

LE588

SOUTH LAKE/ DISTRICT COUNCIL RECEIVED

31 MAR 2011

RESOURCES

28th March 2011.

Your Ref: DH/60.12.43.

Dear Mr. Hudson,

SOUTH LAKE/ DISTRICT COUNCIL RECEIVED

31 MAR 2011

RESOURCES

South Lakeland Development Framework
Land Allocations – Consultation on Emerging Options.

Thank you for your letter of the 19th January 2011, when you requested my comments on the above.

Having now considered the proposals put forward by South Lakeland District Council, I wish to make the following observations in respect of the proposed development in Little Urswick, which is in the near vicinity of my home:

1. As many residents of Little Urswick have long been greatly concerned about the grossly untidy state of Midtown Farm, with attendant health hazards – bearing in mind that until recent years it was a very attractive and well-maintained working farm in the centre of the village, and which has deteriorated to its present state, it is accepted that some development of the site would certainly be preferable to this continuing nuisance.
2. However, the amount of development proposed, namely 44 dwellings, is totally unacceptable for this site in the centre of Little Urswick. We already have a large number of new properties in the village – Greenbank Gardens, Beechfield, Low House Gardens, Reed Gardens, and the old School development – and the rural and social nature of this very old village is already changing due to this. This is surely gross overdevelopment in this small area.
3. Bearing in mind that Great Urswick and Little Urswick are already ‘peppered’ with properties for sale or rent which have been on the market for some time, and the fact that the villages have lost their post office, shop, and now are threatened with the complete loss of their bus service, there are few amenities available to sustain an expansion of the village population.
4. Increased traffic and need for extra parking on these already congested and narrow roads would be to the general detriment of residents, and lead to serious questions of safety to children going to and from the local School.
5. Any considered development of the site would need to be appropriate for a site of this nature, which, having been a working farm for some centuries has a number of very old buildings which should if possible be preserved,

especially as the site hosts a bat colony and many breeding birds, butterflies and moths.

6. Drainage is a problem in the village at the best of times, with flooding a common problem after spells of rain.
7. Little Urswick Village Green is a prominent focus of the village and needs to be protected and preserved for future generations.
8. Finally, local opinion is strongly against the building of this number of houses in this area of the village, and particularly on the green field site to the rear of Midtown Farm. It is felt that there is no great demand for these homes, bearing in mind the lack of local employment opportunities and the possible rise in transport costs. It is considered that the detrimental effect of such a development would jeopardise the present quality of the lives of the existing residents, which has already been compromised by the loss of amenities already listed.
9. I would be grateful if you would take note of these comments when the proposals are further considered.

Yours faithfully,

Dan Hudson,
Development Strategy Manager,
South Lakeland District Council,
South Lakeland House,
Lowther Street,
KENDAL.
Cumbria LA9 4DL.

