

Lower Holker Parish Council

10th March 2011

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

Dear Sir/Madam

Local Development Framework – Emerging Options Consultation

I refer to the recently published Maps of Emerging Option sites and Settlement Fact Files in respect of Cark, Flookburgh and Ravenstown in the Parish of Lower Holker. The emerging option sites were listed as follows: -

- R687 – land off Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh adjacent to the railway line
- R685 – land off Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh behind Bridge House.
- RN20M – land off Moor Lane, Flookburgh
- R321 M – land to the rear of both Main St and Winder Lane, Flookburgh
- R670aM – land in Ravenstown
- EN42 – industrial site off Station Rd, Cark in Cartmel behind the railway station
- Site temporarily identified by Site No E47. This is a plan submitted privately which includes a new road from Main St, Flookburgh to Station Rd, Cark in Cartmel. This plan includes new housing, parking, play areas and village green. The plan is not an emerging option but has been submitted to SLDC for planning approval and consideration as an emerging option. (See attached plan)

After consultation with the residents of the Parish at two public meetings/ drop in evenings the Parish Council has resolved to put forward the following for consideration during the consultation period.

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

This is the major concern of the residents and all are opposed to any further housing development at Sites R321M, R670aM, and RN20M.

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 R321M, R670aM, and RN20M.

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 especially on sites R685 and R687.

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 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.

Recommendations of Parish Council as regards emerging options:

- **SITE R670AM -Ravenstown**

The Parish Council does not support this site for housing development. This development would result in further traffic having to use Main St, Market St and Winder Lane, which are already at saturation point as regards traffic flow and parking facilities. In addition the hamlet of Ravenstown does not have the capacity for any more on road parking. The drainage and sewerage system are considered inadequate to accommodate further development.

- **SITE R321M - land rear of Main St and Winder Lane, Flookburgh**

The Parish Council does not support this site for housing development. This development would result in further traffic having to use Main St, Market St and Winder Lane, which are already at saturation point as regards traffic flow and parking facilities. Access to the site would present traffic problems

- **SITE RN20N- land off Moor Lane, Flookburgh.**

The Parish Council does not support this site for housing development. This development would result in further traffic having to use Main St, Market St, Moor Lane and Flookburgh Square, which are already at saturation point as regards traffic flow and parking facilities. In addition this land has been earmarked by the Parish Council as historical washing and livestock drinking slabs and they have made plans for its development for community use.

- **SITE R687 –land off Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh**

Before considering this site for housing development the Parish Council would insist on a condition that a new footbridge be built over the railway line at this point. The present bridge is narrow and provides no safe refuge for pedestrians.

- **SITE R685 –Land off Allithwaite Rd, Flookburgh**

Before considering this site for housing development the Parish Council would insist on a condition that a new footbridge be built over the railway line at this point. The present bridge is narrow and provides no safe refuge for pedestrians. Before this site emerges as an option consideration would have to be given to access via Manorside. This road is often double parked with visitors to Bridge House residential home. The road is also too narrow to accommodate previous development there.

- **SITE TEMPORARILY IDENTIFIED AS E47 – land to the north off Main St, Flookburgh up towards Station Rd, Cark with provision for a new road linking the two. This plan submitted privately for consideration at public meeting and yet to be subject to consideration by SLDC as option of any description.**

The Parish Council conditionally supports this plan. It provides a new road, which might alleviate the flow of traffic on Main St and Market Street as it provides direct access to and from the school from Cark. The Parish Council notes the provision of a play area and village green, parking for the church and new graveyard. In addition the green space between Cark and Flookburgh is retained near Station Rd. The Parish Council would support traffic calming/managing measures on Main Street if this plan emerges as an option.

NOTE.

The Parish Council requests a meeting with an Officer from the Local Development Programme to discuss the emerging options in more detail. The next meeting of Lower Holker Parish Council takes place on Friday 1st April 2011. If this is inconvenient a meeting with a sub committee can be arranged at a date convenient to all concerned.

Yours Sincerely

G.T Critchley (Mr)
Parish Clerk
015395 58883
geoffreycritchley@gmail.com

Documents enclosed:-

- *Minutes of Public meeting held 8th January 2010 (previously sent)*
- *Minutes of Public meeting held 8th February 2011*
- *Copy of comments extracted from completed sheets at meeting on 8th February 2011*
- *Copy of comments re emerging site from completed sheets at meeting of 22nd February 2011.*

LOWER HOLKER PARISH COUNCIL

South Lakeland District Council Allocations of Land Development Plan Document

Public Meeting held at 6.30pm on Friday 8th February 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 Plan Document Map.

Present: -

Parish Councillors: - R Airey. (Chair) T Wilson, C Silverlock, J Ryland, M Keith, County Councillor Road Wilson

97 members of the public (see attached list).

Apologies: - Cllr C Silverlock, Cllr S Rawsthorn, District Councillor M Nicholson, Mr & Mrs T Owen

Councillor R Airey welcomed all members of the public to the meeting and thanked them attending. She then explained the purpose of the meeting pointing out that maps of the emerging options 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 threw the meeting open to those present to make any 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 and the
4. The fact that there were already three sites in the parish with planning permission building houses, why the need for more.
5. The present traffic problems and the consequences if further housing allowed.
6. The number of empty houses already in the parish.
7. The number of second homes in the parish
8. The meaning of local occupancy
9. The meaning of affordable homes
10. Can the present infrastructure of the villages stand further development
11. The lack of facilities for children and teenagers in the parish.
12. The lack of car parking and the need for more in the villages
13. The possible advantages to be gained when conditions imposed on planning applications.

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. It was pointed out that the Parish Council had bought a field and hoped in conjunction with the local charity to develop it into a multi sports area and play area. The opportunity was taken to ask for help with this project

Questions from the floor asked how many houses was it proposed to build. Reference to the LDF document suggested that a further 125 more houses needed to be built between now and 2025. This figure was compared to the number of houses built in the parish over the last 20 years. It was very similar figure. In response to this figure it was pointed out that there were three sites in the villages already with planning permission for housing development and the question was asked had these been taking into account when the new emerging options were put forward. Many also pointed out the number of empty houses there were in the parish and asked what was being done to make use of them.

It was pointed out to the meeting that emerging option site numbered R670aM in Ravenstow was not referred in the Flookburgh /Cark Fact File. No explanation could be given for this. (Subsequent enquiries reveal that the Flookburgh/Cark Fact File did not include Ravenstow. This was classed as a small hamlet separate from Ravenstow and referred in a separate Land Allocations Development document.)

During the discussion the subject of second homes and holiday homes was raised. Many saw this to the detriment of the villages. Councillor Wilson told the meeting that the question of holiday homes and second homes had troubled him for some time and he suggested a campaign to have a condition placed on new developments, which prevented their use as second homes or holiday homes.

The meaning of local occupancy and affordable homes was also raised. In response to a question as to what was classed as affordable it was said that this meant the homes had to be sold at 80% of market price. Many present were of the opinion that even with such a discount local people could not afford to buy especially in the present economic climate when deposits of 10 % were required. Questions were asked as to the meaning of local occupancy. It was pointed out that this covered a wide area. As far north as Shap and as far south as Morecambe was included. The consensus of the meeting that this was too wide an area and not to the benefit of local people.

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 developments 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 to their emerging options. 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 every 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, where 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 more street parking. The imposition of planning conditions should be exploited to the full. An example being that before an development takes place in the vicinity of Allithwaite Road a condition should be imposed to ensure a footbridge was built over the railway.

The Chair then invited all those present to inspect the maps of the emerging options and write on their comments on the paper provided these would be studied later and a further meeting would be called in two weeks time to analyse the comments and then prepare a response to SLDC.

It was pointed out that SLDC were holding a Road show at Lower Holker Village Hall on Thursday 3rd March 2011 between 1.30pm and 7.30pm to explain the Land Development Framework in respect of Lower Holker Parish

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - EMERGING OPTIONS

1st OPEN MEETING TUESDAY 8TH FEBRUARY 2011.

COMMENTS EXTRACED FROM COMPLETED SHEETS

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – EMERGING OPTIONS

2ND OPEN MEETING TUESDAY 22ND FEBRUARY 2011

COMMENTS EXTRACTED FROM COMPLETED SHEETS.

SITE 321

1. No.
2. No.
3. No Comment
4. Bad idea pure infill.
5. Eccleston Meadow entrance is too narrow to serve any extra houses onto an already too busy Main St.
6. No to this site
7. No.
8. Encroaches on school playing field and restricts future potential to expand school.
9. OK.
10. Main problem here is access and traffic congestion already a problem near school.
11. Should be kept for school expansion. Not for housing.
12. Yes – highly suitable if R670 (New access road is need to caravan park avoiding Flookburgh) road is approved.
13. Would swamp traffic/housing that already exists.
14. Traffic calming throughout village i.e. like Dalton.
15. No to this site too much traffic already.
16. Any developments that are taken forward must supply parking for every property and **must** be made to use it. Also no property in its lifetime should be sold as a 2nd home.
17. Too congested as it is will mean more traffic on Main St (J.Keith)
18. Road access is diabolical
19. I am opposed to the road access in Eccleston Meadow. It is unacceptable.
20. No – congestion, lack of infrastructure too much traffic on Main St.
21. No Way – Access very bad.
22. See Ravenstown E 47 (No.32). All need new stronger electric cables and drainage.
23. NO.
24. Good site within development boundary. Development will hardly change *character* of village. Site can be delivered good access.
25.
Access. According to the reproduced sheets exhibited at the meeting on Tuesday 22nd February this is described “good” coming in from Eccleston Meadow. Access here would in fact be dangerous and unacceptable – ask any local inhabitant! The junction of Eccleston Meadow and Main St is already a danger zone, particularly so for children coming and going from school, elderly people using the Post Office and hairdressers, car drivers and pedestrians alike. Main St is a much-used thoroughfare, is narrow and congested. The junction, with parked cars, is blind. Twenty more houses = many more cars using Eccleston Meadow and Main Street. On a more personal note the entry into the new development would be just where we have to back out our vehicles, including a motor home right by our gate and drive. Vehicular access to R321M on Eccleston Meadow would also be extremely dangerous for vehicles leaving Eccleston Meadow heading for Main St. The access would have to be situated on a right angle bend. Access was the reason given for the refusal of planning permission last time it was requested. The only thing that has changed is that now there is more vehicular traffic than then.

SITE 321 (continued)

Impact on Environment

- i. The recent development on Winder Lane has already changed the environment with trees and other vegetation being destroyed. The area of R321 holds significant number of wildlife – a count of birds recently revealed at least 25 species, including sparrows, once common and numerous, now under threat, and unusual winter visitors. The area is also home to bats and small mammals. There are not many areas of trees as in R321 left within the village.
- ii. Tree clearance not only impacts on wildlife and visual attractiveness but the removal of all vegetation and its replacement by the built environment causes significantly more surface drainage, leading to the risks of flooding. It would appear from Council documents that United Utilities have concern over water issues regarding this site.
- iii. Extra Air Pollution. It is interesting to note that the Council itself assesses air quality as a negative factor for this site. Studies of the effects of lead and other pollution on school pupils show a direct positive correlation impacting on existing residents and also the primary school.
- iv. Extra Light Pollution

The Historical Landscape of R321 even noted and used as a negative assessment by the Council.

Privacy a factor the Council states that it assesses on site visits, not being synonymous with “view” and not being considered by us as such. We would lose much privacy.

26. Within development boundary, does not affect character of village, very small increase in traffic on Main St. Can be delivered as owner all agree.

.

SITE RM20

1. No
2. No comment.
3. Again problem of access and *traffic*? Problem parking in Main St
4. Yes if a link road is built from Moor Lane to Winder Lane.
5. Agreeable.
6. Would only add extra congestion to village.
7. tick (preferred housing options).
8. Traffic calming throughout village i.e. like Dalton.
9. tick (preferred housing options).
- 10.** Any developments that are taken forward must supply parking for every property and **must** be made to use it. Also no property in its lifetime should be sold as a 2nd home.
11. Poor access and in way of 'Fish Slabs' project (J. Keith).
12. Overcrowding . Too close to listed buildings. Flood Zone.
13. Infilling No problem.
- 14.** See Ravenstown E47 (No 32). All need new stronger electric cables and drainage.
- 15.** Good site on edge of development boundary reasonable access. Will hardly impact on village *character* ? No 35).
- 16.** Access problems worsened onto Mile Road already congested with holiday traffic in summer-doesn't affect character of village but bad busy junction.

SITE R685

1. The access to the site either creates a problem for residents of old peoples house or a difficult dangerous access from near the railway bridge.
2. Preferred options because of high levels of traffic and parking in village itself. These developments would need a footbridge over the railway and parking provision & use should be enforced.
3. No comment.
4. Good with bridge added access from site direct to Moor Lane keeps Market St clear.
5. Preferred option
6. To close to blind summit of railway bridge for safe access.
7. OK need for footbridge over railway.
8. Could be suitable but road access past Bridge House would need widening.
9. Least disturbance to village.
10. Build here and make a link road through to Moor Lane and reduce traffic in the Square.
11. Sensible idea.
12. Best site for village
13. tick(preferred housing options)
14. Traffic calming throughout village i.e. like Dalton.
15. tick (preferred housing options).
16. Preferred option.
17. Preferred option.
18. Any developments that are taken forward must supply parking for every property and **must** be made to use it. Also no property in its lifetime should be sold as a 2nd home.
19. Possible good site if new footpath made to Moor Lane. (J .Keith).
20. New footbridge needed but concern re dangerous access/exit so near to blind corner.
21. Infilling access good.
22. Only if new footbridge and Bridge House car park problems addressed.
23. All need new stronger electric cables and drainage.
24. YES.
25. Extends footprint of village outside development boundary. Possible flooding problems. Access OK.
26. Letter received - We were not able to attend the meeting in the village hall at Flookburgh but were at the previous m meeting where R685 was put forward as the preferred option for development. We wish the Parish Council to be made aware of the following situation here at Manorside/Marsh Gardens.
 - We have been having sewerage problems recently and also over the last few years (More information from Rod Wilson) The reason is that water levels are high all our manholes have sewerage in them and are backed up right through the system. At the moment the pumping station somewhere on the mile road is inadequate to take the sewerage and surface water from the twelve houses already here. There is also a hole in the main trap and sewerage is entering the back directly. After many problems with United Utilities we have been told that nothing can be done till the water level drops. Imagine this in a hot and wet summer. We have also been told that should the proposed development of 39/40 new homes in field R685, United Utilities cannot refuse connection to the main sewers. They say they can make recommendations only and that these are sometimes ignored they cannot enforce them. On the fact file for

R685, sewerage/drainage is only the last bullet point, around No.11 and well behind screening and other considerations. We can only hope that should this go ahead some pressure can be brought to bear on sewerage/drainage as this ought to be a basic health right for not only the new homes but for us already suffering now.

(Nick and Eileen Eccleston 6, Manorside, Flookburgh)

27. Extending footprint of village outside present boundary. Low lying land, flood risks.

SITE R687

1. Preferred options because of high levels of traffic and parking in village itself. These developments would need a footbridge over the railway and parking provision & use should be enforced
2. No comment.
3. Good with bridge added access from site direct to Moor Lane keeps Market St clear.
4. Too close to blind summit of railway bridge for safe access.
5. OK.
6. Housing here would be good but problem of footpath over bridge must be dealt with.
7. On the edge of the village – good does not include a playground.
8. Yes if bridge widening implemented and footpath.
9. Agree with previous comments.
10. Dangerous.
11. This is the best one if we want a footbridge over railway and to keep traffic out of Main St.
12. tick (preferred housing options).
13. tick (preferred housing options).
14. No .
15. Any developments that are taken forward must supply parking for every property and **must** be made to use it. Also no property in its lifetime should be sold as a 2nd home.
16. Footbridge over railway required (J. Keith).
17. This seems the best option.
18. New footbridge needed but concern re dangerous access/exit so near to blind corner.
19. Access very bad.
20. Only if new footbridge built'
21. All need new stronger electric cables and drainage.
22. Best one by far.
23. Major safety issues re access and foot traffic over bridge. Major impact on village character outside development boundary.
24. Dangerous access too close to the railway bridge no good footpath link to village.

SITE R670

1. No
2. No comment.
3. Build round ring but keep centre as play area.
4. No due to traffic congestion & already overdeveloped area.
5. OK
6. Quite suitable for further houses here (again ensure parking space)
7. On the edge of the village – good does not include a playground.
8. Sensible. Infrastructure already there.
9. Apart from extra traffic into the village OK.
10. Not this one unless a second road can be put in for traffic which would keep it away from Winder Lane.
11. Not suitable due to traffic congestion/parking down Main St and parking outside school.(22)
12. Not suitable due to traffic congestion/parking down Main St and parking outside school (23)
13. Yes .
- 14.** Any developments that are taken forward must supply parking for every property and **must** be made to use it. Also no property in its lifetime should be sold as a 2nd home.
15. Land not suitable due to flood risk and Ravenstown sewerage and drainage is over capacity now (J.Keith).
16. OK - provided sufficient infrastructure not enough at present.
17. Good. Ideal infilling.
18. Ravenstown – infrastructure traffic and flood plain. Cannot support.
- 19.** All need new stronger electric cables and drainage.
- 20.** Will complete outer circle, would look OK. Generate more traffic past school and down Main St.
- 21.** If this site was developed it would mean heavier traffic through village and past primary school.

SITE E47 (Not SLDC emerging option but submitted privately. Will need planning approval from SLDC)

1. Yes.
2. An excellent idea, which will both, provide housing and benefit the village.
3. Late application previously not considered. This application would reduce the gap between Cark and Flookburgh villages. Once an access road is built the 'green gap' will be under increasing pressure from further developments. The proposed junction by the railway bridge near a limited footpath and is on the brow of a rise with poor sight lines. The sloping site would intrude on the SW aspect. The proposed housing is not the appropriate match to local need in respect of elderly use and affordable housing. There would be a loss of productive farming land.
4. The only viable 20 yr approach ensures infrastructure in place. Sorts traffic problems (largely) Possible One –Way with Station Rd for other way.
5. Yes
6. Yes.
7. Concern over roundabout on corner by Cark railway bridge.
8. Certainly has great merit. Would be interested to here what SLDC would recommend.
9. *No to Roundabout.* Ideal/Can we handle extra traffic. Sewerage problem. Electric needs improving.
10. This ticks all the boxes
11. Best plan Main St could then be one way.
12. Looks OK on this plan but my concerns would be who the developers will be and would they remain in keeping with original plans. Restrictions would need to be placed to prevent developers from expanding or not completing all work for the community areas.
13. *Dreamers ?*
14. Yes (J. Keith)
15. Any developments that are taken forward must supply parking for every property and **must** be made to use it. Also no property in its lifetime should be sold as a 2nd home.
16. Best plan overall although reservations about road width where proposed crossing of main road and exit at Cark. Roundabouts and speed restrictions needed. Would provide much need play area and take traffic/parking off Station Rd.
17. Very good. Ideal on all aspects.
18. One of the best plans, for houses, roads, safety.
19. We think this is the best solution to our problems of those proposed. It is well thought out and has thought of minimising future problems too. All need new stronger electric cables and drainage.
20. Yes

GENERAL COMMENTS.

1. Can I say I thought the proposed letter well thought out and explain majority view very well.
2. Council document states “Cark/Flookburgh scores best in terms of access to jobs...education and training... Access to what jobs? Access to what training? By their own admission, only ”mediocre scores were given against impact on the built environment, water supply and sewerage, potential for the use recycled materials, biodiversity, potential for energy efficiency and the use of renewables”. How many houses to be built in spite of these reservations? And who for? People of working age will mostly have to travel some distance to work using car travel. The council also states that privacy/outlook factor have been addressed in site visits, as have transport, congestion and safety. Really??. In their assessment of sites there is no mention of privacy, outlook, congestion or safety yet they come up with the conclusion that Sites R321/EN42/R671a/R672a/R314/R322/R311 score the highest in Flookburgh and Cark. In Ravenstown/Moor Lane they say that RN8/R670a/ MN4 are best. How about a better method of assessment, involving all relevant factors ? The one used is simplistic and flawed. The traffic problems in Flookburgh are well know – Main St with residential, commercial, tourist, agricultural vehicles using it, buses including school buses, residential parking, traffic and parking generated by the Post Office and Hairdressers, the school etc. The Square is equally congested and dangerous not to the mention the bridge.

MAP OF NEW SITE SUBMITTED BY MR WILSON

