and tourism demands from Flookburgh, Cark, Holker, and Cartmel, in addition to traffic bound for Grange.

All traffic has to come through the centre of town, on roads that are unsuitable for heavy commercial vehicles. Any development that generates such traffic should be situated to the north of the town, accessible from the A590. Only additional high value employment that does not involve heavy goods vehicles should be planned within the town's central road system.

The proposed sites are on the town periphery, with the implication that cars would be used to come into the town centre, which would impact on the already overloaded car parking areas.

Development on this scale should be dependent on prior implementation of alternative highway provision to deal with the inadequacy of the main street in Grange as the only route for commercial traffic. Proposals to increase employment land use will exacerbate an already hazardous situation for pedestrians and cyclists.

The March 2013 AECOM Cartmel Peninsula Traffic Impact Assessment Study was not fit for purpose, being a 'travel to work' study, not a daytime 'travel for services / retail / leisure study. All new developments in the peninsula should have been modelled for their impact on Grange in its role as Key Service Centre, taking current peak traffic flow in height of season as the baseline. For instance, the new Health Centre will generate more traffic throughout the day as it provides a much wider range of services; commercial development on MN25N will generate more vehicles on a narrow road already leading to a 1000-pitch caravan site and Holker Hall, the venue for major events in the area, and the majority of considerable Fri – Sun tourist traffic to Cartmel travels through Grange first.

The AECOM Study did not account for "pinch" points where traffic accumulates due to the narrowness of the country lanes. The Grange Fact File states that "In places this road narrows and on some stretches, there is a feeling of car domination." The Core Strategy document (5.12) also identifies that "Access into the peninsula is poor" and that Grange "suffers from problems associated with the impact of the private car on the built environment. For pedestrians, the Grange-over-Sands environment is noticeably poor. In general terms, footpaths are narrow and there is a strong sense that the car is the dominant feature on Kents Bank Road and Main Street. Improving linkages, infrastructure and the quality of the pedestrian environment are key priorities."

The Study does not take into account a clustering of developments in the area between Grange and Allithwaite. The cumulative effect of the proposed developments will be a built-up suburb from Grange to Allithwaite, creating bottlenecks, awkward turnings and more hazards for increased numbers of pedestrians. Without any recognition of this, the appropriate infrastructure cannot be planned in. Space for safe footways and cycleways has not been identified, nor the speed restrictions and traffic management measures necessary for a densely populated suburb. Nor has any funding been identified for the same.

The Local Plan should not include plans for development for which the necessary highway improvements have not been included. It is imperative that improvements are made to reduce dependency on private car use. Significantly higher traffic levels could well threaten the core economic activity of the town, namely tourism. Developers of major sites will be required to contribute to the improvement of local bus services, with the aim of providing good quality integration between modes and services. Very few of the known development sites are likely to be classified as 'major', thus no significant contributions can be anticipated from developers.

The topography and gradients mean that it is extremely unlikely that new residents on most of the proposed sites will be able to walk or cycle into the Town Centre, to school or to the new supermarket.

**SLDC have confirmed in meetings with the Town Council that there are few viable improvements that can be made to the highway infrastructure, either road based or for cyclists and pedestrians because of the topography and existing town layout. So the replies given to the consultation responses by SLDC are meaningless, as they require mitigation measures that SLDC themselves accept are not possible.**

The Core strategy states:

*“There should consequently be an emphasis on promoting sustainable modes of transport such as an increase in the footpath network for pedestrians and provision for cyclists through the preparation and use of ‘Mobility Plans’.*

- **There is no Mobility Plan** for Grange-over-Sands. We have higher than average numbers of older people and substantial numbers of mobility scooter users, who find existing conditions very challenging. This Mobility Plan is very important to us for safety and wellbeing.
- **There is no assessment** and consequent plan to improve the pedestrian experience between all the settlements.
- **There is no cycle experience assessment** to ensure cyclists’ safety between settlements. The Council would recommend that The CTC (Cycle Touring Club) carry out cycle route assessments to ensure that existing cycle ways are safe for cyclists and refer to the Local Plan to ensure that its recommendations are viable.
- **There is no evidence of any other source of funding** to provide improved bus services.
- **There is no evidence of the possible improvements** that should be provided, or any survey to demonstrate the quantified likely reduction in town centre congestion.
- **There is no highways improvements plan for the “pinch points”** for the Cartmel Peninsula.
- **There is no infrastructure plan** devised for Grange-over-Sands or the surrounding area to deal with the proposed level of development.

Any development is likely to increase demands on water resources and sewage infrastructure. It states that the policy aims to ensure that development takes place in accordance with environmental capacity and the capacity of the existing infrastructure provision. However UU are in the process of consulting and developing their Water Resources Plan for 2014. The consultation is due to be issued for consultation in summer 2013. During 2012, a review of the forecast demand was completed, with updated household and non-household information. UU advise that this has been developed alongside Local Authority Development Plans to ensure corresponding growth assumptions. In parallel with the water balance calculation, supply side and demand side options will be identified to ensure sufficient Security of Supply. Once a constrained option list has been finalised, the social and environmental benefits and costs will be reviewed to determine the most appropriate programme of work to include in the WRMP.

The next statutory Water Resources Management Plan annual review will take place in June 2013. The completed UU Water Resources Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in Summer 2014.

- **There is no evidence that UU can support the infrastructure requirement of the scale of the developments.**

*Managing flood risk*

*“...Managing flood risk, whether tidal (from the Sea), fluvial (from rivers) or through surface water (through local drainage issues) is a key issue... Once all elements of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 have been implemented, Cumbria County Council will assume responsibility for developing a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy which will include risks from surface water run-off, groundwater and ordinary watercourses, completing a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment and preparing Surface Water Management Plans for areas of greatest risk and approving, adopting and maintaining Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) that meet National Standards for development. The County Council’s drainage team have also been engaged throughout the process and will use their new powers. Development Management and Development control decisions will use the Surface Water Management Plan to ensure that effective surface water management is incorporated in all new development...”*

**This section is unsound. There is no evidence to support the assertion that ‘sites have only been proposed for allocation where the EA and the Council’s own land and drainage team are satisfied that a solution can be achieved’.**

**There is no evidence in the accompanying Evidence Base that County Council’s land and drainage team have found solutions to managing flood risk in Grange, and no record of the ‘detailed discussions’ that SLDC say they have had with the Environment Agency.**

**There is no evidence that appropriate SuDS- based surface water management solutions on limestone are available or can be recommended. Grange and area experiences surface water flooding at many sites and nowhere has a satisfactory solution been recommended or applied, even in major projects such as Windermere Rd, even with the substantial intervention of the Environment Agency and district and county drainage personnel.( Windermere Rd Flooding report 2012, Sedgwick Court Flooding Information, Kents Bank Station Flooding information available if required).**

The Environment Agency do not have an existing soundly assessed database of surface water flooding risk to draw on, or it would have been included in the Local Plan Evidence Base and mentioned in the Settlement Fact Files . We cannot see why the Environment Agency should claim to be ‘satisfied that a solution can be achieved’.

Even the new United Utilities Storm Water Holding Tank at Yew Tree Playing Fields is not designed to accommodate runoff from areas towards Kents Bank / Allithwaite, where the proposed 200+ housing development site is located. The Plan therefore concentrates most of the development in the area with no new provision for Storm Water Runoff.

There is no evidence that Russell Armer (RA), an established construction firm which has built locally before, can find local solutions for managing surface water runoff. Its recent preliminary site plan for R89, one of the proposed development sites near Allithwaite, shows a combination of domestic soakaways plus storm water holding tank, in a scheme which Grange Town Council’s independent drainage expert has characterised as risky and in need of further investigation. (report appended).

Soakaway tests being carried out currently by RA are happening at the end of a prolonged spell of dry weather, instead of in typical conditions of ground saturation, as recommended by government regulations. They do not conform to BREA Digest 365 Design Criteria. This will lead to an over-estimate of soakaway capacity and will be no guarantee of runoff not exceeding that of the unbuilt site, nor of it not becoming a detriment to properties close by and on lower land.

**There is also no evidence that RA have planned the soakaway locations according to underground conditions.** It is recommended that soakaways in limestone be made where there are no existing underground fissures , to preclude those voids becoming overactive channels of runoff that erode the land and become a danger to underground utilities such as sewage pipes. As there is no evidence that R A has conducted or intends to conduct geophysical / hydrological surveys to identify underground fissures, it is uncertain whether they possess the expertise to achieve the satisfactory solution that this section is claiming.

**If no-one has the expertise then the site is not viable and this section is unsound. If it is too expensive to carry out the proper surveys and implement effective solutions, then the site is not viable and this section is unsound.**



It is also possible that an increase of over 25% in housing for Grange and area, much of it quite densely concentrated, may have more severe effects than previous piecemeal building over 160 years. MN25N and R89 are very close to each other and are intended to produce 200+ houses overall, each supposedly managing its rainfall runoff within its own curtilage.

**There is no evidence that the equivalent of 200 soakaways in close proximity on unassessed limestone is an acceptable risk and will not produce erosion**, or harm nearby properties, over the lifetime of the housing. If Cumbria County Council are to be responsible for maintaining the SuDS they have approved, they need to be sure they will remain in sound working condition, and provide that evidence for potential home builders and buyers.

**There is no evidence that the Local Flood Management Strategy Team will be able to 'approve, adopt and maintain' SuDS that solve the surface water issues on the sites in Grange, given that the Team is not yet constituted, has no effective database of areas at risk, and is likely to be composed of the County drainage team who already fail to solve the flooding issues in Grange.**

Drainage solutions in the Grange area are constrained by the presence of the railway embankment that runs the length of the shoreline and acts as a dam for the rainfall runoff, both surface and underground, from the hillside above Grange. Much local flooding occurs just behind the embankment and has proved expensive, difficult or just impossible to address. Even the priority brownfield development sites at Berners Close, which are located adjacent to the railway embankment, are proving challenging in this respect and can only be considered viable because SLDC owns the land and is not proposing to develop for the open market.

**Nowhere in MM008 has this major constraint and its implications for new development been acknowledged.**

From the hillside above Kents Bank Railway Station, where sites MN25N and R89 are proposed, there is already flooding of existing properties from roads and previously built soakaways. The road outside the Railway Station is the lowest point of the slope ; it already floods, and no remedy has been found. There is no evidence that Network Rail have been consulted about the possible impact of building above and adjacent to the railway embankment in this area. As a major landowner and provider of key infrastructure, they are likely to have legal interests and requirements in this situation.

**We find no statement in this section or elsewhere that they have been consulted about solutions or that they are satisfied that their assets are protected.**

MM052 4.12 and MM053 Policy LA3.2 are equally unsatisfactory on managing flood risk.

'MM052 4.12 Land south of Allithwaite Rd' merely says : "A holistic approach to drainage management on this site will be needed, including Sustainable Drainage Systems ( SuDS)". There is no explanation of what a holistic approach might involve. Site R89 is very nearby, shares the same topology and the same potential flood risk, is immediately above the same blocks of houses at risk, but would be even more densely peppered with soakaways than this site - is this going to be taken into account at the same time? Will it share some of the SuDS? Or does holistic just mean putting in all the drainage at the same time? MM053 doesn't even mention flooding as an issue.

Compare this with MM059 for South Ulverston which begins 'Surface water management is a key issue' and proceeds to make a list of conditions regarding all major aspects of surface water management. This is what Grange needs, a genuinely holistic and detailed approach to the whole area.

**MM052 is ineffective because it underestimates the flood risk and does not specify the conditions for development to address the risk.**

## **MM009: Policy 2 (27a)**

### **Viability**

*“...The Council has carried out a viability study which has assessed the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, including requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions and other requirements and, taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, has ensured that development will provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable...”*

The Viability Study is silent on abnormal costs associated with drainage assessment and management of runoff and storm water on specific sites. There is a real danger of developers arguing to reduce numbers of affordable homes on such sites in Grange. This has already been a factor in the redesign of the affordable provision at the Berners Close development.

The Viability Study assumes building to Level 4 Code of Sustainability but this is not mentioned in any Development Brief – developers of private housing who are not used to thinking in those terms may claim it is an abnormal cost and talk down the ratio of affordables to meet it. Level 4 Sustainability should be specified for all housing in the Plan and developers required to respond positively to that challenge.

The Viability Study shows no consensus among landowners, agents and builders as to how much constitutes a ‘competitive return’. If local landowners drive up the amount of a competitive return to its upper limits, there is no safeguard against developers claiming abnormal cost in acquiring the land, and talking down the ratio of affordables, or infrastructure contributions. It should be made plain in the Modifications for each site what the essential infrastructure demands are, and which are compensatable off-site.

- **This is unsound as there is no evidence of a site by site viability plan supported by multi-agency project planning and finance schemes.**

## **MM024, page 45, para 2.67**

### ***Development briefs***

***“...Briefs - Second Tranche (to be adopted by December 2016)***

*Mixed-use Allocation, Land south of Allithwaite Road, Grange-over-Sands...”*

**The development brief for this site should require a full flood risk assessment, and full, early, genuine community engagement for Allithwaite and Kents Bank**

**MM051: page 107 to 108, para 4.11**

*The Berners site incorporating the pool, lido and car park at the centre of the Promenade*

*“...The Berners site incorporating the pool, lido and car park at the centre of the Promenade is the key regeneration priority in Grange-over-Sands. The site is being regenerated in partnership with Grange Town Council to create a cluster of facilities and attractions including commercial uses, an integrated health centre, new market and affordable housing and enhanced car parking and residential and business space. The Council is seeking to regenerate this site on a partnership basis involving local businesses, house-builders, extra care home providers and a local medical practise. The site includes a former Lido which has recently been listed. It is estimated that 50 dwellings will be delivered in Phase 2 (2017-2022) and 53 in Phase 3 (2022-25). Residential uses are not appropriate for and are not proposed on the part of the site that contains the old lido, which falls within Flood Risk Zone 3a...”*

**The above use description is now out of date and conflicts with SLDC Cabinet Executive decisions 19 September 2012 CEX/64 .**

The site now being developed for a Medical Centre, public car park, private housing and affordable housing. Dwelling numbers are not known yet.

*“...Policy LA3.1: Mixed use allocation at Berners Pool, Grange-over-Sands Purpose: To set out the policy framework for the regeneration of the Berner’s Pool site to deliver housing, care facilities, and open space. 2.22 1.87 Ha of land at Berner’s Pool, Grange-over-Sands, as shown on the policies map, is allocated for housing (Estimated capacity 103 dwellings), including extra care housing (60 units) , health care (D1) open space and where appropriate other uses including employment (B1) and leisure use development (0.35ha). Residential use will not be permitted on the former lido east of the railway line...”*

**Use description has changed as above.**

**Grange-over-Sands Town Council is strongly in favour of affordable housing development on the Berners site.**

## **MM052: page 108 para 4.12 Land south of Allithwaite Road, Kents Bank, Grange-over-Sands**

*“...Land South of Allithwaite Road The second major allocation is a large site on Allithwaite Road west of Kents Bank. This is the only large site available in Grange-over-Sands and can accommodate both housing and employment needs. The site is topographically complex and significant in landscape terms. Development will require highly sensitive design to ensure that separation is retained between Kents Bank and Allithwaite, that landscape impacts are minimised and important site features conserved and that the development represents an organic and sympathetic extension to the town. The Promenade footpath offers the opportunity to provide improved pedestrian and cycle access to the Town Centre. A development brief will be essential to ensure that a high quality sustainable development is achieved. A holistic approach to drainage management on this site will be needed, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)...”*

For this site and R89 adjacent, the Local Plan has failed to maintain the importance of Green Spaces and Open Spaces and their significance to Green infrastructure. CCC undertook a study in 2008 to assess the accessibility of open spaces. One of the main findings was “a need to focus on improving the quality of open spaces” .

Allocations of Land Development Plan – Discussion Paper 2008 refers to the CCC Green Infrastructure Study:

“these standards will be used to inform the requirements for new provision of open space in the Allocations of Land DPD. When considering other land use allocations.

The DPD identifies the importance of maintaining green gaps between settlements, and in particular (4.5) identifies the need to avoid coalescence with the neighbouring settlement of Allithwaite.

This issue has been raised repeatedly by residents, yet MM052 merely says that “The proposal at this site incorporates areas of public open space and a green gap is proposed to the west of the site.” The points made by the residents that such a small gap is insufficient, and the views would be irrevocably changed have simply not been addressed or explained away.

As identified by SLDC in the Fact File - a gap needs to be on both sides of the entrance point to be effective, and MN25M would appear to directly contravene this.

Green Infrastructure consists of all those elements of the landscape that are not entirely man-made such as the network of open space, woodlands, wildlife habitat, lakes and rivers and other perceived natural areas, which sustain clean air, water, and provide resources to enrich the quality of lives of the residents and add to the visitor experience of the tourist economy.

### Green Infrastructure in Cumbria - The role of green infrastructure in aiding the delivery of sustainable growth and regeneration in Cumbria – Rebanks Consulting Ltd 2010

“Green infrastructure acknowledges that the landscape is as much cultural as natural and heavily human-influenced. It seeks to ensure that future human influence is informed and well planned. The Green Infrastructure concept recognises that our ‘natural’ systems and assets (including human-influenced and enhanced features) offer multi-functional benefits. For example a publicly accessible pond on the edge of a business park can have a variety of uses from a school field trip to a pleasant lunch spot, offering a range of benefits from education to health. The better existing and future Green Infrastructure can be taken into consideration planned and designed, the greater those benefits should be. Consequently, the County Council needs to take account of Green Infrastructure through its spatial planning and development control functions.”

The economic outputs associated, directly or indirectly, with the natural environment are of considerable value. Cumbria attracts 15.3 million visitors, which bring in £1.17 billion to Cumbria’s economy and provides employment for 20,575 full time equivalent (FTE) posts.

Green infrastructure also defines how places are experienced and perceived, and this can be equally important to economic development.

**This is unsound because:**

- **The development of this site would bring about coalescence.** The mitigating development recommendations will not reduce the coalescence of the sites from the estuary or for the local residents. The site was identified as forming a gap between Grange-over-Sands and Allithwaite. The site includes an important wildlife area. Development of this site in isolation would constitute a very large extension into open countryside that would be very prominent in the landscape and would also result in the merging of Grange and Kent's Bank with the village of Allithwaite.
- **The importance of existing views should have been considered, and important views mapped and protected.**
- **The Promenade footpath DOES NOT offer the opportunity to provide improved pedestrian and cycle access to the Town Centre.** This route cannot be cycled nor walked with a child's buggy or pram NOR is it accessible for individuals in wheelchairs or any kind of mobility impairment due to a steep flight of steps and the width of the path next to the rail track.
- **There are no designated cycleways in Grange.**

**MM053: page 110 Policy LA3.2**

*Land south of Allithwaite Road, Kents Bank, Grange-over-Sands*

*Policy LA3.2: mixed use allocation at land south of Allithwaite Road, Kent's Bank, Grange-Over-Sands 11.25 11.2 ha of land south of Allithwaite Road, Kent's Bank (ref MN26#) as shown on the proposals policies map is allocated for mixed housing (estimated capacity 202) and B1 And B2 employment development (1.5 ha). B8 employment uses will not be permitted on the site a development brief will be prepared to guide the development of this site. as well as other core strategy policy requirements, development must make provision for the following: a landscape and green infrastructure framework incorporating the retention of the westernmost portion of the site for open space and landscaping, the retention of existing woodland, additional planting, landscaping and biodiversity provision and links to existing woodland areas to create and improve wildlife corridors; submission and approval of a transport assessment and travel plan; pedestrian routes through the site to create network with existing footpaths and highways; new bus stop(s) and a pedestrian link to the town centre.*

**This is unsound:**

- **The Local Plan conflicts with the Spatial Strategy:**

GRANGE-OVER-SANDS: SPATIAL STRATEGY

"The aim is to help Grange adapt to the demands of the future while retaining its unique character areas, built heritage, green network and dramatic views. In essence the spatial strategy builds on Grange-over-Sands particular sense of place."

".. to protect the network of green spaces and important environmental characteristics of the town and its setting and in partnership with landowners promote their positive use and management.
- **There is no evidence of within the site allocation of a plan to preserve the natural integrity of the site:**
- The site is immediately adjacent an area that is subject to a Limestone Pavement Order
- **The site has high biodiversity value;** in particular as a result of its close proximity to Greaves Wood Limestone Pavement and the fact that it includes a small but important copse as well as many hedgerows.

## **MM054: page 110 Policy LA3.3**

### **Guides Lot, Grange-over-Sands**

*“...Policy LA3.3: Mixed use allocation at Guide’s Lot, Grange-Over-Sands 1.26 ha reduced to 1.15 Ha of land identified on the policies map at Guide’s Lot, Grange-Over-Sands is allocated for housing (estimated capacity 16 dwellings) and employment (B1) (0.63 ha reduced to 0.57 ha) as well as other Core Strategy Policy requirements, development must ensure that an appropriately planted and permanently fenced buffer strip of 10m width is retained adjacent to the Wart Barrow Site Of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Any new development should be set back at least 15m from the boundary of the SSSI site...”*

### **This is unsound**

- The Core Strategy 2009 Household Waste Recycling

“The existing Kendal Canal Head household waste facility is too small and if the proposed regeneration of Kendal Canal Head (AAP preferred options April2008) is implemented then the facility will need replacing. There is also a need to relocate the existing facility at Grange over Sands due to existing issues with highways access. The existing facility at Ulverston needs to be expanded and Milnthorpe requires a new site. Obviously an increase in the population will put further pressure and demands on existing supply potentially resulting in a need to provide enhanced quantitative and qualitative improvements/provision”.

- **There is a conflict between the removal of the waste recycling centre “due to existing issues with highways access “ and putting forward the same site for housing which will impact on the “existing highways access”!.**

### **CONSULTATION – Main Modifications**

- **Council officers have failed to provide clarity over the scope of this consultation exercise.**
- **Despite requests for an extension to the consultation period there has been no communication from Mr Hudson or SLDC**
- This consultation exercise itself is therefore flawed and unsound.

### **REFER TO FOLLOWING COPIED EMAILS WITH REGARD CONSULTATION**

- 1: Email – 10 April 2013 – From GTC Town Clerk to Mr Hudson requesting an extension.**
- 2: Email - 12 April 2013 – From GTC to CEO CALC requesting support.**

**1. FOR YOUR REFERENCE:**

**BY EMAIL 10 April 2013**

**Dan Hudson**

**Development Strategy Manager South Lakeland District Council**

Dear Mr Hudson

**SOUTH LAKELAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**LAND ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD)**

**Public Examination – Consultation on the updated Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications to the DPD.**

Please could I approach you on behalf of Grange-over-Sands Town Council and ask for an extension to the consultation period.

The Council next meet as a Full Council on Monday 13 May. They will review a draft response, agree any changes and resolve a response. We would then submit a response to you by email on 14 May 2013.

We would appreciate you help in this matter.

**NO RESPONSE RECEIVED AT TIME OF THIS SUBMISSION.**

## **2. FOR YOUR REFERENCE:**

**BY EMAIL – 12 April 2013 – To Mr D Claxton CEO CALC**

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

**Public Examination – Consultation on the updated Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications to the DPD.**

As you are aware GTC asked SLDC for an extension to this consultation. To date I have not had a reply.

This consultation runs for four weeks during an election period for the County Council and Town Council. This is the busiest time during the calendar for town and parish councils: Annual Meetings, Annual Town/Parish Council meetings, end of year and audit. There is also a public holiday within the period.

I have been informed today from local pressure groups that the parameters of the consultation has been expanded by SLDC to include the evidence behind the main modifications. This change to the consultation needs to be published. The public also need to be able to comment on omissions from the main modifications. At the time of sending this email the Council has not received notice of a change to the content of the consultation.

**Guidance Consultation principles: guidance**

**Organisation: Cabinet Office**

**Published: 17 July 2012**

“The objectives of any consultation should be clear.”

“Timeframes for consultation should be proportionate and realistic to allow stakeholders sufficient time to provide a considered response.”

“Information should be disseminated and presented in a way likely to be accessible and useful to the stakeholders with a substantial interest in the subject matter.”

“Consultation exercises should not generally be launched during local or national election periods.”

I have been informed by a number of local and district action groups that they have attempted to complain unsuccessfully about this matter with SLDC. My members have asked if CALC are able to intervene with regard this matter to ensure a fair and transparent consultation takes place.

**Mr Claxton contacted the Monitoring Officer at SLDC on behalf of GTC.**

**NO RESPONSE RECEIVED AT TIME OF THIS SUBMISSION.**