

Response to Planning Branch Ltd. Representation Dated March 2012

SHLAA Site RN35

Land Adjacent to Cartmel Old Grammar, Cartmel, Grange over Sands

Introduction

Having carefully reviewed the above document I wish to make the following response to the document commenting on both the principles involved together with a number of significant inaccuracies in the representation.

1. Principles

- 1.1. Planning Branch assert that the Cartmel Village “has no rigid form and development pattern” and therefore as site RN35 is close to a very small number of properties, North of the village, they should be entitled to build on the site.
- 1.2. The logic of this is clearly nonsensical, as if taken to its ultimate; it would mean that any road/lane which had houses a few hundred metres+ apart could have infill development of the type they propose and irrespective of other factors.
- 1.3. If Planning Branch figure 3.2, was expanded to cover a larger area, it would show many other small settlements of houses, a similar distance as RN35 is from the village and hence by similar logic development could take place over a much wider area of open countryside and certainly link together all the many small villages and towns within a several miles radius.
- 1.4. The North Side of the village has always been considered as the more attractive “open countryside” side of the village. In particular its position adjacent to the Racecourse is particularly attractive and should not be destroyed.

2. Factual Inaccuracies

- 2.1. Planning Branch states that the site is on a bus route – ***this is inaccurate and the site is not on a bus route***
- 2.2. Planning Branch make much of the nearest distances to the village and the walking time for a normal person - ***this is inaccurate as it ignores the fact that the nearest general shop is approximately 1,000m and as the proposal is for older persons any times should be based on their speed of walking. In other words, a return journey of almost an hour to purchase basic food requirements. Obviously other facilities, such as the Doctors Surgery are even further away.***
- 2.3. Planning Branch state “existing highway and pedestrian infrastructure” will be used – ***they make no mention of the fact that these are narrow lanes, without pavement, without lighting and with a 60mph speed limit. This is completely different to the proposed sites R112 and ON17 that Planning Branch compare to which are closer to the key village facilities, on 30mph roads with pavement and lighting.***
- 2.4. Planning Branch make reference to the site being adjacent to “the existing care facilities” i.e. The Old Grammar Nursing Home as a benefit – ***This home was taken into the hands of***

the receivers last July as it was only able to fill approximately 50% of its beds and was loss making. Although recently sold, its future is far from certain.

- 2.5. Mention is made of adjacent flood risks – ***development of RN35 can only make the flooding worse on the adjacent land, Racecourse and potentially adjoining houses which are at a lower level to the proposed development.***
 - 2.6. Figure 3.4 in the Planning Branch report shows an area as “Public Open Space”. Without being picky, I would not describe the village cemetery in such a fashion.
3. **Other factors**
- 3.1. The Inspector should also be made aware that site RN35 does not have access to mains sewage or gas, essential for “older persons”. Both these facilities are available at the other proposed sites mentioned by Planning Branch. The other proposed sites are also much closer to the bus routes.
 - 3.2. The Inspector should be aware that Planning Branch proposes two entries onto the highway for RN35 usage. Both are onto derestricted roads. One of the lanes is a single lane with passing places and while the other is wider it frequently floods. Both these lanes then lead into what is known as “Sticky Toffee Pudding Corner”, a very narrow, congested and dangerous bend.
 - 3.3. Planning Branch mention the need for housing for “Older People”. Indeed there is a glut of similar housing less than 3 miles away at Grange over Sands. The situation is so bad, it is almost impossible to sell the properties at a reasonable price with a significant number always for sale (at least 8 at present). An “older person” bungalow in Cartmel itself remained unsold for almost two years and was finally sold at a knock down price for general use.
4. **Conclusion**
- 4.1. If the Planning Branch approach to RN35 is agreed, then not only will an important open space be destroyed, it will leave the way open for other random developments in a particularly attractive and important area of open countryside.
 - 4.2. There are a considerable number of inaccuracies and misleading statements in the Planning Branch document and the Inspector should be aware of these in the decision making process.
 - 4.3. Even if all other objections fail, there are a significant number of other factors that make sight RN35 suitable for development.

D J White

June 2012