

Burneside Parish Council

(with Strickland Roger & Strickland Ketel)

Response to the Land Allocation : Emerging Options

part of the Local Development Framework

1. Background

1.1 The District Council plans to allocate land suitable for building 102 new “dwellings”, within the Parish. These are shown on :

Map 6 : Burneside sites at R489M (Hall Park Extension) and M38M (Willink Recreation Field) for 72 and 30 new dwellings respectively.

Map 16 : Bowston site R664M(Field at Meadow Close) 9 homes.

The Parish would also be affected by development shown on

Map 1 : Kendal N.W. site R170M (Field near Carus Green Golf Club) 225 houses.

1.2 The Parish Council has formulated a response after consultation:

- a. through a well attended public meeting
- b. meetings with interest groups (residents, sports clubs, employers & potential developers)
- c. through comments via the parish web site
- d. attendance at SLDC roadshows and presentations

1.3 The following comments relate to all the sites referred to above

2. Concerns Raised

2.1 All the meetings made reference to the likely effects of development on the already serious problems of **sewage/waste water disposal**. This is acknowledged by United Utilities, who write in para.3.29 of the LDF

"Increases in housing and employment land will put pressure on the existing sewage network and wastewater treatment works in Kendal. The Environment Agency has highlighted two areas where there are sewer capacity issues: Kentrigg Walk and Steeles Row, Burneside. In addition it has concerns about the capacity of the Waste Water Treatment Works, located to the south of Kendal. A lack of sewage capacity at these locations may increase the incidence of sewage discharge to the River Kent and have an adverse affect on the species for which the river is designated a SAC. Measures are needed to avoid/mitigate these adverse effects and protect the health and wellbeing of local people."

It is understood that there is no guarantee of investment by United Utilities after 2015 to build the necessary sewerage infrastructure required to develop the sites and the scale of investment is unlikely to be affordable by any developer.

2.2 Burneside is located near the confluence of the River Kent and River Sprint. There were concerns that development would increase the likelihood of **flooding** in the area by:

- a. Affecting the water table through the construction of concrete foundations

b. Increasing water "run-off" from hard surfaces (issue relates to the combined effect of surface water and foul water entering the sewerage system) There were severe floods in the Parish in 2009, closing the main road and seriously damaging many homes.

2.3 Traffic concerns were frequently raised. It was felt that additional traffic generated by all the sites would have a negative impact on the Parish. Burneside Road already has many adverse safety features throughout its length and is the subject of extremely poor air quality at the junction with Windermere Road. It was also felt the traffic access points to the sites would give rise to safety problems.

2.4 It was considered that large-scale development in the Parish would lead to deterioration in traffic conditions.

2.5 The social composition of the Parish gave rise to concerns. *"The Local Development Framework 2008"* refers to the percentage of social housing within the parish as being above the percentage for the district and county. Burneside has over 30% social housing already. More social housing would contribute to more imbalance in the socio-economic status within the community.

a. The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD)

The average IMD score for England is 21.58 and for South Lakeland 11.67.

District	War Deprivation Score
Burneside	15.26
Staveley-in-Westmorland	9.70

Upper Kent is the third most deprived LAP in South Lakeland, and Burneside is the poorest district within it.

2.6 Sites M38M, R664M and R170 all contribute to increased coalescence between Burneside and Kendal, and Burneside and Bowston. Residents were not in favour of this and were against the **erosion of the Green Gap**. This was related to the probable loss of agricultural land and the detrimental effects on wildlife; flora and fauna.

2.7 These issues are referred to in the current LDF document, p8 Key Issue 1: *"It is vital to protect the countryside for its intrinsic beauty, diversity and natural resources and for its ecological, geological, economic, agricultural, recreational and social value."*

3. Conclusions

3.1 No development should take place on the sites: R489M M38M R664M & R170M until infrastructure problems of sewage and waste water disposal are solved.

3.2 Any development must take adequate precautions to alleviate potential flood risk. It must be demonstrated that development :

- a. would not have a significant impact on the capacity of an area to store floodwater
- b. that measures required to manage any flood risk can be implemented;

- c. that surface water is managed in a sustainable way;
- d. that provision is made for the long term maintenance and management of any flood protection and/or mitigation measures

It must be noted that this general area has been subject to frequent flooding.

3.3 Problems related to highways safety and traffic volume must be satisfactorily addressed if development is to go ahead.

3.4 There must be no coalescence between the settlements (Bowston, Burneside, Kendal), and the Green Gap must be preserved to ensure that individual settlements are kept distinct and maintain their individual character.

3.5 Housing development must take account of the existing large proportion of social housing in the Parish. This imbalance needs to be redressed.

3.6 It is acknowledged that development will inevitably take place as the area grows. New developments must respect and be sympathetic to the character of the locality, and enhance the existing built environment. It is a particular concern that no more agricultural land is lost for the future.

3.7 The CRHT Housing Needs Survey of Burneside (2009) states :

“we consider that twenty-two households would be in need of affordable housing within the next five years in the parish of Burneside.”

and most residents were happy to allow development on this scale.

3.8 Any loss of existing facilities should be compensated before final development takes place. Appropriate renewal and replacement should take place after consultations with interested local groups. There may be advantages to be had by transferring social and sporting venues to a more central location within the actual village setting.

Burneside Parish Council
April 2011