

Personal Submission for LDF consultation

I fully support the excellent submission of Grange Town Council Support Grange Town Council and support David core in his excellent critique of the process to date. At the moment you certainly do not have local support. I and many others cannot understand why you are proceeding with such haste, when there is now no statutory obligation to do so, and we were lead to believe that such matters came under the umbrella of localism not imposition from afar. A rational local planning unit would be the parish councils in the area represented by the Ancient Parish of Cartmel in the County of Lancashire not some distant, clearly out of touch, District Council.

There are at present concerns about the movement of vehicles in, out and throughout the Peninsula. This has recently been exacerbated by heavy vehicles passing through Grange and along the B5277. Any development on the eastern side of the Peninsula will, with the current road configuration, continue to add to the traffic nuisance, particularly with proposed, unreasonable, expansion of housing, and non-domestic facilities; the sweating of both the Holker assets at Holker and Cartmel; and the Flookburgh airfield. Full traffic surveys should be carried out and the result subject to public debate across the peninsula before any allocation of land is proposed. I am at loss to see how access can be improved via the existing main feeder the B5227. Thus one would have reasonably expected corridors for improved roads one possibility being the opening up of access via the Cartmel Valley from the new A590 junction above Lindale and as far as Cark. That would put the cat amongst the pigeons!

I have concerns about the present unstable combined sewerage system with frequent lifting of many manholes. The proposed work in the Memorial fields will not in any way contribute to the poor planning and neglect of the current crudely designed system.

With the exception of road traffic and sewerage I am reasonably relaxed about the ability of Utilities to incrementally develop to meet even the unreasonable level of expansion proposed.

However I would remain to be convinced that the town of Grange is properly protected against wild fires in view of the amount and close mutual proximity of vegetation and the likely effects of climate change. I was most surprised that static water tanks were not required for the large hotels and nursing homes in view of the potential difficulties in fire-fighting water supplies. Any loss of open space, as proposed, will exacerbate the situation.

I note that the Inspector was not convinced by the initial allocation of dwellings to Grange nor am I nor Grange Town Council - the word 'gerrymander' has been heard linked to the the50's and 60's expansion of London to the green suburbs !. I would like to see a proper derivation of need based upon the 2011 census that can be subjected to proper examination by our tame statisticians and Chartered Engineers. I find no support for the 500

dwelling figure within Grange and I and most of the audience were appalled by the apparent ageist attitude of your officers at the recent meeting in Grange.

The poor standard of planning in the past and some outrageous recent decisions have left a general lack of confidence of the planning process as applies to Grange and it's surroundings. There was adequate opportunity to reserve communications corridors to, and within, the Peninsula in the past. In my view there should be full investigation into the granting of planning permission, and subsequent development for the Pastures retirement village at Allithwaite / Cartmel and the proposed development of Greenacres

Specific sites

354 and 355 neither appear to be suitable as they will add vehicle movements to poor access points in the road system.

449, 74 will add hazard to junctions on the overloaded and hazardous B5227

353, 672, MN25M less hazardous but still onto overloaded road. Both associated with sewerage problems. Latter is of quite disproportionate scale.

R350M, 350, 351,349, 13 EN 24,,RN114 probably contaminated. Poor access, will require pumped sewerage discharge into already overloaded system (meets un controlled run off from Nursing Home) roadways and covers now regularly lift further down the hill).

RN2 Guides Farm this would potentially provide base/ visitors centre toilets etc. for cross bay walks leaving across Cart Lane Crossing instead of Kent's bank , retirement and current accommodation for Queens Guide and clean up a semi derelict site at price of a few housing units.

Privately owned important open space

I attach drawing with three sires designated A , B and C- in each case I believe these should have, in any event, been designated Privately owned important open space on aesthetic grounds and as a bonus contribute to fire breaks.

A the land currently used as a paddock abutting Risedale Hill – if 74 and 449 were proceeded with would give sensible break before the nursing home.

B the grounds of the nursing home – I understand the building was until recently listed - I am most surprised that the grounds to the front which include a bowling green are an important feature were not redesignated at the time of the delisting. Protection is imperative as there have been three recent retrospective planning applications for work on the site one of which was the relocation of 'Albert' to release space for vehicle parking, and another for a polytunnel (refused and now understood to be subject to enforcement). There is currently a problem with the discharge of surface water from the nursing home grounds

onto Risedale hill with lifting covers further down the combined sewerage system so that even impervious landscaping could exacerbate this problem.

C The proposed development site off Greenacres

This site was misguidedly included in the old plan without and understanding of the access problems which, quite predictably, have developed. Initial proposals for five bungalows would have been acceptable and thus little concern was raised at the outline stage. However the intensive development proposed is considered, generally, as being unreasonable - particularly in the light of the sub-standard Rowanside / Risedale junction. A long standing dispute over access means that the owners of the unadopted Greenacres Road will, to everyone's relief, not grant access. I note, with relief that this land has been excluded from designation in the LDF drawings. Now the overgrown leylandi have been partially removed it is apparent that the parcel of land contributes of the character of Grange when viewed from the Bay and serves as a potential fire break. Thus in view of it's importance I feel it should be redesigned.

I am available to discuss any of these matters with you.

A W Coles MA. BSc.(Hons.) CEng. FIGM..FEI.