

SOUTH LAKELAND LAND ALLOCATIONS - FURTHER CONSULTATION
From: Graham Rivers [Sent: 07- Sep- 11 16:34]
To: Development Plans
Subject: RE: SOUTH LAKELAND LAND ALLOCATIONS - FURTHER CONSULTATION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Thank you for inviting us to take part in the further consultation exercise. We would like to respond as follows, our comments are focused on the area around where we live in Flookburgh:

1) Alternative Sites:

The suggested list of alternative development sites fills us with horror - if they were all to be granted the villages of Holker, Cark, Flookburgh and Ravenstown would be swamped by and amalgamated into an urban sprawl consisting of over 2 miles of continuous residential development. This is totally unacceptable - we chose to live in a small village, not a town. The independence of these very different villages and maintenance of as much existing green space between them as possible must be preserved at all costs.

Consequently, further housing development within existing village footprints is generally ok, whereas development that eats into the green space that separates the villages should be avoided.

Most of the proposed new residential sites to the south of Flookburgh (RN158, RN159, RN160, RN263) immediately rule themselves out due to the flooding risks. Any housing built would be uninsurable. However some of this land has already established itself for employment use, so if businesses were willing to accept the flooding risk then a little further expansion of this use would be acceptable, so we support EN25 and EN41.

Residential development of RN276 is acceptable as it falls within the existing footprint of Flookburgh, whereas development of RN229 should be ruled out for many reasons:

- It is the major green space between the villages of Flookburgh and Cark.
 - It is on a hillside so any development would stand out visually with a negatively overbearing impact on the attractive local countryside
 - It would disproportionately enlarge the current development footprint of Flookburgh by around a third.
 - The proposed through road seems unnecessary - it would merely add to maintenance expense and potentially encourage further development to the west of the village such as unwanted static and touring caravan site expansion.
- We object to EN49 as an extension to EN42 Station Yard. There is no need to expand this facility as the current Station Yard site is 70% unused and suffers from serious access problems from Station Road.

Similarly RN286 and RN309 should be ruled out as they represent most of the current green space between Holker and Cark, whereas some residential development on RN287 could perhaps be acceptable as it is mainly within the existing Holker village footprint.

As we are sure has already been mentioned, development on the south cartmel peninsula area needs to be carefully considered in light of the serious infrastructure issues:

- notwithstanding recent enhancement by United Utilities the current sewage infrastructure is believed to be operating at maximum capacity.
- there are only 3 road access points via Holker Mosses, Cartmel or Grange. There are obvious volume related maintenance and safety issues with each (e.g. the "narrows" at Allithwaite, the traffic bottleneck outside the convenience store in Cark, the permanently poor condition of the Holker Mosses road.

2) Land Allocation Document Period

Yes, it would seem to make sense to reduce the period covered by the Land Allocation document to 2020 so that it can be properly reviewed again then to take into account the impact of the Localism Bill and proposed changes to the

national planning framework.

3) Small Villages and Hamlets

Yes, in general it is better to adopt the Neighbourhood plans based option B. However, having been involved in a couple of Parish meetings to discuss local planning I have deep concerns that developers will simply hijack the process to advance and garner village support for their current projects and simply dress it all up as an agreed Neighbourhood plan. Development of neighbourhood plans will need 'handholding' by SLDC to ensure transparency is achieved.

Graham Rivers
Philippa Baddeley

-