

**Arnside and Silverdale AONB DPD Pre-Publication Consultation, 19/6/7-17/7/17.**

**Response to invitation to comment – email from SLDC of 16/6/17 refers.**  
These comments relate to Storth (numbered point 2 in the 16/6/17 email).

Response by E.W.Craker.

**Introduction.**

I made comments on the then Draft Plan Consultation Plan Document in December 2016 with particular reference to B35/B38/B81 and B125. Briefly, those comments supported housing and office accommodation on those areas. Those comments still stand.

The current proposals are to extend the development into areas B116 (known locally as the horse field), B117, and a significant part of B79. These areas are all greenfield.

I object to those proposals for the reasons given below.

**Objections to development on B79, B116 and B117.**

1. It has been stated that doubt has been expressed by the landowners as to whether the land shown at the last consultation is sufficient to finance a new access.

I cannot see that this is the case.

B81 (the main part of the old TP land) abuts the B5282 Park Road, and access can be simply gained from it to both parts of B81.

The required sight lines can easily be accommodated within B81. Indeed, the old TP access is still visible part way along B81, and a new road from this point, across it to the southern part of B81 could hardly be easier.

Equally, an access across B125 (The Ship car park) has no complications, again sight lines can be easily accommodated.

Thus the access from the B5282 is economical both in cost and land use.

2. The land in question, B79, B116 and B117 is all greenfield.  
There is no reason to consider development on greenfield land.  
SLDC and LCC have already found and allocated sufficient land to meet the development needs of the area for very many years to come – as

evidenced by the proposals put forward in November 2016.

3. The proposals show a cul-de-sac some 350m long.  
This is far in excess of what is permitted by the Cumbria Design Guide.
4. Presumably acknowledging the length of the cul-de-sac, the proposals show an emergency vehicle access to Yans Lane.  
Yans Lane itself and the highway network at the centre of the village (near the shop and war memorial) is severely sub-standard and is often blocked by private cars, delivery vehicles etc. There are no footways.  
The existing highway network is totally unsuitable to take additional traffic and emergency vehicles.
5. Control of emergency accesses is extremely difficult.  
It would almost certainly become a short cut further increasing traffic in Yans Lane, or because of a breakdown, not be available when required.
6. If development were to be permitted on any of the greenfield land it would set a very dangerous precedent, particularly as it is within the AONB. There would certainly be pressure on the planning system in the future to permit further development on B79, and indeed on greenfield land elsewhere both within the AONB and outside of it.

**Additional comment (to my response of 11/12/16) regarding development of B81.**

The new junction to Park Road should be above flood level so that it reduces the extent of works necessary to deal with other low lying parts of this road.

**Summary**

The proposal to develop on B79, B116 and B117 is unnecessary, unworkable and would set a dangerous precedent.

E. W. Craker. 9/7/17