

Lower Holker Parish Council

2nd September 2011

Development Strategy Manager,
South Lakeland District Council,
South Lakeland House,
Lowther Street,
Kendal, LA9 4DL

Dear Sir/Madam

Local Development Framework – Alternative Sites Put forward by Respondents to Consultation

I refer to the recently published Maps of Alternative Sites Put Forward by Respondents in respect of Cark and Holker and Flookburgh and Cark Airfield in the Parish of Lower Holker.

The Alternative Sites Put Forward by Respondents was listed as follows: -

Cark and Holker

- EN 49 Land North and East of Cark Industrial estate, Cark – new site- employment
- ON 44 Land SW of Orchard House, Cark – alternative site- Open Space
- RN 229 Land south of Railway at Cark-Alternative site- housing
- RN 276 Two paddocks between telephone exchange car park and railway, Flookburgh. – new site- housing
- RN 286 Land North of Cark Manor, Holker – new site- housing
- RN 267 Land north of Holker School. Holker – new site- housing
- RN 309 Land south of Holker School, Holker- new site- Housing

Flookburgh and Cark Airfield

- EN 25 Moor Lane, Flookburgh – alternative site- employment
- EN 41 Land south of Moor Lane Business Park, Flookburgh- alternative-employment.
- MN 12 Outerthwaite Farm, Allithwaite-alternative site- housing.
- RN 158 Land east of Moor Lane, Flookburgh south of Flookburgh-alternative-employment.
- RN 159 Caravan park and field to the south Moor Lane, Flookburgh –alternative site-employment.
- RN 160 Land around Airfield Approach business park, Flookburgh – alternative site-employment
- RN 263 Cark Airfield, Flookburgh- new site- housing

After consultation with the residents of the Parish a public meeting the Parish Council has resolved to put forward the following for consideration during the consultation period.

1. Traffic Congestion –Flookburgh Square, Moor Lane, Main St and Market Street, Flookburgh

This is the major concern of the residents and all are opposed to any further housing or industrial development at *Sites EN25, EN41, RN 158, RN 159 RN 160, RN 263*. without consideration being given to road improvement schemes in the vicinity of Flookburgh Square and also including a link road from Allithwaite Road, Flookburgh to the Moor Lane, south of the village of Flookburgh

2. Lack of Parking Facilities

Most residents complained of over saturation of parking on Main St, Market Street and Winder Lane, Flookburgh and once again voiced the opinion that no further housing developments should be allowed on sites *RN 158, RN 159 RN 160, RN 263*.

3. New Foot bridge over railway at Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh

This was a pre-requisite for all residents before any further development was allowed in the parish

4. Lack of Play Areas and Sports facilities for children and teenagers

Before any further housing development the lack of play areas and sports facilities of for children and teenagers should be addressed.

5. Second Homes

The number of second homes in the parish was of major concern to parishioners and suggestions put forward included planning conditions to prevent new homes becoming second homes.

6. Affordable Homes

The consensus of opinion was that affordable homes were required as a matter of urgency for local residents. However all were of the opinion that the present formula, which classed homes as affordable, was not good enough. Those classed as affordable were still too expensive for local people.

7. Local Occupancy

The majority of those attending the meetings were unaware of the wide definition of local occupancy and on being made aware of its contents expressed the opinion that it should be restricted further to 'local residents'

8. Empty Properties

Many present were able to give the number of empty properties in the parish and asked why nothing being done to bring them into use. They also expressed the opinion that if empty properties were utilised and land at present with planning permission was taken into account then there would be no need for further development to meet the government's requirements.

9. Quality of Village Life and its retention

It was pointed out that the parish was a rural area with a certain appeal to its residents who chose to live there. Whilst the influx of off- comers into already built housing was accepted any further influx into new housing developments would rob the villages of their character.

10. Infrastructure

Any further housing development would have an adverse effect on the infrastructure particularly as regards road capacity, car parks, schools, medical facilities, drainage and sewerage, and power supplies.

11. Employment

The Parish Council supports developments, which would provide employment for local people but would recommend any development allowed brings employment of a valuable nature as opposed to unskilled labour.

Recommendations of Parish Council as regards Alternative Sites Put Forward by Respondents to Consultation.

CARK AND HOLKER

- **SITE EN 49 -land north and east of Cark Industrial estate - employment**

The Parish Council support this proposed development, which hopefully would bring employment for local people. Reservations are expressed as to access to the site and the Parish Council are of the opinion that improvement to the access should be a pre-requisite before any development is allowed to take place.

- **SITE `RN229 and ON44 - land SW of Orchard House, Cark and land south of railway at Cark - housing and open space**

. The Parish Council as did the majority of persons who attended the meeting support this proposed development. It was argued that this development would assist in reducing the traffic flows along Main St and Station Rd by providing the alternative route from Station Rd, Cark to Winder Lane, Flookburgh. However many present argued against this presumption being of the opinion that it would not have any effect on reducing the traffic on these roads and could lead to an increase in traffic along Main St.

Concerns were also expressed as to this development resulting in the green space between the villages of Cark and Flookburgh being reduced to a very small area and thus resulting in the villages becoming merged into one and forming a small town. It was pointed out that the development site shown on the most recent maps included all the land between Cark and Flookburgh whereas the plans submitted by the developer did not. Supporters of the development gave an assurance that the enlarged site on the map was at the insistence of SLDC and that the developers plans did include a green space. It was also argued that the proposed road would have safety aspects, as it would encourage speeding motorist because of its straightness.

It was felt by some that the enlargement of the settlement boundaries as a result of this development would totally alter the character of the two villages which was were its main attraction to both residents and visitors alike.

It was also asked how this development would be of any use to solve the need for local affordable houses. The detached houses proposed would be too expensive to meet local needs This represents a major development for the village with clear planning gains. It is therefore imperative that the planning gains included in the development become a pre-requisite and assured as part of any development framework.

- **SITE RN276 – two paddocks between telephone exchange car park and railway, Flookburgh- housing**

The Parish Council and the majority of those present did not support use of this site for development as it was felt the access to and from it via Green Lane and Market St could not support further traffic,

- **SITES RN286, RN287, RN 309 land north of Cark Manor and north and south of Holker, School**

The Parish Council objects to the development of these sites due to the fact that they fall outside the settlement boundaries and also the fact that the road linking the sites with Cark Village and the schools is unsuitable both for pedestrians and access by vehicular traffic from the sites. The road is narrow on the approach to Cark Village with no footpath on either side of the road. The road consists of many bends and access to and from the sites would be dangerous. This type of development represents strip development and would be detrimental to the character of the village by extending the village settlement boundaries.

FLOOKBURGH AND CARK AIRFIELD

- **SITES EN 25 and EN 41 –Land Moor Lane , Flookburgh and land south of Moor Lane, Business Park, Flookburgh - employment.**

As these sites were already earmarked for industrial development there appeared to be no objections to these sites. However concern was raised regarding access to these sites via Station Rd, Market St, Flookburgh Square, Moor Lane. Many argued that there was too much traffic passing along these roads already especially heavy goods vehicles. Access to Moor Lane from Flookburgh Square was a problem with parked vehicles outside the shop causing obstruction to passing traffic. Once again the provision of a link road to access these sites from Allithwaite Rd needs consideration.

- **SITE MN 12 – Outherthwaite Farm. Allithwaite.**

The Parish Council notes that there is planning permission already granted for development on this site and would need to consider any future amended plans before further consideration. (Possible in Lower Allithwaite Parish Council area)

- **Sites RN158, RN159, RN160- - Land off Moor Lane, Flookburgh – employment**
- **SITE RN 263 – Cark Airfield, Flookburgh – Housing**

The Parish Council and the majority of those present at the meeting note that these sites lay on land identified as a flood plain and therefore should not be considered for housing development. Once again the vast majority of those present voiced the opinion that no further housing development should be allowed along Moor Lane because the access roads are unsuitable for further traffic. It was pointed out that access from Station Rd, Main St and Market St all had to pass through Flookburgh Square and then down Moor Lane. Recently conducted traffic surveys revealed excessive amounts of traffic passing through the Square now and further increase in development would only add to this congestion. It was also pointed out that the traffic flow into Moor Lane was being obstructed because of parked

vehicles outside the convenience store. In addition the restricted road width a short distance down Moor Lane resulted in one-way traffic at the narrowest point.

GENERAL COMMENTS

A wide range of comments came from the floor on the following subjects: -

1. Was there a need for further housing development in the parish?
2. What was seen as the number of houses required in the parish and how was this figure arrived at.
3. Retention of the quality of village life
4. The present traffic problems and the consequences if further housing allowed.
5. The number of empty houses already in the parish.
6. The number of second homes in the parish
7. The meaning of local occupancy
8. The meaning of affordable homes
9. Can the present infrastructure of the villages stand further development
10. The lack of facilities for children and teenagers in the parish.
11. The lack of car parking and the need for more in the villages
12. The possible advantages to be gained when conditions imposed on planning applications.

Yours Sincerely

G.T Critchley (Mr)
Parish Clerk

Documents enclosed:-

- *Minutes of Public meeting held 24th August 2011*
- *Copy of comments extracted from completed sheet concerning the alternative sites made at meeting on 24th August 2011*

LOWER HOLKER PARISH COUNCIL

South Lakeland District Council Allocations of Land Development Plan Document

Public Meeting held at 7pm on Wednesday 24th August 2011 at Flookburgh Village Hall to give members of the public an opportunity to express their view as regards South Lakeland District Council Allocations of Land Development Framework -Alternative sites put forward by respondents to Consultation

Present: -

Parish Councillors: - R Airey. (Chair) T Wilson, M Keith, County Councillor Rod Wilson

36 members of the public (see attached list).

Apologies: - Cllr G Gardner, Cllr S Rawsthorn, Cllr J Ryland, Cllr J Rowlandson

Councillor R Airey welcomed all members of the public to the meeting and thanked them attending. She then explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the alternative sites shown on the most recent maps. These sites had been put forward by respondents to the last round of consultation. This consultation did not permit comments on the emerging options sites discussed at previous meetings and only comments referring to the new alternative sites would be considered. The alternative sites were displayed at the rear of the room and that members of the public would be invited at the end of the meeting to make their comments on 'stick on' sheets on the emerging options. Councillor Airey then asked those present for their views on the following sites threw the meeting open to those present to make any comments.

CARK AND HOLKER

SITE EN 49 (Industrial)

Varied comments arose from the floor both supporting this site and opposing it. The main concern the access to the site from Station Rd, Cark. The present junction of Station Rd and the station approach road was unsuitable for most traffic and especially heavy good vehicles. The junction would need major alteration if this was to be considered a viable site. There was support for provision of more employment in particular local employment. Some of those present felt use should be made of the empty industrial units already present on the site. The close proximity of the River Eea raised concern over the possibility of flooding on and around the site. Concern was also raised that the present infrastructure could not support this site.

SITES RN 287, 309, 266 Holker (Housing)

It was explained to the meeting that Holker Estates owned all three sites. Enquiries at the estate revealed that the estate had proposed none of these sites and they were not aware of the identity of Mr Evans who put forward the sites for consideration. The Estate said they were not promoting these sites for development at this time but of course could not rule out consideration been given to it at a future date.

Comments on this site were again varied. It was argued that the sites were outside the village envelope and beyond the settlement boundaries.. The main area of concern was the pedestrian access to the village. and hence the school. The road was narrow with bends and there was a section of the road without a footpath on either side. It was felt the road was too dangerous to support more development.

FLOOKBURGH AND CARK AIRFIELD

RN 229 and ON 44

This proposed development site was discussed at length. A majority of those present supported it. It was argued that this development would assist in reducing the traffic flows along Main St and Station Rd by providing the alternative route from Station Rd, Cark to Winder Lane, Flookburgh. However many present argued against this presumption being of the opinion that it would not have any effect on reducing the traffic on these roads and could lead to an increase in traffic along Main St.

Concerns were also expressed as to this development resulting in the green space between the villages of Cark and Flookburgh being reduced to a very small area and thus resulting in the villages becoming merged into one and forming a small town. It was pointed out that the development site shown on the most recent maps included all the land between Cark and Flookburgh whereas the plans submitted by the developer did not. Supporters of the development gave an assurance that the enlarged site on the map was at the insistence of SLDC and that the developers plans did include a green space. It was also argued that the proposed road would have safety aspects as it would encourage speeding motorists because of its straightness.

It was felt by some that the enlargement of the settlement boundaries as a result of this development would totally alter the character of the two villages which was its main attraction to both residents and visitors alike.

It was also asked how this development would be of any use to solve the need for local affordable houses. The detached houses proposed would be too expensive to meet local needs.

RN 276

The majority of those present did not support use of this site for development as it was felt the access to and from it via Green Lane and Market St could not support further traffic,

SITES EN 25 and 41,

As these sites were already earmarked for industrial development there appeared to be no objections to these sites. However concern was raised regarding access to these sites via Station Rd, Market St, Flookburgh Square, Moor Lane. Many argued that there was too much traffic passing along these roads already especially heavy goods vehicles. Access to Moor Lane from Flookburgh Square was a problem with parked vehicles outside the shop causing obstruction to passing traffic

SITES RN 158, RN 159, RN 160 and RN 263.

The majority of those present noted that these sites lay on land identified as a flood plain and therefore should not be considered for housing development. Once again the vast majority of those present voiced the opinion that no further housing development should be allowed along Moor Lane because the access roads are unsuitable for further traffic. It was pointed out that access from Station Rd, Main St and Market St all had to pass through Flookburgh Square and then down Moor Lane. Recently conducted traffic surveys revealed excessive amounts of traffic passing through the Square now and further increase in development would only add to this congestion. It was also pointed out that the traffic flow into Moor Lane was being obstructed because of parked vehicles outside the convenience store. In addition the restricted road width a short distance down Moor Lane resulted in one-way traffic at the narrowest point.

A wide range of comments came from the floor on the following subjects: -

13. Was there a need for further housing development in the parish?
14. What was seen as the number of houses required in the parish and how was this figure arrived at.
15. Retention of the quality of village life
16. The present traffic problems and the consequences if further housing allowed.
17. The number of empty houses already in the parish.
18. The number of second homes in the parish
19. The meaning of local occupancy
20. The meaning of affordable homes
21. Can the present infrastructure of the villages stand further development
22. The lack of facilities for children and teenagers in the parish.
23. The lack of car parking and the need for more in the villages
24. The possible advantages to be gained when conditions imposed on planning applications.

The opinion was expressed that it was difficult to make any comment on the proposed alternative sites, as there was no details supplied as to how many and what type of property was to be built on them. In addition in previous consultation SLDC had first given their opinion as to the suitability of the sites. In this consultation residents were asked to form an opinion on sites which could be discounted by SLDC when they got round to making their recommendations based on planning laws, environmental, highway, sewerage and infrastructure conditions. It was agreed this presented difficulties and this had been pointed out to SLDC at an earlier meeting The only explanation forthcoming was that time was of the essence and the whole Local Development Framework Document had to be completed to timetable.

Many present expressed the opinion that there was no need for further development in the village. It was pointed out that by choice we lived in a rural village community and wished to preserve this way of life. Visitors to the area also enjoyed the quality of life in the villages and it was important that this way of life should be preserved. Further development would be to the detriment of the community. It was also pointed out that the infrastructure of the villages would not stand further development. Schools would need enlargement, the drainage system could not cope and further development would lead to increased traffic and the need for more shops and health provision. The lack of facilities in the parish for local children and teenagers was also raised.

During the discussion the subject of second homes and holiday homes was raised. Many saw this to the detriment of the villages.

The meaning of local occupancy and affordable homes was also raised.

The present state of the traffic in the parish was seen as major concern. The lack of parking facilities resulted in both Main St and Market Street being full of parked cars at times of the day. Parking was especially bad on Main St and further development would only make the problem worse. It was suggested that Flookburgh Square no longer had the capacity to meet the parking needs and land should be sought to build new car parks.

It was put to the meeting that these proposed housing developments were at the insistence of the last Government and until such time as the new Government changed the policy the development were a fait accompli. This being the case then it was up to the residents of the parish to make sure their proposals as to where, and what should be built and with what conditions. , were put forward to SLDC planners. If no representations were made to SLDC then they would presume there were no objections. This was a opportunity for the residents of the parish to put forward their ideas as to the future of the parish. The good and bad points should be highlighted and what the residents perceived needed to be done to preserve the villages and improve them. If property was to built effort should be made to identify sites were the residents wanted them and under what conditions. Representations should be made as to what type of property should be built, were it should be built, the impact of further traffic should be highlighted and the provision of parking for the new properties so as to avoid s more street parking. The imposition of planning conditions should be exploited to the full.

The Chair then invited all those present to inspect the maps of the emerging alternative sites and write on their comments on the paper provided. The Parish Council would study these and their recommendations based on these comments would be forward to SLDC.

Those present were reminded that this consultation continued until the 9th September and that everyone with an opinion were urged to write to SLDC during this consultation period and making their views known.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

ALTERNATIVE SITES PUT FORWARD BY
RESPONDENTS TO CONSULTATION.

OPEN MEETING TUESDAY 24th AUGUST 2011.

COMMENTS EXTRACED FROM COMPLETED SHEETS

SITE EN 49 (Industrial)

- Industrial OK
- Small Businesses only
- Best
- Difficult access for Flookburgh.
- Good location, existing development, brown field site.
- Not needed half of existing Station yard site unused. Poor access.
- Access from Station Rd unsatisfactory. Camber lethal.
- Would hopefully tidy up behind station, better access. Good.
- Nothing to lose. Roadway needs repairing, / access for wagons
- If this proposal brings in new business very good.
- Very good proposal.
- Yes.
- Bring in new businesses
- Good- bring in industry.
- No need for new units just develop the empty units that are there.

ON 44

- Do not recommend- would change the whole village of Flookburgh
- Greenfield
- Good idea.
- Positive for village.
- Great site –best of choices.
- Good
- OK.
- Far to big a development. Will turn village into town. Who will pay to extend school with all extra families.
- Good. Best for village.
- YES YES. Good idea benefit village

RN 229

- Would completely alter the character of Flookburgh.
- A definite good idea.
- In favour of development.
- Good Site.
- Best.
- Excellent proposal, foresight for the village for generations to come. Take opportunity to comment to what we want rather than someone else make the decisions for the village.
- Excellent Windy road, poor visibility, very little pavement, bad connections to Cark centre at present, invaluable green approach to Holker
- Excellent t proposal for the village, new roads better access for Ravenstown
- Positive for village.
- Good location- best choice.
- This development must include a green buffer zone between the villages of Flookburgh and Cark.
- Unacceptable enlargement of village footprint. Would merge Cark and Flookburgh. Road safety at Cark (convenience store). New road would be a serious ‘Rat Run’ for traffic from Ravenstown. Insufficient sewerage infrastructure. This hill is prominent, spoil view of village.

- Totally unsuitable for the amount of houses and cars and road. Road Safety and sewerage are major issues as are destruction of green space. Alters the whole view of Flookburgh from all viewpoints. Will encourage further development of touring caravan sites.
- Unacceptable enlargement of village footprint. Would merge Flookburgh with Cark. Road safety issues at Cark.
- Access from Station Rd impracticable.
- Far too big a development. Will turn village into town. Who will pay to extend school with all extra families.
- Good. Best for village
- YES YES. Good ideas benefit village.
- Like the idea of a play area. Not sure whether combining Flookburgh and Cark is what the locally people really want. I;M very worried that the access road to Ravenstoun would be dangerous because of its straightness and especially because it passing the school and the proposed play area..
- RN 229 is my favourite housing proposal, however it should be linked with the station yard proposal (EN 49) to provide employment.
- Excellent proposal, cover all aspects of village life for improvements for generations to come and not just housing make the most of the opportunity available.
- Please address Traffic/Speed “culture”. I am amazed a child hasn’t been killed.
- Best idea. Keep green space.
- What’s against it.
- Well thought out scheme- including funding-which is obviously critical. A good move into the future.
- Best possible solution, New road, playground and parking for church..
- This proposal will ruin the character of the villages of Cark and Flookburgh. Whilst it is proposed to retain a ‘small’ green space between the villages this proposal virtually combines them to form a small township. . The proposed junction of the new road and Station Rd is impractical at the proposed site. The railway bridge and bends in Station Road would mean vehicles approaching the proposed junction from either direction would have limited views of the junction .
If more houses are needed in the villages then small developments only should be allowed the design of which should be in keeping with these two old villages. The proposed road will only add traffic to the already overloaded Flookburgh Square, Market St and Main Street. Before any development is allowed in the Parish serious consideration should be given to the provision of a footbridge over the railway on Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh and a link road to give access from Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh to the caravan site and industrial; units on Moor Lane.

RN 276

- Green Lane too narrow for extra traffic.
- Inadequate access
- Bad access.
- Tick ?.
- Good infill development.
- OK.
- OK

RN 286

- Road system poor would not recommend.
- Inadequate access.

- Windy road, poor visibility, very little pavement, bad connections to Cark centre at present, invaluable green approach to Holker.
- OK – No problem.
- Not suitable for housing due to the bad roads. Also extends Cark.

RN 287

- Road system poor would not recommend
- Windy road, poor visibility, very little pavement, bad connections to Cark centre at present, invaluable green approach to Holker.
- OK- No problem.
- Not suitable for housing due to the bad roads. Also extends Cark

RN 309

- Road system poor would not recommend.
- Windy road, poor visibility, very little pavement, bad connections to Cark centre at present, invaluable green approach to Holker.
- OK- No problem.
- Not suitable for housing due to the bad roads. Also extends cark

RN 263

- Flood Plain.
- Flood Plain.
- No development of airfield-valuable local resource-Moor Lane unsuitable access and Flookburgh junction bad.
- Completely unsuitable on a flood plain-lack of infrastructure- poor road access.
- The Cark Airfield proposal is far too big for the infrastructure available. Totally unsuitable.
- On flood Plain.
- Totally unsuitable for housing and industry

RN 160

- Flood Plain – Bad access

RN41

- Flood Plain – bad access.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- Any development levy must be used in the village.
- ON 44 site good - Rest awful