

Comments on Development Brief Phase 3 B . Area East of Milnthorpe Road, Holme.

1.Non-Compliance with Government Guidelines

The development includes the rear gardens of Laurel Bank and Rosecroft. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paras 48 and 53 preclude development in residential gardens where development would cause harm to the local area. This point was raised by me with Alastair McNeill , Principal Development Plans Officer on 9 October 2012. He emailed me on 10 October 2012 confirming this situation and that my property, xxx would be removed. The two remaining properties were left in as allocated land on the basis that they were simply available. Needless to say, every property would likely be available if eye-watering amounts of money were offered to the owners for their gardens. It is SLDC's responsibility to ensure that policies are adopted to comply with Government guidelines, not simply to include land because it is available.

I would be interested to learn if this issue was discussed with the Inspector dealing with the Land Allocation in 2012 and if not why not?

2 Number of Houses

The size of the development is excessive indicating to a developer that 73 homes can be built. The 2.43ha stated in the brief includes the area of wet and boggy land, which has drainage issues and will be unsuitable for building. The consequences of this, alongside the public open space on the eastern side, is that the greater part of the development will be on the rising ground sloping towards Milnthorpe Road. Surface water running off the development will significantly add to the existing drainage problems creating instability.

The western part of the site is highly visible from Farleton Knott and the Northern approaches. It will not sit comfortably in the landscape of open countryside on the edge of Holme village. With the bulk of the proposed houses located in this area then the density of the proposal should be assessed and modified. Any scheme put forward by a Developer should be based upon two options showing plans for 25% and 50% of the available capacity thus ensuring that the development sits well in the environment and is sympathetic to the surroundings and contours of the land.

3 Traffic and Accessibility

The draft brief indicates the vehicular access point to be on Milnthorpe Road with a pedestrian access at the eastern end onto Mayfield Avenue. With the proposal for 73 houses, then the traffic flow could be substantially increased. On the basis of 3 cars per household, tradesmen and visitors, then there could easily be over 700 car movements per day. ($73 \times 3 = 219 \times 3 \text{ movements} = 657 + 50 \text{ visitors} = 707$).

Cars travelling south will require to drive through the centre of the village where cars are already parked on the street resulting in further congestion approaching the Post Office. These vehicles will either turn left up North Road which is single file in many places or proceed towards Burton which already has significant pinch points, to be further added to by its own housing development plans and ensuing traffic congestion issues.

Any vehicles headed for Kendal are likely to go by Elmsfield Lane to link up with the A65 at Junction 36. This road is single file throughout its length. Cars headed for Milnthorpe will require to go through Whasset, which again is single file in places.

Apart from the proposed development generating a significant amount of local traffic on compromised roads, there is a material safety issue to be addressed. There is no footpath from the proposed access point down Milnthorpe Road to the Crescent, a distance of approximately 400 yards, part of which is on a blind hill. The Community playing field is located opposite the Crescent and the natural access for children and others would be down Milnthorpe Road. Speeding traffic has been an issue for many years and the proposal to have such a large development with only one access will create a dangerous pedestrian risk situation, especially for children. In my view an independent Traffic Impact Assessment is imperative. Whilst the cost of this may be down to the Developer, the choice of the consultancy should be made by the Highways Agency.

4 Conclusion

The oversized scale of the proposed development blending in with the countryside, the decision to ignore NPPF guidelines, constraints on the site with inadequate drainage and the problematic traffic arrangements lead me to suggest that this entire scheme should be abandoned.

TN Ballantyne
25/05/2017