

The LDF Development Project Team
South Lakeland District Council
Lowther Street
Kendal
LA9 4DQ

Re: the LDF proposals for Ulverston in the first and subsequent development proposals.

I wish to reaffirm my support for the proposals and objections put forward by Ulverston Town Council on the main and subsequent sites in Ulverston, and the necessity to ensure the green belt around Ulverston is maintained to prevent other settlements becoming sub-summed within Ulverston.

I also support the stance that the villages should be an integral consultee on any proposed developments within their communities.

I have grave reservations for the extent of the proposed developments on R 126M including R156 and R126 as too high a density of development on ground which has a historic flooding problem. That R691Ulv be removed as this will combined with R126M double the housing footprint in that section of the town.

I oppose the extent of the proposed development on RN130 as this breaches the requirement of 10.5m minimum either side of the aqueduct, as this site straddles the line. Likewise site RN131M does likewise, development on this site will have the potential for adverse effect on the dwellings already there. There are mature trees and other fauna and flora which are the feeding grounds of local bats, and many other species. My objections also extend to sites R697 has a stand of mature trees which provide a refuge for wild life, photograph attached; RN141 and RN131 for the above reasons.

I have strong reservations on the extent of the southern perimeters of R242 has a history of flooding (photograph previously submitted), and R697M as they encroach onto the 10.5 m boundary rule. There are also access/egress problems from those sites if they are to be developed as proposed. A reduction in the size of site and the number of dwellings would maintain the green belt and reduce the down hill water displacement. There is currently a history of rain water run off producing a water fall effect into the Bardsea Caravan Park during high rain fall cycles.

In the original submissions for consultation the following areas were disregarded, under the subsequent draft papers there were included. I would support sympatric development on site R692UlvM which protects the existing farm house and buildings.

I object to these locations being re-introduced, they are: -
R22 and R130 there is no suitable access and the sides of the ravine are exceptionally steep, there is a water course running through there which encroaches upon the properties at the bottom of Rake Lane. In the winter and heavy rain periods this stream becomes a torrent, any development would risk life and property to those dwelling at its foot.

The site R266 is a thriving business which provides a social community facility giving a focal point for residents. The combined land mass would not be an economically viable area to permit social or affordable development.

Site R12 should be removed this is under active consideration for a community use development.

Site R253 has new mixed development on it.

I have extremely grave concerns for any development on sites MN18 and M14 as the only access to these is by crossing a ford, where the water level varies between inches and several feet of very fast flowing water. The ground is spongy for most of the year and is subject to tidal variances through subterranean influences being very wet during rains and winter.

The site R136 has been bunded by the water agencies to form a flood plain catchments area. Evidence has been submitted from the 2009 floods showing that area and the adjacent public foot path (Rope Walk) under several feet of water.

The site next to M14 has been suggested, the construction of a foot path on this area has been hotly contested by GSK who own the site and the aquifer below it. Because it has the aqueduct running through this site I would oppose its development being in breach of the 10.5m condition.

Having read the flooding study prepared by Jacobs (2007), highlighting their findings for any further development on sites adjacent to the land between the canal and North Lonsdale Road. Sites EN35 – M27 – EN36 – ON25 - PS254 any construction would have to have its floor level raised to a minimum of 800 mm above the fluvial flood plain to ensure the integrity of the building and safety of occupants. Likewise for area

MN17 which floods often as many as 4 times a year, canoeists are able to practice on the water at those times.

This would have a seriously detrimental effect on the safety of those dwellings along North Lonsdale Road and Steel Street as their floor levels are below the current road surface level. All these properties suffered inundations in 2009. Some residents have been physically and psychologically unable to return to their homes since then.

Site EN22 was originally part of Phase 1 of the Lund Farm Industrial area.

It has lain empty and unused for over 8 years, being a breeding ground for nats – mosquitoes etc. and a zone for fly tipping. Development of this site has been, and is actively supported. Site EN23 has potential for industrial use being at the side of the old mill buildings.

In the submissions sites M26 and E30 have been designated as employment land. This is supported by the Ulverston Canal Head master plan of 2004.

Following the recent heavy rain I visited those sites on Tuesday 6th September 2011. I noted that live stock were grazing quite happily in the field, with water covering only their hooves. When the beast moved away they were on dry ground. The water course which runs parallel to the A 590 and crosses the Eastern end of E30 is heavily congested with trees and shrub like growth and grasses, whilst being bounded by well established hedge rows. Vehicular access to those locations and the A 590 could be established onto the Booth's round about via the side of the glass factory without impinging upon the current Next Ness Lane. Stabilisation of the banking supporting the present roadway would be necessary for a short section especially if any trees were to be damaged or removed.

Cllr. Norman Bishop-Rowe
8th September 2011



