

## Lake District Local Plan Review

Submission by the **Crosthwaite and Lyth Parish Council** relating to the Local Plan Review section 3

### **Allocations of land, Crosthwaite, site references 228 and 229**

The Council feels aggrieved that allocations of land sufficient for around 51 houses should have been inserted in the Local Plan Review with assessments by planning officers, but with no reference to the Parish Council or the people of Crosthwaite who will be affected by them.

The proposed sites are close to – one adjoins – the development of 13 houses by Castles and Coasts Housing Association. With that and other developments in the village we will have accrued close to 20 houses to add to an existing stock of around 85. That is substantial. It has been greeted (so far as we are aware) without objection. The scheme includes affordable housing: we welcome it. This is a vibrant, generous and welcoming community. We feel strongly, however, that now is not the time for further development. We need to absorb and integrate the new villagers coming to join us.

It may be that these sites will be developed in the future on a much smaller scale than you envisage, and that might be acceptable, but not now. We feel threatened by the provision in your document *Allocations of land – the story so far* that, 'We will also have to be mindful of how we can maximise the potential from these development opportunities...' Crosthwaite is a small village: it is quite wrong to concentrate into it the housing requirement of a large area.

Our objection goes deeper than that. The infrastructure is inadequate for further development:

- The road through the village is narrow and winding. Access to it from 228 would presumably be through the recent development, which is not designed for that volume and would be inadequate. Access from 229 to the highway would so far as we can see offer no visibility splay at all on a curving road, where cars park to pick up children – totally unsatisfactory.
- There is no mains gas.

- There is no shop.
- Employment opportunities are limited.
- There is no public transport – making it particularly unsuitable for affordable housing.
- There have been frequent and recent total outages and low pressure on the water. The reason given by United Utilities is not that there has been a burst, but that there is high demand – meaning that the system is already inadequate for existing users. We know of no proposal to upgrade it.
- There is no mains drainage. We rather doubt if the land could take sewage plants of the size required within the space available.
- Hollow Clough beck has risen to flood a dwelling already – it cannot take any more run-off. Top water drainage of these sites is a serious concern.
- The Coast and Castles Housing Association have had problems we understand in obtaining an adequate electricity supply. We know of no proposal to upgrade it.
- There is poor Broadband speed.
- The school is full. Presumably some of the people in these houses will have children, with a difficult prospect for their education. The only land available for any expansion by the school is 229, which comes right up to the school boundary.

The proposals appears to us to go against your own draft policies. Looking at the Village section of Spatial Strategy, the proposals would not

- 'Strengthen community viability and resilience' - no - they would threaten them.
- 'Maintain and enhance existing local service provision' – as shown above the proposals would threaten the local service provision, such as it is, not enhance it.

- 'Be within or relate well to the form of the settlement...' - no - you are proposing a most inappropriate density.

They certainly go against your existing policy. Consider Paragraph 3.4.10 of your Local Development Framework Core Strategy: 'We are providing a policy framework which ensures the longevity of our vibrant communities and meets our duty to 'seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities' ''.

We do not think that in this instance you are meeting that duty.

Or 3.5.2:

“Development must be of a scale that is sympathetic to the role of the settlement and respects its appearance and physical capacity. When assessing a development proposal, we will take into account spatial variations, such as location, size and level of service provision. These affect both the settlement’s current role and community aspirations for its future role. We recognise the needs of our local communities and want to enable settlements to evolve in order to adapt to rural challenges. However, we will not permit development, or inappropriate settlement expansion, that compromises the area’s special qualities or its distinctiveness.”

'Sympathetic to the role of the settlement?' 'Evolve?' Proposals that with existing developments and consents bid fair to double the dwellings in the village in the space of a few years! More a population explosion. We find it hard to imagine a more 'inappropriate settlement expansion'. 'Community aspirations'? You have no idea what our aspirations are – you did not trouble to ask.

These are major proposals, of which we have had little notice. We have however given them some thought and a public meeting has been held. Some 150 residents attended at short notice. None spoke in favour of the proposals. Many signed a petition opposing your proposals, which is being submitted to you.

The Parish Council of Crosthwaite and Lyth feels strongly that **the allocations with site references 228 and 229 should be deleted from the Local Plan Review.**

Robert Sykes

Chairman on behalf of the Crosthwaite and Lyth Parish Council