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Introduction

Barrow Borough Council is preparing a new Local Plan that will influence the amount and location of new development across the Borough in the period up to 2031. The Local Plan will cover local planning issues, such as deciding which sites should be developed and what policies are needed to ensure that new development is well designed. Once adopted, the Local Plan will be the development plan by which all future planning applications will be determined.

As well as identifying how much development the Borough needs over the Local Plan Period (2012 – 2031), the Local Plan will also need to allocate sufficient land to meet the development requirements. These sites will need to be sustainable and justified through extensive evidence to be allocated in the Final Local Plan.

All sites have undergone two stages of assessment, as follows:

- Site Appraisal – appraising site suitability, availability and deliverability, and other issues, such as biodiversity, landscape impact, access, scale etc.
- Sustainability Appraisal – appraising potential sites against a range of economic, environmental and social objectives.

At any stage the Council may require additional information to be submitted about a potential site to support the site appraisal.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and identifies sites which may have potential for housing. The SHLAA does not make judgements about which sites should be developed for housing to meet the housing requirement. The document is not planning policy, but will be used as an evidence base document to inform the production of the Local Plan. It also helps determine how much weight should be given to planning policies which relate to the supply of housing.

The initial SHLAA was produced in 2012, with a first update published in December 2013, which looked at the housing land supply position at the end of the 2012/13 period. A second review was published in March 2014 and discussed the housing land position at the end of the 2013/14 monitoring period.

The current SHLAA contains new sites put forward for consideration as housing sites under the Local Plan consultation process which ran September/October 2014. The Council has encouraged the continued submission of sites for appraisal throughout the Local Plan and SHLAA process. The aim of the SHLAA is to identify sufficient deliverable sites to meet the District’s five year housing supply and to identify further developable sites to meet the 10 and 15 year housing targets, considering other sources of provision, including broad locations for growth.
The SHLAA is an evidence based study which:

- Identifies sites and broad locations with potential for development;
- Assesses their development potential; and
- Assesses their suitability for development and the likelihood of development coming forward (the availability and achievability).

As a result, the SHLAA: -

- Informs the formal allocation of sites and the approach to housing site selection in the forthcoming Local Plan.
- Demonstrates whether there is sufficient ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable’ land in the Borough to meet the housing requirement.
- Identifies whether action would need to be taken to ensure sites will become deliverable or whether plan policies need to be reviewed to enable identified sites to be developed for housing.
- It also highlights whether there are any ‘gaps’ in current policy.

The Council considers that it has a robust 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. This is supported by the fact that the majority of sites included in the supply are already under construction, are subject to current planning applications or are within the ownership of the Council. A cautious approach has also been taken when determining which sites are deliverable and when estimating when they are likely to be developed.

More information on this can be found in the Housing Land Statement 2016.

**Strategic Housing Market Assessment**

The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) provides an assessment of the housing market that operates across the Borough of Barrow-in-Furness, the type of housing sought and required and an estimate of possible future requirements. The overall aim of the SHMA is to provide an evidence base from which future housing and planning policies can be developed.

A SHMA was undertaken in 2012 and 2014, however a review has been undertaken in 2016. This assessment is a refresh of the 2014 SHMA and provides critical evidence to support the preparation of the Borough’s Local Plan preparation.

The 2016 SHMA builds upon the evidence base already established through a major household survey and stakeholder consultation carried out in 2014.

Specifically, the 2016 SHMA will:
• Refresh the evidence base relating to the Housing Market Area for Barrow in Furness Borough and consider interactions with other areas, notably South Lakeland and Copeland;
• Update all secondary data where possible to bring the evidence base as up to date as possible;
• Reanalyse 2014 household survey evidence by sub-area;
• Update housing need and market demand analysis by sub-area;
• Prepare further analysis of the housing requirements of older people;
• Review the need for starter homes;
• Establish an appropriate Objectively Assessed Need for housing based upon the available household projections and take account of migration trends and economic growth scenarios;
• Consider Duty to Co-operate issues;
• Take account of the findings of stakeholder consultation carried out for the 2014 SHMA.

The study is based on evidence obtained from a range of sources, including the 2011 census, the 2014 Valuation Office Agency and household survey data, which can provide evidence on the range of dwellings across the county by tenure, type and size. The 2011 census/household survey can provide data on the characteristics of households (singles, couples and families) living in them. This can help establish a basic profile of dwellings and how this may change in the light of alternative scenarios.

The 2016 SHMA will consider the housing required for the plan period, provide shortfall analysis and housing requirements to inform the Council’s housing target for the proposed plan period.

**Stages of Local Plan Preparation**

**Stage 1 – Call for Sites**

The initial stage of the Local Plan was to identify potential sites for development. A ‘Call for Sites’ exercise was undertaken, closing on 1st April 2016, after a period of 4 years. Landowners, developers and the general public were asked to suggest sites for possible development or change and also sites that should be protected from development. This stage was publicised through press releases, posters in local council offices and libraries and also at events, such as Housing Strategy Consultation Group.

The sites put forward, together with any sites identified by the Council through background studies, such as Local Brownfield Study and Urban Capacity Study, were all included in the initial list of sites published for public consultation. These sites were proposed for a variety of uses, including housing, employment and mixed uses. It will be the role of the Local Plan to identify how much development land is needed to meet the growth and regeneration needs of the Borough, and then identify the most sustainable sites to accommodate this.

A total of 165 sites were put forward for consideration for housing during the ‘Call for Sites’ stage. The Council can only allocate sites for development, which have a realistic chance of
coming forward for development within the plan period. Sites put to the Council for considerations through the ‘Call for Sites’ stage will not necessarily be supported for development (unless planning permission is already approved on the site). It will be the role of the Local Plan to identify how much development land is needed to meet the growth and regeneration needs of the Borough and then identify the most sustainable sites to accommodate this.

**Consultation**

**Regulation 18 – Pre-Production Consultation – Have Your Say – 2012**

Consultation on the Regulation 18 Stage of the Local Plan ran from 10th September 2012 to 2nd November 2012 and included the following:

- The Council sent 175 consultation emails and 33 letters to interested parties including Councillors, specific consultees, consultants, architects, agents and housing developers.
- The Council publicised the consultations on the Council website.
- The Council issued a press release to the local newspaper.
- The Council displayed posters and leaflets at the Town Hall and local libraries.

During the consultation period, the Council received representations from 50 different individuals, organisations and bodies. A total of 275 representations were received with 239 relating to the content of the Plan and its potential policies and 36 relating to site submissions.

**Issues and Options Stage - 2014**

Consultation on the Issues and Options Stage of the Local Plan ran from 19th September 2014 to 31st October 2014 and included the following:

- The Council sent 247 consultation emails and 58 letters to interested parties including Councillors, specific consultees, consultants, architects, agents and housing developers.
- The Council publicised the consultations on the Council website.
- The Council made consultation documents available in Council offices and local libraries.
- The Council issued a press release to the local newspaper.
- The Council displayed posters and leaflets at the Town Hall and local libraries.
- The Council held public drop in events throughout the Borough.

**Consultation Responses**

During the consultation period, the Council received representations from 70 different individuals, organisations and bodies. A total of 751 representations were received with 552
relating to the content of the Plan and its potential policies and 199 comments on specific sites. Comments and proposed amendments to wording were taken on board where appropriate and the Council welcomed the continued input and engagement from consultees.

Preferred Options Stage – 2015

- Consultation on the Preferred Options Stage of the Local Plan ran from 8th July 2015 to 4th September 2015 and included the following:
- The Council sent 275 consultation emails and 71 letters to interested parties including Councillors, specific consultees, consultants, architects, agents and housing developers.
- The Council publicised the consultations on the Council website.
- The Council made consultation documents available in Council offices and local libraries.
- The Council issued a press release to the local newspaper.
- The Council displayed posters and leaflets at the Town Hall and local libraries.
- The Council held public drop in events throughout the Borough.

Consultation Responses

During the consultation period, the Council received representations from 104 different individuals, organisations and bodies. A total of 480 representations were received with 330 relating to the content of the Plan and its potential policies and 150 comments on specific sites. Comments and proposed amendments to wording were taken on board where appropriate and the Council welcomed the continued input and engagement from consultees.

The representations and the Council’s response to them are available to view in the document ‘Representations to Preferred Options Draft Local Plan July 2016’. Comments on sites are reproduced in this document.

Site Selection

Sites that have been submitted for consideration for their potential for housing development are immediately discounted in the following circumstances:

- Sites located in the open countryside
- Sites of less than 0.4 ha
- Sites with no obvious means of access and no evidence to suggest that access can be achieved
- Sites where the Highways Authority has raised significant objections
- Sites where there is no realistic prospect of the landowner making it available
- Sites located within areas of high flood risk as shown on Environment Agency Maps.
Once the discounted sites above have been removed the Council carried out assessments of all sites to determine whether they are developable. The assessments are compiled from a desktop study using the Council’s GIS systems, and a site visit carried out on each site.

The assessments, along with other evidence base documents, have enabled the Council to determine the most suitable and sustainable sites for future housing development. Those which are not being taken forward are included in the Non Selected Sites Document July 2016.

It is anticipated that the sites set out in this document (Proposed Housing Site Assessments) will be developed over the Plan period. In the event that any site remains undeveloped towards the end of the Plan period, the Council will contact the landowner with the aim of identifying any barriers to development and facilitating the development of the site. Ultimately, if the sites remain undeveloped, the Council will remove the sites and allocate an alternative suitable site.

**Viability**

Keppie Massie have undertaken a Local Plan Viability Study on behalf of Barrow Borough Council. The study has established the economic viability and deliverability implications of Barrow’s emerging Local Plan and its policies. It also ensures the emerging Local Plan policies are realistic and can deliver sustainable development without putting the delivery of the Plan at risk and considers the prospects for the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy in the Borough. More information can be found in the Barrow Local Plan Viability Assessment 2016.

**Conclusion**

National Planning Policy requires that the Local Plan brings forward sustainable development. A key element of this is making sure people have the best access to facilities and services, such as schools, healthcare and public transport.

The Local Plan needs to include a list of sites in the Borough, where future development should be directed. These will need to be sustainable places, as well as giving consideration as to where development is needed. Likewise, the Local Plan needs to be clear which areas are not appropriate for future development and need to be conserved and protected.

The site selection process has resulted in a total of 38 sites being allocated for housing. This document includes a schedule for each allocated site. The site schedule includes a site description and aerial photograph, any site constraints, comments from the Highway Authority and any representations received during the last round of consultation. This is intended to demonstrate how the Council has selected the proposed sites to be allocated for housing development.
Barrow-in-Furness
**REC05  Land South of Leece Lane, Barrow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC05 Land South of Leece Lane, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 322988</th>
<th>Northing: 469544</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 0.64</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/ 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Vacant, greenfield site adjoining the urban boundaries.

**Flood Zone:** This site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Site is currently used as grazing land, although can be wet and marshy. There are mature trees and hedges border the site.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
None

**Highways Comments:**
A single point of access from Leece Lane may be sufficient, although the speed limit on Leece Lane indicates that sufficient visibility will be unattainable. Repositioning of 30mph/National Speed Limit signage to extend the 30mph zone would reduce the visibility requirement, although this would be subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). Otherwise, this site is a non-starter on highway safety grounds as it creates conditions detrimental to highway safety. Sufficient pedestrian/cycle links with Leece Lane would be required.

**Land Ownership - Private Ownership**
Visibility - 4.5m x 70m
Road Width - 5.5m + footways

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**
Site has some surface water concerns near to the main river.

Site includes an Ordinary watercourse on the western boundary and a Main River on the southern boundary.

Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up.

Any work within the channel of a watercourse or near a Main River will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
Other Constraints:

Rights of Way - Public footpath No.602018 to consider

Property comments - Property support an allocation for residential development.

BGS Radon Map

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status – Comment</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC05</th>
<th>Contact/Organisation - Rowena Hargill Cumbria Wildlife Trust</th>
<th>Consultee Reference Number - 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE: Preferred option site - REC05, Land south of Leece Lane, Barrow. Coordinates: -353994.9, 7192124.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing with regards to the above preferred option site. We would like to express our concern regarding the potential development of 19 properties on this site which has been included in the Barrow Borough Local Plan produced in June 2015. Stone Dyke the 'County Wildlife Site' is adjacent on either side of this proposed development site. This site is named in section 10.6.4 titled ‘Local Designations’ on page 204 in the Barrow Borough Local Plan document, this section states that these sites are of importance for the local biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are concerned that development on this site has the potential to cause damage to Stone Dyke County Wildlife Site. We would request that further investigations are carried out before this site is included within the Barrow Borough Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Objection</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC05</th>
<th>Contact/Organisation - Mr K Grime</th>
<th>Consultee Reference Number - 360</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The description and photograph of this site is somewhat misleading. An area of 1.539 Ha could only be achieved by tipping on the existing marsh/fenland area. Without the wanton destruction of this area which encompasses almost half of that shown on the photo an area of land of well under 1 ha would be available. The land marked red on the photo on the western side is also not owned by Mr Russell; neither is the 25 feet shown red south of my property No 7 Stone Dyke. A simple site inspection would confirm this; also reading the Proof of Evidence of the local Planning Authority Ref 86/1040 prepared for Mr B D Beckett in Oct 1988 in support of the refusal to give planning consent on this site would confirm approx. sizes of the site and issues affecting it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All these issues are still relevant today; probably even more so with regard to the importance of the habitat. Whilst stating in Table 8 in the Preferred Options Draft Consultation, page 123, that the eastern part of the site represents a valuable habitat are you prepared to see it tipped on? Here I would refer you to the statements of intent in the Preferred Options Draft. In section 10 Natural Environment particularly I quote &quot;to protect and enhance habitat and bio-diversity&quot;. Cumbria Wildlife Trust are still opposed to any development in this area, but due to unprecedented demand on their resources due to the many issues with the 400kv lines from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sellafield are unable to get involved.

Furthermore, in addition to asbestos contained in the old Vickers tipped land, the area to the east of number 12 Stone Dyke was illegally tipped on with uncontrolled waste in the late 1980’s by the owner Mr Russell. Indeed he was successfully prosecuted in July 1988 for this offence after the intervention of the then Conservative Member of Parliament Mr Cecil Franks. Mr Russell infers in his missive to the Local Plan Issues and Options Draft that the site is partly developed. This is a slight exaggeration. There are 2 homes built in the 1950’s both on Septic tanks, one with no gas and both with barely adequate water supplies. Our Septic tank drains into the proposed site via approx. 100 metres of perforated pipe laid in herringbone fashion. Permission for this is written in my deeds. Any development on this site would need a substantial outlay to overcome the many constraints that plague it. A further consideration may also be that at the moment the corridor of land to the immediate south of the site is being assessed for viability for the new 400kv supply line to Roosecote substation.

Could the planning department please explain why the unused fields adjacent to Roose rugby pitch/school field and fronting onto Leece Lane have been allowed to become an increasing eye sore? Why are they prepared to leapfrog this area which would benefit from development? Surely in a time when many school playing fields are being developed any potential restraints could be overcome. I cannot understand why the planning department which spent so much time, effort and taxpayers money in the late 1980’s opposing a similar scheme is now prepared to support this proposal.

I reiterate that this area of land to the south of Leece Lane should be left as a natural barrier until such time that the Holbeck development is completed when a reasoned reassessment may be made of housing requirements in the area. In Mr Russell’s missive he refers to Mr Hipkiss’s letter on 19-09-2014" to ensure the site was included - due to the interest of John Coward local builder". I assume that this statement is incorrect and Mr Hipkiss did not refer to John Coward in his letter.

As the owners of two fields on the South side of the proposed development, I would like to point out that the development would have no access from the lane on the West side due to him having no access, also I would like to point out that he doesn’t own any of this strip of land either. The only access would be from the narrow west part of Leece Lane between two completely blind bends. This would be very dangerous, especially when this development could turn out to be quite extensive.

My second point is about the wild life, this seems to have been well documented by Mr and Mrs Fell as well as Mr Grimes. I would like to also add that the site has a thriving population of butterflies and moths as well as orchids and other flowers. Building here could destroy wildlife, resulting in many different species becoming extinct in this area.

The final point is the contamination. As a resident of Roose for 72 years, I remember the lorry loads of industrial waste coming on a regular basis for Mr George Rodgers to construct the tip. This waste was full of boiler ash containing heavy metals from burning coal, asbestos pipe insulation and anything else that came from ship refits and repairs from Vickers Shipbuilders.

I am sure that if this site was disturbed, the contamination in the air and the run off of the water table into well beck will be catastrophic to humans as well as wild life, which I mentioned in my previous statement. Please remember, once these habitats are lost, they cannot be replaced.
Proposed Housing Site Assessments

Unconfirmed whether site can be assessed safely. Cumbria County Council (CCC) Highways confirms that the Site is a “non-starter” if not resolved. The Site includes a number of trees and a pond that may provide habitat for protected species. Against this context we are unconvinced that site is deliverable, without significantly more evidence.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - REC05
Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from Leece Lane may be considered sufficient, although the speed limit on Leece Lane indicates that sufficient visibility will be unattainable. Consideration should be given to repositioning of 30mph/National Speed Limit signage to extend the 30mph speed limit. Pedestrian links, including appropriate crossing points, should be created along Leece Lane, connecting to existing pedestrian links on Leece Lane.

Flood Comments - Site has some surface water concerns near to the main river.
Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. Objections to the land South of Leece Lane are noted.

In light of comments received, particularly from Cumbria Wildlife Trust the eastern part of the site in the Preferred Options Draft has been removed as it was recognised as having valuable woodland habitat and biodiversity value. The Council considers that the remaining part of REC05 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site. Further evidence on the likely impact on biodiversity and the potential contamination of land will be required before the site can be developed.

Comments have been received from Cumbria County Council Highways department, who have assessed access to the site and have agreed that the site is viable in principle. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and if development were to proceed at land South of Leece Lane, highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to planning application approval.

With regards to the query about the former playing fields on Leece Lane, the fields were not considered for housing allocation as the owner did not put the land forward during the ‘Call for Sites’ period of consultation.
# REC09 Field between Netherby Drive and Ormsgill Lane, Barrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>REC09 Field between Netherby Drive and Ormsgill Lane, Barrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>319934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>471883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size:</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield:</td>
<td>Housing/ 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site used for grazing, within the urban boundaries.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** The site is currently used a grazing land, with mature trees and hedges bordering the site. The site boundaries the wildlife corridor and is within the current Green Wedge.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**
A single point of access from Quarry Brow would be considered sufficient, positioned halfway along the frontage of the development site. Quarry Brow is a Minor Access Road with a 30mph speed limit, indicating that visibility splays are achievable. Pedestrian/cycle links with Quarry Brow, Netherby Drive and Angle Meadow Lane should be provided.

Long cul de sacs promote dependence on the car so should be avoided but can occasionally be acceptable in order to make effective use of the space available. In these instances their length should be minimised and turning areas must be provided to cater for service and refuse vehicles with pedestrian links available to other areas. Access points to connect with any future development to the north should be provided.

Visibility – 4.5m x 33m. Potential problems with visibility at the access to Ormsgill Lane.
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – Should have a 5.5m + footways Minor Access Road in order to future proof in case of further development to the north.

**LLFA Flooding & Drainage Comments:**
No particular issues with this site.
The layout of the development site and the drainage system should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.

**Other Constraints:**

Proximity to Ormsgill Quarry and near to a septic tank.

**Representations:**

| Status – Comment |
| Site Ref - REC09 |
| Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council |
| Consultee Reference Number - 9 |

A single point of access from Quarry Brow may be considered sufficient, provided that visibility requirements can be achieved in both directions. Pedestrian links should be created with Quarry Brow.

Flood Comments - No surface water concerns, Other issue would be the location of surface water discharge from site.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments.
**REC18  Field to East of Park View School, Barrow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> REC18  Field to East of Park View School, Barrow</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 320937  <strong>Northing:</strong> 470221</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 0.92</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Greenfield site within the urban boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong> The site lies within Flood Zone 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site includes mature trees and bushes and is regularly used for informal recreation and dog walking, therefore low biodiversity value.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highways Comments:**

Any development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking and cycling. REC 18 must not rely on the B07/2014/0392 access from West Avenue as that access is already overstretched but a new access from Lesh Lane would relieve this pressure.

Visibility – 4.5m x 33m at Lesh Lane.
Land Ownership – Cumbria County Council
Road Width – 5.5m carriageway width with 1.8m footways on both sides needed to connect through from Lesh Lane to committed development at Parkview School (former).

**Flooding & Drainage:**

**LLFA**

No surface water flooding concerns however consideration of discharge point will need to have regard to site SHL014. A master plan for drainage is needed, with a view to joining up the potential sites which have been identified in the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation document (REC18 and SHL014).

Drainage must not go towards known flooding location at junction of West Avenue/Jesmond Avenue.
Other Constraints:

Adult Social Care Comments - CCC land (playing fields) nearby considered appropriate to include extra care housing as part of potential residential or development:

Property Comments - Property support an allocation for residential development

Green Infrastructure:

Consideration will need to be given to ensuring that access arrangements take suitable account of the new green wedge and neighbouring development.

Representations:

Status – Objection
Site Ref - REC18
Contact/Organisation P and D Latimer
Consultee Reference Number – 486

I write in regard to the consultation on the Barrow Borough Local Plan (Preferred Options Draft) which I have only recently become aware of. I should also say that I write on behalf of my wife who has been resident in this house for more than 50 years as well as myself who has been here for over 40 years.

We wish to object to the inclusion in the plan of the area of old Parkview playing fields designated REC 18 on your plan. This objection is based on the following reasons:

This land is part of a large green area in Central Barrow and there was once much more but with the development on Barrow Park playing fields bordering Greengate Street and Risedale Road, of the Leisure Centre and other buildings, a large chunk of green land that was available for local recreational use, has been removed. To now make available for housing, a green area effectively dividing the rest of the land is, I submit, a mistake.

The two fields adjacent to Lyndale and Horndale Avenues and which are leased the Barrow Wanderers Football club form part of this green area and would be left in isolation from the rest which currently stretches over to Bridgegate Avenue. If some of this green area has to sacrifice then I submit the land adjacent to Bridgegate and Lesh Lane would prevent this division and also allow more road access assuming it to be used for housing.

There are brown field sites in the borough that should be developed before more green fields are used and I know that the council are making efforts to do this since as reported today, the demolition of Arthur Street and attempted development is an example.

If this land is to be used for anything other than the recreational use that it is at present, may I offer the following suggestions. It could be used as it once was when school fields, as more sporting pitches for football or other sports like rugby and hockey. That area lacks a proper playground for local children that many other wards in the borough possess and this would provide facilities lacking at present.
What I would really like to see is some of this land used as How Tun woods off Cliffe Land has been used, for the development in conjunction with the Woodland Trust or a similar body for the growth of woods to be used for walks and the extension of natural habitat. The borough lacks wooded areas and trees tick many boxes from an environmental point of view. They combat climate change as well as providing a home for birds and small mammals.

As a regular visitor to Newcastle, I always appreciate the city protection of the Town Moor there which provides a large amount of green land in the centre of a large city. There are often cows grazing on this land which is leased for that purpose and that provides a country feel to the area which I know is appreciated by residents and their children. I note that the leaflet regarding this draft uses words like protecting public open space and natural habitats. REC 18 as part of this green area has already a limited natural habitat. I regularly see hawks or kestrels hovering over the fields before plummeting to capture a small mammal. The fields are home to hedgehogs, now in danger, to field mice and voles and I have seen on several occasions the presence of wild rabbits which flee as soon as they are approached. The hedges are home to many brambles and are full of blackberries which are picked by locals every Summer.

There is a registered maintained footpath which runs from Fairfield Lane down to where the old schoolyard is presently and then down to Lesh Lane that borders this ground and needs to be taken into account. We are not anti-development and recognise that Barrow needs to change and adapt, but to use green land already used for recreation, is surely a contradiction of both the efforts by health bodies to urge us all to be more active as well as removing areas where children can develop sporting talents. How this country will develop its National sporting talent with so many school fields being sold off is beyond me. Centres such as our Park Leisure Centre are useful only so far and open fields encourage young legs to run and exercise. Where will we be when the only such facility requires a car or bus journey? Growing up in Fife Street in the 1950s, I and my friends had the fields of Barrow Park and subsequently the playing fields about which I write as our playground. I valued it very much and it contributed to a happy childhood. This treasured land still exists in Central Barrow and to sacrifice some of it will be condemned by future generations.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC18
Contact/Organisation - S Baines
Consultee Reference Number - 554

I wish to object to the field (associated with the Park View school) Proposal REC18, being seen as a "Preferred choice" for housing. Barrow Council recognizes the need for Green space within the town.

The Councils own proposed "Green infrastructure Strategy" document clearly highlights the way forward. Indeed "Green Infrastructure Strategy" Policies G12, G13 and G15 clearly contradict proposal REC18. Fragmentation of an existing "Green wedge" into smaller pieces is Not the answer. The opportunistic sale of the Parkview school site should not be seen as justification or support for proposal REC18, however convenient.

The loss of "Green space" in developing the Academy and sports track must be accounted for by removing REC18 and the adjacent Green wedge from any future development plans. This is the only way any long term Sustainable Green policy can be claimed or advanced in Furness.

I have already proposed that - These fields should be considered as part of the Barrow Park forming a "Green Heart" linking the Park to surrounding green belt of Furness. Foot bridges would avoid traffic zones creating safer "Clean Green "walking routes into the Academy and town. I would urge the Planners and Councillors to actually go and walk in this Green space. There are NO places with such open and expansive views within the Town, with views out to Piel Island and lower Furness.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - REC18
Contact/Organisation - Barton Willmore Story Homes
Consultee Reference Number - 257

CCC considers the Site to be a “non-starter” due to unattainable access. No solution is provided by the evidence base to this problem. Development of the Site would result in a loss of open space. The Site is not accessible and would represent a departure from other policies within the draft Local Plan (Policy G1). The
Council has yet to assess the level of open space provision within the Borough and the need for existing facilities. Given this lack of evidence, the Site should be removed from the Plan.

**Status**  
Comment  
Site Ref - REC18  
Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council  
Consultee Reference Number - 9

To demonstrate the ability of this site to access the highway, the site boundary should be amended as per the revised site plan prepared by Cumbria County Council.

Flood Comments: No surface water concerns however consideration of discharge point will need to have regard to site SHL014.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The Highways Department initially felt that access to the field to the East of former Park View School was unattainable. The site boundary has since been amended to include access from Lesh Lane, as per the revised site plan prepared by Cumbria County Council. The Council therefore considers that REC18 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site. Should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval.

Objections to allocating this field as a selected site are noted. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation and biodiversity is an important issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated.

Furthermore the County Council, who own the site, have stated that it is surplus to requirements as its use was ancillary to Furness Academy (South) which occupied the adjacent site until it was demolished and is now being developed for housing. CCC therefore intend to dispose of the site. Although the site is within proximity of the new Furness Academy school, it is not within the grounds and does not form part of its playing fields. It is currently used for informal recreation such as dog walking.

Open space to the north and south of the site will be protected as green wedge and green space. Sensitive development may help reduce the impact on the sites biodiversity value. On this basis the site is considered suitable for development.
## REC19b Thorncliffe South (tennis courts/field section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> REC19b Thorncliffe South (tennis courts/field section)</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 320330</th>
<th><strong>Northing:</strong> 470921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.79</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing / 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Part brownfield/ part green field site. Tennis Courts are no longer in use, playing field still in use and used for informal recreation/dog walking. Adjacent to school and residential area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong></td>
<td>The site lies within Flood Zone 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact on Heritage Assets:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site includes mature trees and bushes and is regularly used for informal recreation and dog walking, therefore low biodiversity value.</td>
<td>A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Highways Comments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access from Thorncliffe Road, doubling as access for development site REC19a, with a secondary access from Lichfield Close would be sufficient. Pedestrian/cycle links with Thorncliffe Road, Lichfield Close, and Devonshire Road should be provided. A single point of access from the adjacent development site (subject to planning permission) may be considered sufficient. Emergency Vehicle Access should be created from Lichfield Close. Pedestrian links should be created, linking to Thorncliffe Road, Lichfield Close and Devonshire Road and any adjacent development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Visibility - 4.5m x 33m</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Width – 5.5m + footways.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Ownership – Cumbria County Council</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Flooding &amp; Drainage Comments:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LLFA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has some surface water concerns close to the south end of the site from adjacent site REC19a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ultimate drainage destination needs to be resolved early as there is no obvious point of discharge. The discharge must not increase pressure on the combined system passing through Harrogate Street where there is a known flooding problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has some surface water concerns close to the south end of the site from adjacent site REC19a. Any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space.

A ditch runs beside the lane and runs out into the field. This arrangement must not be prevented but could be improved.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.

![Surface Water Flooding Map](image)

**UU**

There is a borehole at Thorncliffe which means that development poses a risk to Groundwater Protection Zone 1. Sewers here will need to be impermeable in order to prevent leakage into the borehole.

**Other Comments:**

- **Adult Social Care Comments** - CCC land (playing fields) nearby considered appropriate to include extra care housing as part of potential residential development;
- **Property Comments** - Property support an allocation for residential development or extra care housing.

**Representations:**

- **Status** - Comment
- **Site Ref** - REC19b
- **Contact/Organisation** - Barton Willmore Story Homes
- **Consultee Reference Number** - 257

Existing open space used for recreation activity. Policy should seek to improve and protect this open space not develop it. The Site should be removed from the Plan as a result.

- **Status** - Comment
- **Site Ref** - REC19b
- **Contact/Organisation** - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
- **Consultee Reference Number** - 9

A single point of access from the adjacent development site (subject to planning permission) may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created, linking to Thorncliffe Road, Lichfield Close and Devonshire Road. Emergency Vehicle Access should be created from Lichfield Close.

Flood Comments Site has some surface water concerns close to the south end of the site from adjacent site REC19a.

- **Landscape Comment** - No comment.
Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan. Should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval.

Comments regarding protecting this site as open space are noted. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation and biodiversity is an important issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated.

Furthermore the County Council, who own the site, have stated that it is surplus to requirements as its use was ancillary to Furness Academy (North) which occupied the adjacent site until it was demolished and is now being developed for housing. CCC therefore intend to dispose of the site. On this basis, the site is considered suitable for development.
# REC26 Land East of Holbeck

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC26 Land East of Holbeck</th>
<th>Easting: 323051</th>
<th>Northing: 469770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 6.43</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing / 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site adjoining the urban boundaries used in part for grazing.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Currently used for grazing, however mature trees and hedgerows border the site, which are likely to provide a habitat for a number of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**
A single point of access from Kempas Avenue or Leece Lane (or both) may be considered sufficient if provided with an emergency access from either Kempas Avenue or Leece Lane (if both are not delivered). If the main point of access is proposed at Leece Lane, the speed limit on Leece Lane indicates that sufficient visibility will be unattainable. Consideration should be given to repositioning of 30mph/National Speed Limit signage to extend the 30mph speed limit. Pedestrian links should be created with Kempas Avenue and along Leece Lane, connecting to existing pedestrian links on Leece Lane to safeguard pedestrian movements.

Visibility - 4.5m x 215m to connect to existing 60mph Leece Lane. Reduces to 4.5m x 90m if speed limit is 30mph.
Land Ownership – Holker Estates Ltd
Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**
No surface water concerns but would look to have Qbar for flood mitigation to Main river. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
**Other Constraints:**
Proximity to listed buildings at Crofters, Holbeck Park Ave.
BGS Radon Map.

**Representations:**
Status - Support
Site Ref - REC26
Contact/Organisation - Christopher Garner Holker Estates
Consultee Reference Number - 219

REC26 Land East of Holbeck is identified for immediate housing delivery. The gross site size is indicated as 6.6ha, but the net developable area as just 3.00ha. The explanation for the significant difference is set out in Table 8:- “The prominence of the site to views of the green ‘horizon’ to Barrow limits the extent of the scheme with green infrastructure measures to protect the character of the settlement edge.”

Appendix I further explains that it is considered that “the remainder is considered to be open countryside which acts as a natural buffer between Barrow and Stank Lane and is important to the open character of the area.”

Stephenson Halliday has prepared a Landscape and Visual Assessment of REC26 and the adjoining SHL083. They do not agree with the initial findings of the planning authority SH concludes:- “The site would remain separated from Stank Lane; both physically, and perceptually as Stank Lane runs along a valley and is largely out of sight from the surrounding landscape (Stank Lane is located adjacent to and running behind Dove Cottage in Photograph 2, however it is out of sight). The proposed development would be located on the west side (the Barrow side) of the ridge which runs from the undeveloped drumlin top down to the crossroads at Dove Cottage. The east side of the ridge, which falls down toward Stank Lane would remain undeveloped. As such the open character of the wider area would be protected.”

We ask the planning authority to review this matter and consider increasing the housing allocation to incorporate land to the east (SHL083) to allow for the development of a larger site for up to 250 dwellings. This would enable an important housing contribution from this location.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC26
Contact/Organisation - Mr Bird
Consultee Reference Number - 331

I write in connection with the above consultation document and in particular to the area referenced as ‘REC26 – Land East of Holbeck, Barrow’. I have examined the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Draft and know the ‘REC26’ site well, as that is where I currently reside, and would object strongly to the development of these piece of land and as such would like to make the following comments:

1. In my opinion the proposed development will degrade the adaptability, success, sustainability and vibrancy of the Holbeck area through the destruction of a valued green space which currently provides opportunities for passive recreation which is counter to the objectives of the local plan consultation paper and in particular Section 2.1 which states ‘The Plan must ensure residents have access through an enhanced network of public
rights of way to high quality inclusive open spaces including the wider countryside and help protect these from inappropriate development'.

2 The proposed development of the area listed as REC26 will also cause the loss of biodiversity, as there is an abundance of wildlife utilising this piece of ‘green space’ such as Owls, Kestrels, Badgers, Foxes, Hedgehogs, Bats, Mice to name but a few. This loss of biodiversity is counter to the objectives of the local plan consultation paper.

Section 2 – Vision for the Borough of Barrow-in-Furness and in particular Section 2.1 Objectives which states ‘The Plan must protect and enhance habitats and species and help promote them as a key to sustainable development’. It also goes against the key challenges listed within the draft local plan, one of which is listed as ‘conserving and enhancing the Borough’s landscape and biodiversity’. Protecting and enhancing habitats is also fully supported by Natural England and therefore allowing development on this land can only be seen as being hypocritical from a Barrow Borough Council point of view.

3. The draft local plan states that key issues to be considered should include ‘Landscape Character’, surely allowing potential development on a piece of ‘green space’ will have a detrimental effect as well as having an impact on the local eco-system. As mentioned above there is an abundance of wildlife utilising this piece of ‘green space’, or in my opinion Greenfield Site, such as Owls, Kestrels, Badgers, Foxes, Hedgehogs, Bats, and Mice. Allowing this proposal to go be accepted within the local plan is a direct contravention of the Barrow Councils publicly-available policies and guidelines as well as going against the visions of the Borough, and in particular the vision to ‘promote the Borough’s greatest assets to attract and retain people and businesses in the area, such as its natural environment’. Allowing development of this land will result in the continuing unnecessary loss of countryside to urban sprawl and less investment in urban renewal.

4 The proposed development will destroy local diversity and distinctiveness through destruction of an open space which has been reclaimed by nature and has a high biodiversity value (Section 1.4 - Natural Environment and Landscape, sub section 1.4.22 has a key challenge of maximising the multiple benefits of the natural environment). We believe a beautiful, thriving countryside is important for everyone, no matter where they live. England’s unique, essential and precious countryside should be retained.

5. The draft local plan also has an objective that states that it must ensure residents must have access to quality open spaces including the wider countryside and help protect these from inappropriate development (Section 2.1). It also states that the plan must protect and enhance habitats and species and help promote them as a key to sustainable development (Section 2.1), surely REC26 (Land East of Holbeck, Barrow) falls into this category as it should be noted that this site, although being an area of outstanding natural beauty, is also a habitation area for an abundance of wildlife such as Owls, Kestrels, Badgers, Foxes, Hedgehogs, Bats, Mice but to name just a few, and should not be allowed to be spoilt and ‘drive out’ the wildlife especially as there are several Brownfield sites in the Barrow area that could be developed instead.

6. The draft local plan highlights the housing stock of the borough as being dominated by older housing, concentrated in the central Barrow area that has issues with quality due to age and condition etc. as well as a lack of choice in the current market to attract highly skilled workers (sections 1.4.24 & 1.4.26). That being the case would it not be prudent to invest in the existing housing as this will lead to gentrification (old housing done up - area becomes more trendy and affluent) so the area will improve and things like crime rates will improve? This would also be a far more sustainable way of developing the area and ensure that new developments promote sustainable travel choices which aligns to one of the key challenges defined within the local plan (section 14.4.48) as well as encouraging sustainable management of resources and minimise waste (section 2.1) and more importantly adhere to Policy S1: Council's commitment to sustainable development. Surely the Local Plan should be set to encourage the Council to redouble its commitment to securing better use of land and promoting urban renaissance. That way we can meet genuine housing need and give real protection to the countryside.

7. The Local Plan states that it must encourage the sustainable management of resources and minimise waste, is this not best practiced by utilising Brownfield sites as Brownfield site redevelopment eases pressure on Greenfield sites and is more sustainable.
8. The local plan also states that it should consider the role which the historic environment can play in delivering other planning objectives such as ensuring the vitality of the town centres, promoting sustainable transport, protecting green belt land and conserving and enhancing the natural environment, all of which I believe that this proposed development would not adhere too.

9. The site is also adjacent to several grade 2 listed buildings and therefore any development could be deemed harmful to the historic environment and again goes against the principles of the draft local plan.

10. One last concern I have is may be perceived as somewhat of a personal one, albeit I do speak on behalf of the neighbourhood when I state that the current development of Holbeck estate is still ongoing and has/is affecting our daily lives. The noise pollution involved with a building site affects us, the mess a building site creates is a daily burden and congestion is sometimes an issue all of which we have had to endure for the past 6-7 years. Having to potentially endure this for another 6-7 years is just unthinkable. This also contravenes the Local Plans Sustainable Development Criteria, which states 'it must ensure the health, safety and environmental effects of noise, smell, dust, light, vibration, fumes or other forms of pollution or nuisance arising from proposed developments', surely enduring another potentially numerous years of all of these does not fit well with the plan?

I'm sure given more time I could list more and more reasons why I believe the proposed site, referenced as 'REC26 – Land East of Holbeck, Barrow', should not be adopted within the Local Plan.

---

I am writing to raise my concerns about the above aspect of the Local Plan and its designation as a 'potentially deliverable site'. I moved into the area (Holbeck Rise) just 2 years ago from Lancaster and have been very pleasantly surprised by, amongst other things, the diversity of wildlife in the surrounding natural habitat; deer, foxes, owls, dragonflies, white egrets (rare visitors), bullfinches, bats, butterflies etc etc.

I am no "eco-warrier" or "loony green" but I think great thought should be given to the impact on this area should further housing development be sanctioned. I witnessed in Lancaster the urban spread into the surrounding fields and woods whilst sites within the city were left undeveloped to become eyesores. Also the absorption of rural communities into the city which, in the case of Holbeck, could soon swamp Stank and Leece for example.

May I please register my concerns officially and ask that they be considered before any decisions are made.

---

I see from the above that the land behind where I live in Kempas Ave (rec26) has been classified as potentially delivery site for housing. I would strongly oppose any plans to build on this site as it is valuable green belt and as such is of great importance to the local community.

---

We write in connection with the potential development of the area referenced as 'REC26 – Land East of Holbeck, Barrow' within the Draft Local Plan. Having digested the contents within the Draft Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation Draft document we would like it known that we object strongly to the potential development of this piece of land and would like to make the following comments:

1. In our opinion the proposed development will destroy a valued piece of green space which currently provides opportunities for recreation, something which is counter to the objectives of the local plan consultation paper (Section 2.1 states 'The Plan must ensure residents have access through an enhanced network of public rights of way to high quality inclusive open spaces including the wider countryside and help
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2. The potential development of this piece of land, listed as REC26, will undoubtedly cause loss of biodiversity as there is a plethora of wildlife thriving on this piece of ‘urban open space’ such as Badgers, Foxes, Bats, Mice, Hedgehogs & Owls. Loosing this biodiversity of wildlife surely contradicts the objectives of the local plan consultation paper, (2.1 states 'The Plan must protect and enhance habitats and species and help promote them as a key to sustainable development'), and goes against the key challenges listed within the plan (one of which is listed as ‘conserving and enhancing the Borough’s landscape and biodiversity’).

3. Protecting and enhancing wildlife habitats is also fully supported by Natural England and consequently allowing development on this land can only be seen as being totally hypocritical from a Barrow Borough Council point of view. Allowing development of this land will destroy local diversity and uniqueness through the destruction of an area that has been domesticated by nature and will cause the unnecessary loss of countryside to urban sprawl, which in itself will result in less investment in urban renewal. (Section 1.4.22 has a key challenge of maximising the multiple benefits of the natural environment). Any potential development of this land will ‘drive out’ the wildlife and should not be allowed, especially as there are several Brownfield sites in the Barrow area that could be developed instead.

4. Within the draft local plan it states that one of the key issues to be considered includes ‘Landscape Character’. That being the case would allowing potential development on a piece of ‘green space’ not have a damaging effect on the local eco-system and go against this ‘key issue’, especially as there is an abundance of wildlife utilising/living on this piece of ‘green space’. Allowing this proposal to go ahead will, in our opinion, be a direct infringement of the Barrow Borough Councils policies, guidelines & visions, one of which is to ‘promote the Borough’s greatest assets to attract and retail people and businesses in the area, such as its natural environment’.

5. Other objectives within the draft local plan are ‘to ensure residents have access to quality open spaces including the wider countryside and help protect these from inappropriate development’ and to ‘protect and enhance habitats and species and help promote them as a key to sustainable development’ (Section 2.1). Unquestionably REC26 (Land East of Holbeck, Barrow) falls into these classifications as, although being an area of outstanding natural beauty, is also a habitation area for an abundance of wildlife such as Owls, Kestrels, Badgers, Foxes, Hedgehogs, Bats, Mice etc.

6. The Draft Local Plan states that it must encourage the sustainable management of resources and minimise waste, would this not be best practiced by utilising Brownfield sites as Brownfield site redevelopment eases pressure on Greenfield sites and is more sustainable. The plan also highlights the housing stock of the borough being dominated by older housing that has issues with quality due to age and condition etc. (sections 1.4.24 & 1.4.26). This being the case surely it would be more cost effective to invest in the existing housing as well as being a far more sustainable way of developing the area. Investing within the town centre areas would also endorse/encourage sustainable travel choices, which would also support one of the other key challenges outlined within the local plan (section 14.4.48). It would also encourage sustainable management of resources and minimising waste (section 2.1) and adhere to Policy S1: Council’s commitment to sustainable development.

7. The Draft Local Plan states that it should consider the role which the historic environment can play in delivering other planning objectives such as ensuring the vitality of the town centres, promoting sustainable transport, protecting green belt land and conserving and enhancing the natural environment. We believe that the Local Plan should resolutely encourage the Council to redouble its commitment to securing better use of land and promoting urban renaissance. Investing and ‘gentrifying’ the existing old housing stock would encourage the areas to become more trendy and affluent. That way we can meet genuine housing need and give real protection to the countryside.

8. It should also be noted that the REC26 site is adjacent to a several grade 2 listed buildings and therefore any development could be deemed harmful to the historic environment, which again contradicts the principles of the draft local plan.

9. We would also like to make note that several studies (one of which was carried out in 2014 by the European Centre for Environment and Human Health at the University of Exeter and appeared in the journal Environmental Science and Technology) have shown that living in an urban area with green spaces has a long-lasting positive impact on people’s mental well-being. These studies have suggested people living in greener
urban areas were displaying fewer signs of depression or anxiety.

10. One other concern/issue we have, which does relate to item No9 above, is that because the current development of Holbeck estate is still on going the noise pollution and mess a building site creates has/is affecting our daily lives and has been doing for the past 7-8 years. Should this potential development be adopted within the Draft Local Plan we would have the potential to endure this for another 6-7 years, which for us is just unthinkable. In our opinion this also infringes the Local Plans Sustainable Development Criteria, which states ‘it must ensure the health, safety and environmental effects of noise, smell, dust, light, vibration, fumes or other forms of pollution or nuisance arising from proposed developments’.

We firmly believe a beautiful, thriving countryside is important for everyone and should be retained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from Kempas Avenue or Leece Lane (or both) may be considered sufficient if provided with an emergency access from either Kempas Avenue or Leece Lane (if both are not delivered). If the main point of access is proposed at Leece Lane, the speed limit on Leece Lane indicates that sufficient visibility will be unattainable. Consideration should be given to repositioning of 30mph/National Speed Limit signage to extend the 30mph speed limit. Pedestrian links should be created with Kempas Avenue and along Leece Lane, connecting to existing pedestrian links on Leece Lane to safeguard pedestrian movements.

Flood Comments- No surface water concerns but would look to have Qbar for flood mitigation to Main river.

Landscape Comments- No comment.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments, the level of objections is noted. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural/grazing land. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation, biodiversity and quality of life is an important issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated.

In light of the GI Strategy and comments received the site size in the Preferred Options Draft has been reduced to minimise the impact on the landscape. The boundary has been amended to follow the topography of the land to the north and east to protect the character of the settlement edge and retain separation between Stank and Stank Lane.

As part of the development of the new Local Plan a review of all policies and allocations took place, this combined with changes in legislation has allowed the Council to assess sites as potential allocations which it may not have in the past. There is now less emphasis on the brownfield first approach, although the Council will continue to promote and allocate brownfield sites some of which are in the town centre. The Council also continues to use regeneration and housing renewal initiatives to improve older stock in the town centre to bring it back into use and raise standards.

A query has been raised regarding the extent of housing development required during the plan period. The Council has calculated the OAN and housing requirement for the Borough over the Plan period based on the most up-to-date evidence available, which are CLG 2012 household projections. These figures project a continued decline in the Borough’s population over the period 2012 to 2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to fall. This results in a projected growth of only 362 households between 2012 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 19 additional households. This figure is then adjusted upwards to take into account future employment growth, future housing vacancies, and second homes to reach a housing requirement figure, which in the Publication Draft Local Plan is 105 dwellings per year. Please see the Housing Land Statement 2016 for more information.

Comments regarding adjacent listed buildings have been noted, a Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken and officers will remain mindful of this issue when considering applications for development on this site.
REC54 Strawberry Grounds, Croslands Park, Barrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>REC54 Strawberry Grounds, Croslands Park, Barrow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size:</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>321145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>470808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield:</td>
<td>Housing /50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Greenfield site within the urban boundary. Adjacent uses include playing fields, residential and primary school.

Flood Zone: The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site): Greenfield site surrounded by hedgerows there is therefore likely to be biodiversity habitats.

Impact on heritage assets: None

Highways Comments:
Litchmead Grove and Monksvale Grove seem capable of allowing increase. Dwellings split 1/3 (MG) to 2/3(LG) should be acceptable. If the sites are linked then no issues from a highway point of view.

Land Ownership – Privately owned

Flooding & Drainage Comments:
Flooding is apparent on the current road network, but not within this site

Other Constraints:
Culverted Beck to south of site.

Representations:
None. This is a new site.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:
N/A
**SHL001 Marina Village**

| Site Ref: SHL001 Marina Village | Easting: 320652  Northing: 468620 |
| Site Size: 25.19 | Use /Indicative Yield: Housing 650 |

**Summary:** Previously developed site within the urban boundaries. Allocated for housing in Barrow Port Area Action Plan.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 2 and 3.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Previously developed site - low biodiversity value.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**

Multiple accesses will be required (probably three with one to Cavendish dock Road and two to A5087 Salthouse Road and/or Vulcan Road). Further pedestrian/cycle links should be created with Salthouse Road and the Strand, Cavendish Dock Road, Vulcan Road and the far extremities of the site including exploring the potential for links to Salthouse Road at the railway bridge and towards Salthouse Mills and the potential site SHL002.

The internal layout should also have good connectivity using loops and links but using road alignment and traffic calming measures to keep road speed down and avoid rat running. Long cul de sacs promote dependence on the car so should be avoided but can occasionally be acceptable in order to make effective use of the space available. In these instances their length should be minimised and turning areas must be provided to cater for service and refuse vehicles with pedestrian links available to other parts of the estate.

Misuse of these roads as through routes should be discouraged through the selection of alignments and features which will manage traffic speeds.

Visibility – 4.5m x 90m.
Land Ownership – Barrow Borough Council.
Road Width – The site is large enough that it may be served by a bus route so a key loop serving the extremities of the site should have a carriageway width of 6m with reductions on short sections for traffic calming measures.
Flooding & Drainage Comments:

LLFA:

Site has many surface water concerns and potential discharge concerns to harbour basins.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space and could be used as SuDS basins/wetlands.

The site must be split up into multiple subcatchments with control features for each subcatchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. More than one runoff destination may be appropriate for this site.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.

UU:

UU would like to work closely with the Council so that the wastewater system is planned as a whole, particularly to avoid piecemeal development tapping into the sewer network in an uncoordinated way, and also to avoid pressure being put on the Frederick Street Pumping Station (which is a storm pumping station). A new pumping station may be required at Marina Village. UU would like to see surface water drained into the docks and they query whether the Council has the right to do this.

The Barrow WwTW is at capacity and more storm storage is required. Development at the site may need to be phased to allow UU time to upgrade the WwTW.

Other Constraints:

Health and Safety Executive Nuclear

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
<th>Site Ref - SHL001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Tim Randles ONR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I note that a number of sites previously identified as developable or potentially developable in the Barrow Borough Local Plan - Issues & Options Consultation Draft September 2014, are now considered to be not available.

With regard to sites: SHL100a, SHL101, REC24, SHL010, SHL059 and, in particular, SHL001, the advice given in our representation of 16 October 2014 stands (see attached) The following paragraphs form ONR’s representation in response to the Barrow Borough Local Plan Issues & Options Consultation Draft September 2014.
With regard to land allocations on Walney Island: ONR would not object to residential development within the designated developable sites SHL100a and SHL101, provided that Cumbria County Council did not oppose such development on the grounds that it could not be accommodated within the Barrow off-site plan.

I note that a further eight sites have been identified as potentially developable (REC24, SHL010, SHL059, SHL089, SHL090, SHL091, SHL094, SHL100b), providing up to 200 additional dwellings. The most significant of these sites being SHL010 (up to 106 dwellings). Cumbria County Council’s (CCC) emergency planning team should be consulted before any of these sites are promoted to developable or deliverable status, regarding the potential individual and cumulative impact on the off-site plan. ONR may object to any proposed residential developments on these sites unless CCC emergency planners confirm that they can be accommodated by the provisions within the off-site plan. With regard to the proposed land allocation on Barrow Island: I note that site SHL003 has been identified as developable, with the potential for 25 dwellings. ONR may object to any proposed residential developments on this site unless CCC emergency planners confirm that they can be accommodated by the provisions within the off-site plan.

With regard to the proposed land allocations on the mainland: I note that there are a number of small sites allocated as either deliverable or developable within the existing emergency planning zone. These are -- SHL062, SHL063a, an unlabelled site directly to the east of SHL062, SHL047, SHL065, SHL061, REC08, REC16, & SHL014. I consider that residential development on these sites would not impact significantly on the characteristics of the area. ONR would not object to developments on these sites provided that Cumbria County Council did not oppose such development on the grounds that they could not be accommodated within the Barrow off-site plan.

The developable site SHL001, with the potential for 650 dwellings, lies within the emergency planning zone and in close proximity to the nuclear licensed site. Residential development on this scale is likely to have significant impact on the off-site plan and ONR would be likely to object to residential developments on the site unless the CCC Emergency planning department provided adequate assurance that it could be accommodated within the plan. I would encourage the adoption of other options for the site which do not include a major residential component. I would make no comment on any of the other proposed allocations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Emily Hrycan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is the potential for industrial archaeology on the site. Therefore, the Plan/evidence base will need to be amended to ensure that reference to this is included and that an assessment will need to be undertaken prior to the site coming forward for development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Barton Willmore Story Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heritage England have concerns regarding the impact of the scheme on the St George’s Square Conservation Area. A Heritage Impact Assessment is required to be undertaken to demonstrate mitigation measures. Without this assessment, the Plan cannot demonstrate that the principle of development can be achieved on the site without harm to the historic environment. The Site is within Flood Zone 2/3. Site has potential for impact on nearby RAMSAR/SSSI/SAC/SPA designations.

Land contamination, local market issues and need to account for ecology severely impact the viability of this scheme.

The Council requires a comprehensive delivery of the scheme. Compulsory Purchase Orders are required to secure the full site creating added complexity and delaying the delivery of the scheme. Creation of a new marina is a necessity to provide the uplift in value necessary to secure the delivery of the scheme. This includes...
the need for the delivery of a costly boat lift.

There is a current funding gap of tens of million pounds. External funding is required to deliver the scheme in full. The Site was first identified within the 2006 alterations Local Plan. The only planning activity on site since was the submission of a Screening Opinion in 2008. The Site was to commence delivery in 2011 but as of 2015 no works on site have taken place. There are significant barriers to the delivery of this Site in the short and medium term. Applying local delivery rates it is clear that 650 dwellings will not be secured within the Plan period. 650 dwellings represent a substantial proportion of dwellings required to deliver the Council’s housing requirement (almost 40%). It is therefore important that the assumptions applied by the Council are realistic to provide the greatest prospect that housing needs will be met in full by the end of the Plan period.

Considering the complex and precarious situation facing the Site it would be more realistic to consider the Site for delivery in the later part of the plan period and into the next plan post-2031 and allocate further deliverable sites to make up for any shortfall.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL001
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A point of access from Salthouse Road may be considered sufficient if provided with a secondary point of access either Salthouse Road or the Strand (by with of Cavendish Dock Road). Pedestrian links should be created with Salthouse Road and the Strand, via Cavendish Dock Road.

Flood Comments - Site has many surface water concerns and potential discharge concerns to harbour basins. Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council, Historic England and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for the site. Sensitive development may help reduce the impact on the sites archaeological value and the nearby St Georges Conservation Area. On this basis, the site is considered suitable for development, subject to officers remaining mindful of these issues when considering applications for development on this site.

The Council note the concerns of the ONR and the sites proximity to a nuclear licensed site.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.

The development of Marina Village remains a priority for the Council, and it is recognised site assembly and remediation is not straightforward however we continue to takes steps to make the site available by for example the provision of new access roundabout.
## SHL010a Park Vale Walney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL010 Park Vale Walney</th>
<th>Easting: 317992</th>
<th>Northing: 468973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.71</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing / 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary:
Part previously developed site within the urban boundaries adjacent to sports pitch / disused running track.

### Flood Zone:
The site lies in Flood Zone 2 and 3.

### Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):
There are mature trees on site and derelict/demolished buildings which may provide a habitat for a variety of species. Currently part of green wedge.

### Impact on heritage assets:
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

### Highways Comments:
A single point of access from Mill Lane or Trent Vale may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Mill Lane and Trent Vale. Should link Mill Lane and Trent Vale.

Visibility – 4.5m x 70m.
Land Ownership - Barrow Borough Council
Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

### Flooding & Drainage Comments:

#### LLFA –
Site has history of flooding and feeds and feeds in to Central Drive systems which are a known flooding problem area. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of streams, sewers and road drainage.

Southern end of site is in EA fluvial Flood Zone, most of the site is at risk of surface water flooding. Linear surface water feature runs north to south through the middle of the site. These constraints will make this a difficult site to build on without increasing flood risk elsewhere. These areas would be best left as open space. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.
Proposed Housing Site Assessments  

Linear surface water features may be unmapped watercourses. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up.

Any work within the channel of a watercourse will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission.

The large area of surface water flooding in middle of site could ideal for a regional SuDS basin/wetland to serve a wider area.

Any housing should be directed around the margins of the site with surface water managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map above.

UU:

The site has a history of flooding and feeds into the system at Central Drive. There is high infiltration into the sewer network in this area. There may be a need for swales or other measures to deal with surface water for this site.

Other Constraints:
Track and Changing Facilities leased to Vickerstown FC.
Health and Safety Executive Nuclear.
Telecommunications tower on eastern part of site

Representations:

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL010
Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes
Consultee Reference Number - 257

It is unclear whether development would retain the existing running track and facilities. We object to the Site’s allocation for development due to the loss of sports facilities if it does not*. A replacement facility would be necessary. Clarity is required from the Council on this issue.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL010
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from Mill Lane or Trent Vale may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Mill Lane and Trent Vale.
**Flood Comments**: Site has history of flooding and feeds into Central drive systems. Mitigation is required to Qbar discharge.

**Landscape Comment**: No comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections to allocating this area as a selected site are noted. The Council agree that retaining sports facilities for recreation is an important issue, and current sports facilities will be retained and where possible improved. The Council has produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas for sport and recreation, it is envisaged that there will be improvements to public footpaths and the network of open space in the vicinity of the site linking to the green wedge, Vickerstown Park and Central Drive. Each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated to enhance the environment and provide opportunity to address vacant sites such as the former Periscope pub.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
### SHL13b Former Candleworks (North), Schneider Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL13b Former Candleworks (North), Schneider Road</th>
<th>Easting: 319431</th>
<th>Northing: 471322</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 1.15</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing / 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Brownfield site within urban boundaries, currently occupied on short term basis by gypsy and travellers. Opportunity to incorporate enhanced pedestrian route to the coast.

**Flood Risk:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** This land is currently occupied by gypsies and travellers, therefore it is unlikely to contain many habitats and species, although the site does include a hedgerow.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None

### Highways Comments:

The following would be required to serve 32 dwellings - 4.8m wide road, 2x 2m footways and splays commiserate with the speed limit (2.4m by 70m if 30mph)

Visibility - 4.5m x 70m

Land Ownership

Road Width 5.5m + footways.

### Flooding & Drainage Comments:

**LLFA**

Some surface water concerns on site. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. Flood Defence Consent needed as well as Planning Permission to connect to watercourse to the north, check on capacity under Walney Road needed.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.
### Other Constraints:

None

### Representations:

#### Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL13b
Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes
Consultee Reference Number - 257

The Site is currently used on a short term basis for gypsy and travellers. CCC considers the Site undeliverable as proposed access is considered insufficient to support the proposed development capacity.

The Council propose to re-allocate the current gypsy and traveller site to the field located immediately to the north of the Site. This could have implications on the marketability of the Site for housing and this proposal needs to be market tested and the subject of discussions with the development industry as a minimum The site should be removed from the Plan. Site is not considered accessible.

#### Status - Support
Site Ref - SHL13b
Contact/Organisation Daniel Connolly, Menton Trading
Consultee Reference Number - 419

This land at Schneider Road, Barrow, has the reference SHL 13b and is included at Table 8 on page 124 of the plan as a preferred option site to be allocated for housing. We support this proposed allocation and have also had discussions with Council officers about bringing forward an application for planning permission for housing development in the near future. It is previously developed urban land and the Council have previously granted planning permission for its development for housing. More recently the Council have declined the opportunity to acquire the land to provide a travellers site and instead have now allocated Council owned land immediately adjoining to the north, as an alternative and new travellers site.

As the land owned by Menton Trading Ltd. is private land it will not under any circumstances be available as a travellers site, and as the Council also recognise that residential development of this land would be beneficial, an application for planning permission for housing will be submitted in the near future. These matters have previously been discussed with Mr. Hipkiss and Mr. Solsby and a response to the most recent correspondence to Mr. Solsby remains outstanding.

#### Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL13b
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

The following would be required to serve 32 dwellings - 4.8m wide road, 2x 2m footways and splay commiserate with the speed limit (2.4m by 70m if 30mph)

Flood Comments - Site has some surface water concerns. Discharge to adjacent beck will require check on capacity under Walney Road. Landscape Comment No comment.
Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The Highways Department initially felt that access to site was unattainable. Further comments have since been received to confirm what would be required with regards to access from the highway network. The Council therefore considers that SHL13b appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site. Should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
**SHL037  E5 Land South of Ashley & Rock, Park Road, Barrow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL037  E5 Land South of Ashley &amp; Rock, Park Road, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 319658</th>
<th>Northing: 472273</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 2.74</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing / 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Previously developed site within the urban boundaries, which provides an informal buffer between industrial areas and residential estates. Allocated in current Local Plan for employment uses. Need to maintain distinct sense of openness to through views and a robust ‘green route’ along Park Road.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (Including proximity to designated site):**
The site is an open space, which can be wet and marshy. There are mature trees and hedges bordering the site, which are likely to provide habitats for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**
A single point of access from Bank Lane or Middlefield (or both) considered sufficient if provided with an emergency vehicle access from either Bank Lane or Middlefield (if both are not delivered). Pedestrian links should be created with Bank Lane, Middlefield and Park Road.

The internal layout should also have good connectivity using loops and links but using road alignment and traffic calming measures to keep road speed down and avoid rat running.

Visibility – 4.5m x 45m from Bank Lane or Middlefield.
Land Ownership
Road Width 5.5m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:** Site has some surface water concerns

**LLFA**
Large parts of the site have surface water concerns with probably at least one Ordinary Watercourse on the site.

Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up.
Any work within the channel of a watercourse will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.

The site must be split up into subcatchments with control features for each subcatchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.

Other Constraints:

Rights of Way Comments - Public footpath No.601089 (Parrock Green) to consider.

This site is located within Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (CLCGT) landscape type 7b – Drumlin Field. The CLCGT highlights the drumlin landform as a defining characteristic, and recommends that field boundaries are maintained and strengthened, and that development should be sited and aligned to complement the grain and form of the drumlins.

The site reflects the topography described by 7b. It is relatively self contained, rising towards the east, bounded by established hedgerow boundaries and a railway line. A line of existing properties front the road which forms the western boundary of the site. Development of this site should conserve the characteristic topography. Given the relatively elevated position of the site, there is potential for over-dominance of the properties to the west. This could be avoided through adopting a suitably low density approach, and allowing for the integration of an area of open space to the west.

Representations:

Status – Comment
Site Ref - SHL037
Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes
Consultee Reference Number - 257

The Site neighbours existing employment use. Heavier industrial uses are located to the north west of the Site, and a proposed employment allocation is located to the west. No assessment has been provided by the Council to demonstrate that noise, odour, air or light pollution emitting from existing neighbouring uses will not lead to any adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of perspective residents. The proximity of these uses and surrounding area may result in viability and marketing issues. We do not consider the Site to be a suitable location for housing.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL037
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
A single point of access from Bank Lane or Middlefield (or both) may be considered sufficient if provided with an emergency vehicle access from either Bank Lane or Middlefield (if both are not delivered). Pedestrian links should be created with Bank Lane, Middlefield and Park Road.

Flood Comments - Site has some surface water concerns.

Landscape Comments - This site is located within Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (CLCGT) landscape type 7b – Drumlin Field. The CLCGT highlights the drumlin landform as a defining characteristic, and recommends that field boundaries are maintained and strengthened, and that development should be sited and aligned to complement the grain and form of the drumlins.

The site reflects the topography described by 7b. It is relatively self contained, rising towards the east, bounded by established hedgerow boundaries and a railway line. A line of existing properties front the road which forms the western boundary of the site.

Development of this site should conserve the characteristic topography. Given the relatively elevated position of the site, there is potential for over-dominance of the properties to the west. This could be avoided through adopting a suitably low density approach, and allowing for the integration of an area of open space to the west.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The site although close to employment uses it also adjacent to an established residential estate, the closest employment uses are not heavy industrial and include garage, car hire and dance studio. The Council therefore believes the site is suitable for residential development and that any adverse impact from the industrial uses further away on the western side of Park Road can be mitigated against through design and landscaping.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
# SHL047 North Central Clearance Area, Barrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL047 North Central Clearance Area, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 320355</th>
<th>Northing: 469395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 1.49</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing / 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Brownfield site within the urban boundaries. Former housing estate which has been cleared as part of Housing Market Renewal Scheme.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
This is a flat site, which is a former housing estate that has been cleared – low biodiversity value.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None

**Highways Comments:**
Developments with only a single point of access should be avoided as they segregate existing and new developments and do not provide for good walking and cycling connections. Misuse of these roads as through routes should be discouraged through the selection of alignments and features which will manage traffic speeds to less than 15mph. Pedestrian links should be created with Crellin Street, Marsh Street, Sutherland Street and Thompson Street.

Visibility – 2.4m x 33m
Land Ownership: Barrow Borough Council
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:** Surface water concerns as drainage would be through SHL010 site. Mitigation required.

**LLFA**
Some surface water concerns at Southern end of site. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere so southern end of site may be best left as open space. Possibly a SuDS basin/wetland.

Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
### Other Constraints:

Health and Safety Executive Nuclear

### Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Michael Barry  Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from any of the surrounding streets, or frontage properties onto the surrounding streets, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Crellin Street, Marsh Street, Sutherland Street and Thompson Street.

Flood Comments - Site has some surface water concerns to the southern part of the site bordering Sutherland place and Greengate Street.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

### Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The Council continues to promote this brownfield site close to the town centre for development. It is envisaged that development to the east of Arthur Street would enable the creation of an urban park providing a significant area of open space currently lacking in the area.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
**SHL059 Former Avon Garden Centre, Mill Lane, Walney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>318136</th>
<th>469265</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHL059 Former Avon Garden Centre, Mill Lane, Walney</td>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 0.88</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing / 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Previously developed site within the urban boundaries. Formerly a garden centre site requiring clearance.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** The site is currently located within Green Wedge and will provide a habitat for a variety of species in the bushes and body of water visible in the area.

**Impact on heritage assets:** A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**

A single point of access from Mill Lane, or frontage properties onto Mill Lane, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Mill Lane.

Visibility - 4.5m x 70m.
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

Surface water concerns as drainage would be through SHL010 site. Mitigation required. Consideration of discharge point will need to have regard to site SHL010. A master plan for drainage with a view to joining up the potential sites would be worthwhile. A SuDS basin within the SHL010 site could serve this site as a regional basin in a masterplan.

Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
There needs to be an integrated / joined-up approach to managing surface and wastewater if the sites in this area are to be developed. UU are not certain if the capacity issues in this area are principally related to surface water or sea water, therefore modelling is required to enable a better understanding of the system. UU have indicated that the pumping station at Vickerstown may require upgrading.

Other Constraints:

Health and Safety Executive Nuclear

Representations:

Status – Support
Site Ref - SHL059
Contact/Organisation Harry Tonge/ Steven Abbott Associates
Consultee Reference Number – 199

Steven Abbott Associates LLP is instructed by the owners the former Avon Garden Centre, Mill Lane, Walney, which is shown edged red on the enclosed location plan (Ref: SAA/2736/01). Part of the site is identified as a housing site in the Preferred Options document (Site Ref: SHL059).

The proposed allocation does not all of the previously developed land on the site. Including the full extent of the previously developed site would increase the site area to approximately 0.9 hectares. By including the site as a proposed allocation the Council has accepted that, in principle, this site is acceptable for housing. It is our view that it is logical to include the full extent of the previously developed site in the allocation to ensure that the most efficient and effective use is made of the land.

During the previous consultation exercise, no concerns were raised by Cumbria County Council in relation to highways. Comments were made about how drainage would be dealt with on the site. It is our view that a suitable drainage solution could be provided within the site. English Heritage commented that the site is adjacent to/in close proximity to the North Scale Conservation Area. This is incorrect; the closest Conservation Area to the site is the North Vickerstown Conservation Area. It is our view that the site could be developed without having a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area.

One objection was raised in relation to the proposed allocation of the site. The objection stated that the site should be retained as open space. As set out above, the site is a previously developed site with a number of buildings and areas of hard standing, and therefore is not currently open space. In summary, we support the inclusion of the site as an allocation for housing. It is our view that the whole of the previously developed site should be allocated.
A single point of access from Mill Lane, or frontage properties onto Mill Lane, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Mill Lane.

Flood Comments - Surface water concerns as drainage would be through SHL010 site. Mitigation required.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The site boundary has been amended in line with comments from the previous round of consultation to incorporate the full extent of ownership as requested.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance.

This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
### SHL061 Kwik Save Premises, Holker St, Barrow in Furness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL061 Kwik Save Premises, Holker St, Barrow in Furness</th>
<th>Easting: 319879  Northing: 469782</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 0.5</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing /22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Previously developed site located in the town centre of Barrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone: This site is located in Flood Zone 1.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong> Vacant retail unit and associated parking area – low biodiversity value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong> A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highways Comments:**

Developments with only a single point of access should be avoided as they segregate existing and new developments and do not provide for good walking and cycling connections. Misuse of these roads as through routes should be discouraged through the selection of alignments and features which will manage traffic speeds to less than 15mph. Alternatively frontage properties onto the surrounding streets may be considered sufficient.

Pedestrian links should be created with Holker Street, Dryden Street and Milton Street.

Visibility - 4.5m x 33m  
Land Ownership – Private Ownership  
Road Width 4.8m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

Some surface water concerns to the south of the site with the boundary of Dryden street. SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.

Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
Other Constraints:

Health and Safety Executive Nuclear

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from any of the surrounding streets, or frontage properties onto the surrounding streets, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Holker Street, Dryden Street and Milton Street.

Flood Comments - Some surface water concerns to the south of the site with the boundary of Dryden street.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
SHL068 Fields to rear of Croslands Park (Holly Croft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL068 Fields to rear of Croslands Park (Holly Croft)</th>
<th>Easting: 321265</th>
<th>Northing: 470867</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 1.45</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: Greenfield site within the urban boundaries.

Flood Zone: The site is located within Flood Zone 1.

Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):
This land is currently grassland and is bordered by a mature hedgerow. The site and hedgerow offer a wildlife corridor and are likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

Impact on heritage assets: None

Highways Comments:
The total number of units of the current estate road cannot be more than 50. The number of 28 should therefore be acceptable of the current road layout.

Land Ownership – Barrow Borough Council

Flooding & Drainage Comments:

LLFA
Some surface water concerns on site. Linear surface water feature runs through the middle of the site.

Linear surface water features may be unmapped watercourses. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up. These surface water features and any SuDS storage should be within a green corridor across the site.

Any work within the channel of a watercourse or near a Main River will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.

The site is close to a known flooding problem on Rating Lane which may be linked to the surface water feature. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to prevent excess run off and keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.

The site should be split up into subcatchments with control features for each subcatchment. Surface water
should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified in the surface water flooding map below.

Other Constraints:
None

Green Infrastructure:
Retain existing green links across site.

Representations:
Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Contact/Organisation L Wallis
Consultee Reference Number - 488

Objection to inclusion of fields to the rear of cross lands park, ref SHL068

I am writing to you with regards to the above proposed development which will require access through Stoneleigh close, Barrow.

My Objections are: Increasing the amount of traffic onto Rating lane can only be a bad thing; the road is very busy already especially at school times. Stoneleigh close is not wide enough to accommodate heavy goods vehicles access to this development; this is a huge safety risk for the public. The corner opposite number 10 Stoneleigh close is a very sharp one, which will not accommodate any large vehicles safely.

I am also aware that Cumbria Highways have commented on this proposal as a "non starter" yet still it appears to be going ahead. Also Chris Garner has stated that it should be retained as open space and is very surprised as am I that it still appears to be going ahead.

Please register my concern/objections

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Contact/Organisation K Cochrane
Consultee Reference Number - 448

I wish to register my objection to the proposed change of status for the green field land to the rear of Croslands Park for use as building land. This site has remained protected for very good reason. It offers a sanctuary for an abundance of wild life which has been allowed to thrive but in harmony with the many people who enjoy walking and using the land for free recreational purposes. Within the hedgerows lives many natural species of our English countryside. For those who know the area well a natural stream runs through this field supporting newt’s frogs and the watering of its many inhabitants who pass through for the very purpose of accessing fresh water.

Surely the Barrow Borough Council has a duty to develop as a priority the many brown field sites in and around Furness before destroying our ever shrinking green belt. Important also is the consideration of safety to the general neighbourhood caused by increasing volumes of road traffic coupled with the horrendous congestion.
caused at school term times. An additional junction onto Ratings Lane is an accident waiting to happen and I consider this a paramount reason also to objecting to any change of protected status and urge our elected representatives and our paid professionals to reject this land for housing development.

**Status - Objection**

**Site Ref - SHL068**

**Contact/Organisation** A MacCambridge

**Consultee Reference Number** - 455

Please register my objection to the inclusion of the fields at the rear of Croslands Park planning, Ref SHL068, being included in the local plan on the following grounds: Access to the proposed site will be via Stoneleigh Close. This road is narrow, having a sharp rise and two ninety degree bends in the first fifty metres. If a car or van is parked in the road any vehicle larger than a car has to mount the pavement to pass. Often visiting cars park partially on the pavement causing obstructions to pedestrians as the pavement is only on one side of the road.

There are two major schools and a large College on Rating Lane onto which Stoneleigh Close joins. This junction is already heavily congested at school starting and finishing times with parked cars, buses etc.... Rating Lane is a major artery for heavy lorries and commuting traffic, and with access to South Newbarns Primary school being only 400 metres further along Rating Lane any further increase in traffic will result in an unacceptable risk to pedestrians (school children) and road users. The land itself is a public amenity with an abundance of varied wildlife too numerous to list, and provides access to areas for exercise and play for all ages.

**Status - Objection**

**Site Ref - SHL068**

**Contact/Organisation** A Shuttleworth

**Consultee Reference Number** - 479

I write to you to in objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Croslands Park reference SHL068 being included in the local plan.

As a parent of a young family I am particularly concerned with the proposal as my children currently enjoy playing and exercising in this green open space. This is a safe and natural area away from any traffic. There is vibrant wildlife in this area and development on this site would cause unnecessary displacement of the aforementioned wildlife. Stoneleigh Close is a cul-de-sac at present and doesn’t experience any major access issues; this is due to there being a reasonable amount of dwellings on the close. However this would change dramatically should any development go ahead.

Foreseen problems include: Access during construction would be a disaster, heavy plant and large vehicles would be unable able to pass safely due to the road on Stoneleigh Close being so narrow. Presently once a week refuse collection can pose a struggle with the driver sometimes knocking on doors to ask for a car to be moved to be able navigate safely around Stoneleigh Close. This is just for a short period of time so although frustrating it is tolerable but one can only imagine the situation with a building site.

Access after the build of the proposed dwellings would also be a huge problem as adding another 54 dwellings would amount to approximately an extra 100 cars using Stoneleigh Close as access to and from Rating Lane. Rating Lane is already an extremely busy road with traffic and is frequented by many children walking to the three large schools, one being Chetwynde School which has recently increased in student numbers. Crossing the road for these children is problematic. Traffic would be backed up even further with vehicles trying to get on and off Rating Lane during peak hours. Add to that deliveries and visitors and it would become a major health & safety issue.

Hence my main reasons for objection are the preservation of a natural area and health & safety concerns. I see that there has now been a revised local plan - consultation draft and still wish to object to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Croslands Park reference SHL068 being included in the local plan. I see the numbers have been reduced to a proposal of 28 dwellings but I still see the same problems as explained in my previous email. Stoneleigh Close has limited access and any building work will still cause major disruptions & safety issues taking into account the narrow road and building onto a small cul-de-sac, add to that Rating Lane being an extremely busy road already. I object to any development on these fields regardless of numbers. Attempting to
only keep green areas will still disrupt the wildlife which was another of my concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Org.</td>
<td>I and D Wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Ref Number</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We wish to oppose the scheme to build 54 houses on the land mentioned above for the following reasons.

We believe the County Council have stated this scheme should be a non-starter due to the further congestion it will bring into an already congested area and this is a safety issue. There are three schools/colleges in the area and we feel that extra properties/traffic will cause an unacceptable risk to schoolchildren and local residents. The entrance to Stoneleigh close around school opening and closing times is used as on overflow for parents in cars waiting for children. The entrance is narrow and there is a blind bend which even now is particularly difficult to negotiate without adding a further potential one hundred cars or so to the problem. This could result in a tragic accident. As stated before Stoneleigh close is a narrow road which has two sharp blind bends very close to each other which makes it difficult to see cars coming in the other direction until the last minute.

I on several occasions have nearly collided with a car coming in the other direction. Increasing the traffic without addressing the access issues we believe would result in an unacceptable risk on an accident occurring. Large vehicles have difficulty accessing the close due to the tightness of the road especially if cars are parked on the road. This is particularly difficult in winter when the roads are icy due to the incline and bend in the road making it difficult to reach the required speed to negotiate this.

If the proposal were to go ahead then we believe there would be three years or so of heavy vehicles trying to negotiate these hazards, again another risk. We also believe a similar proposal for development of land at the top end of rating lane was rejected for similar reasons and so this proposal should be judged in the same way, as there is a far greater concentration of residential properties already present in the Stoneleigh close area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Org.</td>
<td>R Speers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Ref Number</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to register my objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Croslands Park- ref SHL068 being included in the local plan.

I am objecting to this based on the following: the site is protected as local amenity land and is used by walkers, joggers and for general recreational purposes for play and exercise. It provides a valuable recreational area for the community that should not be sacrificed. As a community we have already lost land at Thorncliffe School and Parkview school for development depleting further the green space in the area, the site is a habitat for wildlife. Herons, Bats, Woodpeckers, Pheasants foxes, badgers, newts, frogs and squirrels are amongst the many varieties of wildlife in the area.

The access to the site is from a busy road with 3 local schools in close vicinity. This will make the road more hazardous for school children. Cumbria Highways has already commented that this is not an acceptable site for development because of this.

For these reasons I object to the land being included in the proposed plans, it should be kept as local amenity land for use by all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Org.</td>
<td>E and P Tumelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Ref Number</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re designation of land use at the rear of Crosslands Park from public amenity to building land. As you can see from the above address I have a vested interest in the proposals presently under consideration by Barrow Borough Council.
While I might disagree with the proposals from a resident’s point of view, it is as my former role as Head of St Bernard’s Catholic School that I feel most strongly that this proposal for approximately 54 houses - meaning one hundred more cars - must be strongly opposed for the safety of the 2500 pupils of three schools who use Rating Lane in the morning and evening.

As a resident and Headteacher I have witnessed the traffic chaos that already snarls up Rating Lane with pupils, bikes and cars in a dangerous mix that leads to congestion and irate motorists. It was because of accidents to the pupils that the school worked with Barrow Borough Council to bring in road calming measures to slow cars and trucks down, and, while that helped the accident rate, there have been too many “close shaves” with pupils moving across Rating Lane in large groups across broad speed bumps that are perceived as crossings by the pupils, despite repeated warnings, with confused signals to motorists.

These calming measures were brought in when St Bernard’s was a third smaller and, while I do not have the figures for the Sixth Form, there has been a significant growth. Chetwynde school, as a Free School is also growing larger. That growth means more pupils being driven to school, more cars waiting at the end of the day and more Sixth Formers driving their own cars to college. It is a history of traffic growth on Rating Lane that already jeopardises the safety of the pupils: just envisage 2500 pupils on a wet dark morning, many on bikes, most crossing roads as cars stop to let pupils out or cars squeezing pass to get to work intolerant of the pupils who cross over speed bumps in front of them; add the buses which transport pupils from all over the Furness peninsula trying to move through the traffic and you will understand why I am so concerned by the proposal for additional houses and therefore traffic on Rating Lane.

The proposal will also require several years of heavy truck traffic on and off the site via Rating Lane as well as all the attendant trade vans visiting the building site. Stoneleigh Close is the proposed access route but it is too close to the entrance to St Bernard’s with its 1000 pupils. Stoneleigh Close has a narrow twisting entrance with two blind corners. It is frequently blocked in the morning and evening with parents dropping their children off or waiting for up to an hour to pick them up. Reversing off drives is already a hazardous affair because of traffic coming into Stoneleigh Close and cutting the blind corner. I have also witnessed cars nose to nose because of the above. The entrance was never designed for the additional cars that the proposal envisages. There are other personal reasons that I would not like to see the re designation to do with green spaces and the ready availability of lots of other building land created by the amalgamation of schools i.e. Parkview and Thorncliffe sites.

This land at the rear of Croslands is not needed and I do not see where the future expansion of Barrow is coming from that would require so much house building. However, the overriding objection to the proposal is on safety grounds for the 2500 pupils approximately who use Rating Lane every day. It is ludicrous to envisage adding substantially more traffic to a dangerous mix and, as someone who has had to deal with parents while their child is in hospital injured by a car on Rating Lane because of all of the above, I am not being alarmist but factual. Do not look at a lucrative site; look at the repercussions and the significant practical implications for the welfare of the young people of Barrow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>A C Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJECTION TO INCLUSION OF FIELDS TO REAR OF CROSLANDS PARK, REF SHL068 I wrote to the Planning Department during the initial consultation period stating my objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Croslands Park ref SHL068 being included in the local plan. I again restate my objection on the following basis:

Loss of public amenity place.
This site is currently protected as local amenity land and should remain so for the following reasons. It proves a very important area for walkers, joggers and general informal recreation, and provides a much needed area for children to exercise and play. The recent trend of selling off local land for development i.e. Parkview School and Thorncliffe Road School has depleted the area of such recreational spaces and it is important to continue to protect this one. It provides valuable green space to break up the large development areas that have taken place in the area around Rating Lane and Chetwyne School and allows a green corridor to remain around this development. The area provide very important habitat for a large number of varied wildlife, we regularly hear...
and see bats, owls, pheasants, squirrels, fox and badgers in the area and have a population of common newt’s, frogs and hedgehogs in our garden which migrate into and out of the green fields at the rear of Croslands Park. The loss of the green space is on direct contravention of your green policy. Access. The access to the site will be via Stoneleigh Close and will increase traffic in the already congested Rating Lane, which is the main access to three major schools and therefore increase the danger of the school users on the Highway. Cumbria Highways has commented that due to the above the site development is a ‘non-starter’ but despite that barrow Borough Council has still moved the site forward as a potential development site. This in my view constitutes to irresponsible behaviour by the Council.

Consultants. I note that Chris Garner, one of the most respected Planning Consultants in the area has commented that the site should be retained as open space and has further stated his surprise that despite the Cumbria County Council clear objection the site is being considered further.

I trust you will consider my objection when reconsidered the final local plan.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Consultee Reference Number - 458

I wish to oppose the scheme to build 54 houses in the field behind Stoneleigh Close for several reasons:

1. During term time there are about 2,000 students, aged between 11 and 18 years, attending 3 schools (St Bernards, Chetwynde and the 6 Form College). In the mornings between 8.30am and 9.15am and the afternoons between 3pm and 4.15pm there is extreme congestion in Rating Lane. This is due to the numerous cars, buses and pedestrians. Parents who bring their children to school are having to park in Stoneleigh Close. As Stoneleigh Close is a very narrow road with a sharp bend this poses a hazard to any driver. Also on one side of the road there is no pavement which means any pedestrian has to walk on the road at their peril.

2. Building 54 extra houses means that there will be even more cars using the road at peak times. There is difficulty now in two cars passing especially at the sharp bend and extreme caution has to be taken to avoid a collision.

3. Due to the narrowness of Stoneleigh Close it is impossible to do a U-turn. This is alleviated by the hammer head at the end of the cul de sac. Any large lorry or dustbin cart has to use this in order to turn around. The alternative is to reverse which is extremely dangerous especially around the sharp bend in the road. If this hammer head was removed, as presumably would happen if the road was lengthened, it would present grave difficulties.

4. Finally may I say that adding more houses to an already congested road is going, in all probability, cause a terrible accident. I have seen young children leaving school and rushing into Stoneleigh Close to reach their parents’ car. If the traffic increases they will be in great danger.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Consultee Reference Number - 459

I write to register my objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Croslands Park ref SHL068 being included in the local plan. My objection is on the following basis:

Loss of public amenity place: This site is currently protected as local amenity land and should remain so for the following reasons. It proves a very important area for walkers, joggers and general informal recreation, and provides a much needed area for children to exercise and play. The recent trend of selling off local land for development i.e. Parkview School and Thorncliffe Road School has depleted the area of such recreational spaces and it is important to continue to protect this one. It provides valuable green space to break up the large development areas that have taken place in the area around Rating Lane and Chetwynde School and allows a green corridor to remain around this development. The area provide very important habitat for a large number of varied wildlife, we regularly hear and see bats, owls, pheasants, squirrels, fox and badgers in
the area and have a population of common newt’s, frogs and hedgehogs in our garden which migrate into and out of the green fields at the rear of Croslands Park.

Access: The access to the site will be via Stoneleigh Close and will increase traffic in the already congested Rating Lane, which is the main access to three major schools and therefore increase the danger of the school users on the Highway. Cumbria Highways has commented that due to the above the site development is a ‘non-starter’ but despite that barrow Borough Council has still moved the site forward as a potential development site.

Consultants: I note that Chris Garner, one of the most respected Planning Consultants in the area has commented that the site should be retained as open space and has further stated his surprise that despite the Cumbria County Council clear objection the site is being considered further. I trust you will consider my objection when reconsidered the final local plan.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Contact/Organisation D and J Kirkham
Consultee Reference Number - 482

Barrow Borough Council Local Plan Objection to inclusion of fields to the rear of Croslands Park, (Holly Croft)
Ref: SHL068

I hereby wish to inform you that my wife and I strongly object to your proposal of using the land to the rear of Croslands Park as a new housing development. As residents of Stoneleigh Close, we are very aware that Rating Lane during term time is already extremely busy with traffic and large numbers of pupils as it is the main road to St. Bernard’s, The Sixth Form College and Chetwynde School.

The junction at the entrance to Stoneleigh Close off Rating Lane becomes hazardous as it is used by some car owners to park their cars when collecting pupils from school. If your proposal goes ahead it would mean a far greater number of cars accessing Rating Lane via Stoneleigh Close which would only add to the present situation of the junction.

Within the draft proposal of the Barrow Borough Council Local Plan, we have noted that comments from Cumbria County Council deem this to be a ‘Non-starter’- ‘very limited highway frontage provided from Stoneleigh Close, not sufficient to accommodate an additional 54 dwellings onto an already busy Rating Lane.’ Furthermore, this area is used as a public amenity place to both adults and children and is a valuable green space to local residents.

As members of Cumbria Wildlife Trust, we are also aware of the habitat the area provides for a wide variety of wildlife. It would be sad to lose this green area especially in view of the recent housing developments that have already taken place around Rating Lane.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Contact/Organisation S J Leitch
Consultee Reference Number - 489

Re: Barrow Borough Council local Plan Objection to inclusion of Fields To Rear of Croslands Park- Ref SHL068,

I am writing to convey my strong objection to the proposed new build of 54 houses in the field behind Stoneleigh Close for the following reasons:

1. Rating Lane is already a heavily congested road, particularly around 8.30am to 9.15am and 3.00pm to 4.15pm, as it supplies access and egress to three different schools and a College as well as people going to work. With the extra traffic from another 54 Dwellings I fear it would be Chaotic.

2. Stoneleigh Close is a very narrow road with an almost blind bend on it. The neighbours on the street know that care, patience and above all a slow speed is necessary when coming in or going out from the close. However visitors to the street do not always think of this and I have very nearly had people careering into me and having to swerve at the last minute when driving out of the close purely because they are driving too fast for the bends. This danger would multiply extensively with another 54 dwellings also using this access.
3. Any large lorry coming in or going out from the close restricts the movement of any other vehicle until the lorry is out onto Rating Lane. If the main access to the proposed building sight was to be through Stoneleigh Close with heavy vehicles coming and going frequently, then the close would be rendered unusable for the current occupants. This is completely unacceptable!

4. We have four young children and there are a number of other young children living on the close. The beauty of Stoneleigh Close being a cul-de-sac is that the kids can be out on the street and ride their bikes and play around in relative safety. This will be gone if the road is extended to cater for another 54 dwellings. I would therefore urge you to consider these objections when compiling the Final Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>N and H Jessiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objection to Barrow Council plan for housing to rear of Crosslands Park Ref: SHL068. We wish to make our objections for housing plan to the field at the rear of Crosslands Park.

Our main objection is the opening of Stoneleigh Close for access to the development. Rating Lane is already a congested road as it is the main access for two schools and one college. Over the last twenty years it has been an accident waiting to happen. To add to an increase in the congestion on this road would be totally irresponsible regarding the health and safety of hundreds possibly thousands of children and students. There are plenty of brownfield sites as well as the proposed Marina crying out for development in Barrow. Please do not add to an already overcrowded area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Dr and Mrs M Maalawy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re: SHL068 Barrow Borough Council Local Plan - field to rear of Crosslands Park. Further to your letter of 8th July regarding the proposed new Local Plan for Barrow.

The land mentioned to the rear of Crosslands Park was bequeathed to the Borough of Barrow many years ago for the recreation and enjoyment of the people of Barrow.

However, much of this land has already been built on. The field earmarked for further building of houses is a wild meadow and should remain as such as it provides habitat for a wide variety of flora and fauna, for children to play and walkers to enjoy.

Also the only access in or out of the site is via Stoneleigh Close which is narrow and inadequate to accommodate additional traffic from further housing.

We are very concerned as to the impact of yet more traffic in Rating Lane. There are four schools- Chetwynde, St. Bernard’s, 6th Form College and South Newbarns Infant & Junior. During term time Rating Lane creates considerable inconvenience and disruption for residents created by parked cars dropping off and collecting children, plus numerous school buses going up and down. Rating Lane is not a wide road and should ambulance, fire engine or police be needed in an emergency there is no way they could get through between Abbey Road and the Flas Lane/Harrel Lane roundabout as the traffic causes severe congestion and the consequences could be enormous. Cumbria County Council and Mr C. Gamer, Consultant, have spoken out about this proposed development being a non starter. We sincerely hope the Planning Committee will agree with this finding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>G Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I write to register my objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Crosslands Park ref SHL068 being included in the local plan. My objection is on the following basis:

Loss of public amenity place: This site is currently protected as local amenity land and should remain so for the
following reasons. It proves a very important area for walkers, joggers and general informal recreation, and provides a much needed area for children to exercise and play. The recent trend of selling off local land for development i.e. Parkview School and Thorncliffe Road School has depleted the area of such recreational spaces and it is important to continue to protect this one. It provides valuable green space to break up the large development areas that have taken place in the area around Rating Lane and Chetwynde School and allows a green corridor to remain around this development. The area provide very important habitat for a large number of varied wildlife, we regularly hear and see bats, owls, pheasants, squirrels, fox and badgers in the area and have a population of common newt’s, frogs and hedgehogs in our garden which migrate into and out of the green fields at the rear of Croslands Park.

Access: The access to the site will be via Stoneleigh Close and will increase traffic in the already congested Rating Lane, which is the main access to three major schools and therefore increase the danger of the school users on the Highway. Cumbria Highways has commented that due to the above the site development is a 'non-starter' but despite that barrow Borough Council has still moved the site forward as a potential development site.

Consultants: I note that Chris Garner, one of the most respected Planning Consultants in the area has commented that the site should be retained as open space and has further stated his surprise that despite the Cumbria County Council clear objection the site is being considered further.

I trust you will consider my objection when reconsidered the final local plan.
partly reflects an increased use of cars by people attending the Sixth Form College but is also attributable to the growth of housing developments in the area. I feel that further increasing the amount of housing off Rating Lane, and introducing an extended period of construction, will only exacerbate this problem.

Construction Density & Services: I am also concerned that the proposal to build 54 dwellings in the field is entirely unrealistic. Examination of the similar sized area currently built up around Stoneleigh Close and Wellbeck Close reveals around 35 houses in a comparable space. Increasing construction density by a factor of over 50% would seem unfeasible and likely to pose a challenge for local infrastructure and utilities. Given the fact that the population of Barrow has decreased over the last 15 years at the same time that a large amount of additional housing has been built around areas like Roose, with more proposed around the former Parkview and Thorncliffe school sites, I'm wondering if there is a clear demand for these additional dwellings? If so, I would have thought a policy of utilizing brown-field sites such as the area around Salthouse Mills would be far preferable to the further destruction of open green fields.

I am hopeful that you will take these reasonable concerns and objections into account when reconsidering the final local plan.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Contact/Organisation L Bowron
Consultee Reference Number - 500

REF: SHL068

I hope you will consider my comments below when compiling the Final Local Plan.

Firstly, in my opinion, Stoneleigh Close is too narrow a road to accommodate the traffic for an additional 54 houses. There is only one footpath leading up the road. A car cannot park on one side of the road and another directly opposite on the other side of the road. On many occasions, cars are "staggered" parking and even then; passing both cars can become difficult. There is also a sharp "turn" in the road, if a car travels down the road and there is another car travelling up the road at the same time, one car, may have to reverse in order to let the other pass. With young children in the street, this is obviously a safety issue. Traffic for an additional 54 houses being built on this road, would only cause further obstruction.

Secondly, Rating Lane is an extremely busy road. There are two schools and one college on Rating Lane, St Bernard's School, Chetwynde School and Barrow 6th Form College (which together accommodate over 2000 children). Often, during school times, it is very difficult to get onto and out of Stoneleigh Close as cars, waiting for children, are parked on the left and right of the entrance to Stoneleigh Close as well as opposite on Rating Lane. The traffic associated with more houses being built on Stoneleigh Close would cause further disruption and delays but more importantly a safety risk for the children crossing the road. I totally agree with the Cumbria County Council Highways comments to your department- "Non-starter, not sufficient to accommodate an additional 54 dwellings onto an already exceptionally busy Rating Lane"

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL068
Contact/Organisation Mr P A Frazer (1)
Consultee Reference Number - 501

Re: Barrow Borough Council Local Plan objection to inclusion of fields to rear of Croslands Park (Holly Croft)
Ref: SHL068.

I refer to your letter of 8th July 2015 regarding Barrow Borough Council Local Plan, Preferred Opinions Consultation Draft, June 2015, my comments are as follows: Rating Lane and the arterial roads feeding it, specifically Stoneleigh Close, are not capable of supporting such a development. This is very clearly endorsed by Cumbria County Council's Highways comments to your department: "Non-starter, not sufficient to accommodate an additional 54 dwellings onto an already exceptionally busy Rating Lane". It is the safety of over 2,000 children who attend Chetwynde School, St Bernard's School and the Sixth form College that is my main objection to the proposal. The Rating Lane traffic during term time is already extremely high and chaotic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Mr P Frazer(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


RE: Barrow Borough Council Local Plan Objection to inclusion of fields to rear of Croslands Park (Holly Croft)
Ref: SHL068. Further to my letter dated 17th August 2015, I understand the Barrow Borough Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Draft has been revised and the number of proposed dwellings has decreased from 54 to 28. Notwithstanding this I still maintain that the Cumbria County Council’s Highways comment to your department "non-starter, not sufficient to accommodate additional dwellings onto an already exceptionally busy Rating Lane" is completely relevant.

The safety of over 2,000 children who attend Chetwynde School, St Bernards School and the Sixth Form College would be compromised by adding even more traffic onto Rating Lane; which during term time is already high and chaotic. I trust my comments will be considered when compiling the Final Local Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Manderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I write to register my objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Croslands Park ref SHL068 being included in the local plan.

My objection is on the following basis:

Loss of public amenity place: This site is currently protected as local amenity land and should remain so for the following reasons. It proves a very important area for walkers, joggers and general informal recreation, and provides a much needed area for children to exercise and play. The recent trend of selling off local land for development i.e. Parkview School and Thorncliffe Road School has depleted the area of such recreational spaces and it is important to continue to protect this one. It provides valuable green space to break up the large development areas that have taken place in the area around Rating Lane and Chetwynde School and allows a green corridor to remain around this development. The area proVide very important habitat for a large number of varied wildlife, we regularly hear and see bats, owls, pheasants, squirrels, fox and badgers in the area and have a population of common newt’s, frogs and hedgehogs in our garden which migrate into and out of the green fields at the rear of Croslands Park.

Access: The access to the site will be via Stoneleigh Close and will increase traffic in the already congested Rating Lane, which is the main access to three major schools and therefore increase the danger of the school users on the Highway. Cumbria Highways has commented that due to the above the site development is a 'non-starter' but despite that barrow Borough Council has still moved the site forward as a potential development site.

Consultants: I note that Chris Garner, one of the most respected Planning Consultants in the area has commented that the site should be retained as open space and has further stated his surprise that despite the Cumbria County Council clear objection the site is being considered further. I trust you will consider my objection when reconsidered the final local plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Barton Willmore Story Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is unclear if access through Stoneleigh is sufficient to support the additional 28 dwellings proposed by this scheme. CCC identifies traffic issues on Rating Lane, with no alternative access. The Site is identified by local residents to fulfil a recreational role. The Site is not suitable for housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total number of units of the current estate road cannot be more than 50. The number of 28 should therefore be acceptable of the current road layout.

Flood Comments - Some surface water concerns on the site.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

### Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments, the high level of objections is noted. The proposal would result in the loss of a greenfield site. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation, biodiversity and quality of life is an important issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated.

The site is currently protected under Saved Policy D26, however as part of the development of the new Local Plan a review of all policies and allocations took place, this combined with changes in legislation has allowed the Council to assess sites as potential allocations which it may not have in the past as there is now less emphasis on the brownfield first approach. A number of playing fields and various open spaces exist in the vicinity of this site, others are well used and maintained, let for grazing and used for sports and are accessed by public footpaths. This field is rough tussocky grassland and whilst it will have some biodiversity value it is not, unlike other neighbouring fields, maintained and used for recreation and is not accessed by any public rights of way. It is also unsuitable for agricultural use. Furthermore the five adjacent fields and the play area owned by the Council comprising some 7 hectares will continue to be protected as open space.

The Highways Authority initially felt that access to the fields to the rear of Croslands Park was unattainable due to little direct frontage with the local highway network. The Council owns this site up to the frontage with the highway, therefore an updated assessment was carried out. The Council also reduced the potential number of dwellings to 28 in the Preferred Options Draft 2015 which is acceptable with the current road layout. The Council therefore considers that SHL068 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site.

Objections have been raised on the grounds of congestion, traffic and health and safety. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval.

The Council and Cumbria County Council have jointly commissioned a Transport Improvement Study (WSP 2016) for the Local Plan, this looks at the impacts of proposed developments on the existing road networks, including cumulative developments, and has highlighted where improvements are required. The study has not identified any requirements for the local network in the vicinity of SHL068 including Rating Lane.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to
A query has been raised regarding the extent of housing development required during the plan period. The Council has calculated the OAN and housing requirement for the Borough over the Plan period based on the most up-to-date evidence available, which are CLG 2012 household projections. These figures project a continued decline in the Borough’s population over the period 2012 to 2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to fall. This results in a projected growth of only 362 households between 2012 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 19 additional households. This figure is then adjusted upwards to take into account future employment growth, future housing vacancies, and second homes to reach a housing requirement figure, which in the Publication Draft Local Plan is 105 dwellings per year. Please see the Housing Land Statement 2016 for more information.
## SHL070a  Land to South of Abbey Meadow, Barrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL070a Land to South of Abbey Meadow, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 321731</th>
<th>Northing: 470007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 0.96</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing /26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site within the urban boundaries used for grazing.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
This land is currently used for grazing and is bordered by a mature hedgerow and trees. The site and hedgerow offer a wildlife corridor and are likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None.

**Highways Comments:**
A single point of access from Flass Lane may be considered sufficient. Points for future access should be preserved. Pedestrian links should be created with Flass Lane and the Furness Abbey to Flass Lane Greenway. The development should be set out as loop.

Visibility – 4.5m x 70m.
Land Ownership – Barrow Borough Council
Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:** Surface water issues for neighbouring site SHL070 strong consideration to mitigation due to main river flooding nearby.

**LLFA**
Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
Other Constraints:

Representations:

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL070a
Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes
Consultee Reference Number - 257

CCC identifies site as a “non-starter” due to highway safety issues. CCC considers the site to be too close to the junction of Friars Lane and Flass Lane to provide for suitable and safe access. The Site is not deliverable.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL070a
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from Flass Lane considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Flass Lane and the Furness Abbey to Flass Lane Greenway.

Flood Comments - Surface water issues for neighbouring site SHL070 strong consideration to mitigation due to main river flooding nearby.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The Highways Authority have reassessed the site at the Preferred Options Stage and now consider that access can be achieved on to Flass Lane.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
## SHL071 No. 11 smallholding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>SHL071 No. 11 smallholding</th>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>321733</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>470215</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size:</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield:</td>
<td>Housing /35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary:
Part Greenfield/ part previously developed site within the urban boundaries which includes the footprint of the smallholding building which has been demolished. A Development Brief has been produced as the Council intends to dispose of the site in the near future, and the site has outline planning permission for residential development.

### Flood Zone:
The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

### Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):
The site is just outside the Green Wedge, however having being vacant and taking into account the hedgerow and mature trees which border the area, it is likely to provide wildlife corridors and habitats for a variety of species.

### Impact on heritage assets:
None.

### Highways Comments:
A single point of access from Duchy Court is considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Duchy Court and Flass Lane and the Furness Abbey to Flass Lane Greenway.

- Visibility – 4.5m x 33m
- Land Ownership – Barrow Borough Council
- Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

### Flooding & Drainage Comments:
Surface water issues for neighbouring site SHL070 together with main river flooding nearby will require detailed consideration of required mitigation measures.

### LLFA
Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
Other Constraints:

None

Green Infrastructure:

Retention of existing green link and area of planting suitable for creation of landscaped focus for the development.

Representations:

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL071
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from Duchy Court may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Duchy Court and Flass Lane and the Furness Abbey to Flass Lane Greenway

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Comments noted.
# SHL082 Land East of Rakesmoor Lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL082 Land East of Rakesmoor Lane</th>
<th>Easting: 321112</th>
<th>Northing: 472963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 18.23</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site adjoining urban area. Currently used for grazing, adjoining uses include agriculture, football club and residential.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Currently used for grazing, bordered by a hedgerow and mature trees, which are likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None

**Highways Comments:**

Multiple access roads will be required along Rakesmoor Lane and access should be provided into the neighbouring estates. Future connections must be provided at all extremities of the site. The internal layout should also have good connectivity using loops and links but using road alignment and traffic calming measures to keep road speed down and avoid rat running. A Transport Assessment and Travel Plan would be required for any development exceeding 79 dwellings, with detailed traffic analysis for any development exceeding 30 two-way trips during the peak hours.

Consideration should be given to extending the 30mph speed limit for the entire of Rakesmoor Lane. Pedestrian links should be created with Rakesmoor Lane, Glenridding Drive and Breast Mill Beck Road.

Visibility – 4.5m x 215m needed to connect with Rakesmoor Lane with present 60mph limit. Reduces to 4.5m x 90m with 30mph speed limit.

**Land Ownership – Holker Estates**

Road Width - Rakesmoor Lane would need to be widened to 6.7m + footways to serve the development. The site is large enough that it may be served by a bus route so a key loop serving the extremities of the site should have a carriageway width of 6m with reductions on short sections for traffic calming measures.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

The size of this site means that it has great potential to adversely affect the hydrological regime of Dane Ghyll Beck and Mill Beck which already have known flood problems at various locations along their length to the sea.
Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS features need to be used to the maximum to ensure these watercourses maintain a natural hydrological response. Many parts of the site are at risk of surface water flooding particularly around the Ordinary Watercourses which are located across the site.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.

The site must be split up into multiple subcatchments with control features including SuDS basins/wetlands for each subcatchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. More than one runoff destination may be appropriate for this site.

We will object to any culverting or insensitive diversion of the ordinary watercourses. Crossings should be by way of clear span bridges. Any work within the channel of a watercourse will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission.

Any development must restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up. Linear surface water features may be unmapped watercourses. Watercourses, surface water features and SuDS should be within green corridors across the site.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.

---

**Other Constraints:**

This site lies in CLCGT landscape type 5c ‘Rolling Lowland’. The CLCGT identifies open, undulating topography, pastoral land use and hedgerows as characteristic. It notes that views are generally limited by the topography. The Vision for the area seeks to soften unsympathetic development edges, with peripheral development integrated within a stronger woodland landscape framework. The allocation is significant in size, although for the main part it is largely contained in a hollow on top of a broad plateau. It is well related to existing settlement form. The two northernmost fields however, occupy rising ground, rendering them more prominent, and poorly related to existing built form. Characteristic hedgerow boundaries run throughout the site. Other than these, there are no obvious particularly noteworthy site features. Given the relatively poor relationship of the aforementioned northernmost fields, from a landscape and visual perspective, it would be preferential if these could be deleted. Given the scale of the site, it is anticipated that a masterplan, incorporating an appropriate GI strategy will be prepared. Opportunities exist given the scale of the site, to
create linked communities, focussed around green spaces. Significant native planting, creating points of interest should be incorporated, further to creating a strong woodland landscape framework, as envisaged by the CLCGT.

BGS Radon Map.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status - Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation Christopher Garner Holker Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Broad Location is identified in Policy H3 – SHL082 Land East of Rakesmoor Lane with the suggestion that this site will contribute housing completions in the years 6 plus. The explanatory text (7.2.14) indicates that broad locations are larger areas that may not be available at present, but where there is a reasonable chance that housing development could be achieved within the Plan period.

The site is owned by the Holker Group and, for the avoidance of any doubt, can be made available sooner in the plan period. The site should be allocated for housing development to allow earlier housing completions. The site will provide for a very different market to Marina Village and Salthouse Mills and therefore provide housing choice and it provide more certainty over the delivery of housing to meet requirements.

The site as a whole is indicated as being 50.07ha but with a suggested net area of just 5.07ha and a suggested site capacity of just 107 dwellings. It is Holker’s view that their land holding has a significantly higher capacity and is able to accommodate several hundred houses, both within the plan period and beyond. It is considered that the planning authority should reconsider the capacity of this area and should identify a larger site for development in the short term. There will be a considerable amount of master planning, consultation and infrastructure works before any housing is delivered. It would be better to allocate the site now to ensure maximum delivery of housing completions in the plan period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Site is located in an area with high landscape sensitivity. Views from the site are available all the way to the Lake District. It is unclear how vehicular and pedestrian access will be taken from the Site. Rakesmoor Lane does not appear suitable to accommodate vehicle movements to support 107 dwellings without substantial highways works and hedgerow removal that may require third party land. The submission by the agent confirms that very little progress has been made in promoting the Site, meaning that it is unknown whether the Site is constrained. The Site is remote from most services and beyond a suitable walking distance. The nearest bus stop is 500m away. Delivery of the Site would promote car usage. We do not consider the Site to be suitable for housing at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from Rakesmoor Lane may be considered sufficient. Consideration should be given to extending the 30mph speed limit for the entire of Rakesmoor Lane. Pedestrian links should be created with Rakemoor Lane, Glenridding Drive and Breast Mill Beck Road.

Flood Comments No obvious discharge point for the site, so this there will be a need for detailed consideration.

Landscape Comments This site lies in CLCGT landscape type 5c ‘Rolling Lowland’. The CLCGT identifies open, undulating topography, pastoral land use and hedgerows as characteristic. It notes that views are generally limited by the topography. The Vision for the area seeks to soften unsympathetic development edges, with peripheral development integrated within a stronger woodland landscape framework.
The allocation is significant in size, although for the main part it is largely contained in a hollow on top of a broad plateau. It is well related to existing settlement form. The two northernmost fields however, occupy rising ground, rendering them more prominent, and poorly related to existing built form. Characteristic hedgerow boundaries run throughout the site. Other than these, there are no obvious particularly noteworthy site features. Given the relatively poor relationship of the aforementioned northernmost fields, from a landscape and visual perspective, it would be preferential if these could be deleted. Given the scale of the site, it is anticipated that a masterplan, incorporating an appropriate GI strategy will be prepared. Opportunities exist given the scale of the site, to create linked communities, focussed around green spaces. Significant native planting, creating points of interest should be incorporated, further to creating a strong woodland landscape framework, as envisaged by the CLCGT.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The site has been reduced in size to minimise impact on landscape character as a result of comments from Cumbria County Council, as the topography of the reduced site area would enable development to sit within the contours of the landscape thus reducing the visual impact of development.

This reduction has meant that the site is no longer considered a broad location and can be brought forward in the Plan period in line with the comments of the owner/promoter.
**SHL100a Land North of Westpoint House (western section), Solway Drive, Barrow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL100a Land North of Westpoint House (western section), Solway Drive, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 317531</th>
<th>Northing: 469794</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 1.67</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing /23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site within the urban boundaries between residential area and community woodland. A Draft Development Brief has been produced by the Council for this site. The site has potential for Extra-Care housing.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
This is a greenfield site and although no trees on site, it borders the green wedge and a woodland. The site is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
None.

**Highways Comments:**
Individual access frontages from Solway Drive could be considered sufficient but access for pedestrian desire lines and potential future development to the east must be preserved. Pedestrian links should be created with Solway Drive.

Visibility – 2.4m x 45m.
Land Ownership – Barrow Borough Council
Road Width – 4.8m + footways (may consider futureproofing with 5.5m width for connection to east).

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**
Some Surface water concerns at the north of the site and around the southern margins. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.

Surface water area to north may be ideal for a SuDS basin/wetland. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.
Other Constraints:

Health and Safety Executive Nuclear

Green Infrastructure:

Maintaining the setting around any development will be important in optimising the setting of the green wedge. The site boundary also includes an area to the north of the site which has issues with surface water, this area as suggested by the LLFA should be used as an area for Sustainable Drainage and as such is not available for development.

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL100a</td>
<td>Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not a sustainable site. Only a primary school and a bus is located within a reasonable walking distance. The Site’s development would promote car usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL100a</td>
<td>Contact/Organisation Michael Barry  Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from Solway Drive, or frontage properties onto Solway Drive, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Solway Drive.

Flood Comments - Surface water issues.

Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The site is considered to be in a sustainable location by the Council.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
### SHL101 Land South of Westpoint House, Solway Drive, Walney, Barrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL101 Land South of Westpoint House, Solway Drive, Walney, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 317742</th>
<th>Northing: 469531</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 1.33</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary: Greenfield site within the urban boundaries between residential area and community woodland. A Development Brief has been produced as the site is owned by the Council. The site has potential for Extra-Care housing. |

| Flood Zone: The site lies within Flood Zone 1. |

| Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site): This is a greenfield site and although no trees on site, it borders the green wedge and a woodland. The site is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species. |

| Impact on heritage assets: None. |

| Highways Comments: Individual access frontages from Solway Drive could be considered sufficient but access for pedestrian desire lines and potential future development to the east must be preserved. Pedestrian links should be created with Solway Drive. |

| Visibility – 2.4m x 45m. |

| Land Ownership – Barrow Borough Council |

| Road Width – 4.8m + footways (may consider futureproofing with 5.5m width for connection to east). |

| Flooding & Drainage Comments: LLFA |

| Some Surface water concerns at the north and middle of the site. Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. Surface water areas may be ideal for a SuDS basin/wetland. |

| Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below. |
Other Constraints:

Health and Safety Executive Nuclear

Representations:

Status – Comment
Site Ref - SHL101
Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes
Consultee Reference Number - 257

See comments above (SHL100a). Not a sustainable site. Only a primary school and a bus is located within a reasonable walking distance. The Site’s development would promote car usage.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL101
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from Solway Drive, or frontage properties onto Solway Drive, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Solway Drive.
Flood Comments - Some surface water concerns.
Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The site is considered to be a sustainable location by the Council.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
**Proposed Housing Site Assessments**  
**July 2016**

### SHL103 Land off Meadowlands Ave, Barrow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: SHL103 Land off Meadowlands Ave, Barrow</th>
<th>Easting: 321830</th>
<th>Northing: 470782</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Site Size:** 1.55  
**Use /Indicative Yield:** Housing/42

**Summary:** Greenfield site adjoining urban boundaries used for grazing.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**  
Site is currently used as agricultural land, trees and hedges border the site which could provide habitats.

**Impact on heritage assets:**  
None

**Highways Comments:**  
A single point of access from Meadowlands Avenue considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Meadowlands Avenue, The Rootings (adjacent) and the Furness Abbey to Flass Lane Greenway and future connections must be provided especially towards Tennyson Avenue.

Visibility – 4.5m x 45m.

Land Ownership – Private Ownership

Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**  
Large areas of the site are at risk of surface water flooding. These constraints will make this a difficult site to build on without increasing flood risk elsewhere. These surface water features should be left as green space, SuDS storage could be located within them.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.

The ultimate drainage destination needs to be resolved early as there is no obvious point of discharge. Consideration of discharge point will need to have regard to site SHL014. A master plan for drainage is needed, with a view to joining up the potential sites.

The site should be split up into subcatchments with control features for each subcatchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible. More than one runoff destination may be appropriate for this site.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.
Other Constraints:

Telecommunications mast adjacent to site.

Representations:

Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL103
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from Meadowlands Avenue may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Meadowlands Avenue, The Rootings (adjacent) and the Furness Abbey to Flass Lane Greenway.

Flood Comments - Some surface water concerns in the area.
Landscape Comment - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development permeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
Dalton-in-Furness
**REC10 Land to West of Crooklands Brow, Dalton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> REC10 Land to West of Crooklands Brow, Dalton</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 323627</th>
<th><strong>Northing:</strong> 474547</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 2.77</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site adjoining the urban boundaries.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** Agricultural land within the current Green Wedge, bordered by a hedgerow, which is likely to provide a habitat for various species.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None.

**Highways Comments:**

The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking and cycling. Accesses should be created with Crooklands Brow and Mouzell Bank and pedestrian/ cyclist accesses at multiple locations around the margins of the site. Future connections must be provided.

Visibility – Would need 4.5m x 90m to Crooklands Brow.
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

Connectivity: The development should be connected with its surroundings so that it increases the attractiveness of walking. Residential areas adjacent to each other should be well connected as should the development be internally. Road alignment and traffic calming measures should be used to keep road speed down below 20mph and avoid rat running. Similarly the option should be open to connect with any future development with at least one street extending to the edge of the site in each direction.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**
Surface water concerns.
The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
Large area of surface water flooding in middle of site is ideal for a SuDS basin/wetland.
Other Constraints:

Landscape - The northern part of the site lies within an area designated by the CLCGT as 3c ‘Disturbed Areas’. Key characteristics include: undulating glacial till; restored mine working landscape; patchy woodland cover, small areas of marsh, pond and reed beds; abandoned mine buildings, old limestone quarries and reclaimed agricultural land. The CLCGT notes that “This disturbed hummocky land is fast becoming naturalised and taking on a bosky appearance... commonly covered by a mixed native scrub of willow, alder, hawthorn, gorse, elder, bramble and rose”, going on to draw attention to the “…rich diversity of semi-natural habitats (which) forms a valuable wildlife refuge bounded by pasture or built up areas.” The CLCGT Vision for 3c is: “These areas will be conserved and enhanced to retain their industrial legacy and wildlife interest.” The site reflects the characteristics described in the CLCGT. The northern part of the site is relatively self-contained being flat and low lying, and surrounded by mature hedgerow. The southern part is more exposed, and is steeply sided, sloping downwards to the west. The site is visible in its entirety from the short section of footpath to the immediate north, and from various higher parts of the town to the south and west. The southern part is the more prominent. The industrial heritage of the area is reflected in the names of the dwellings which abut the southern part of the site – ‘Quarry Side’ and ‘Quarry Lodge’.

In wider landscape terms, the site is well related to the existing settlement, and could therefore be sensitively developed. Attention is drawn to the following:

- Existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees should be retained where possible. These provide screening for the site, and may provide valuable habitats.
- Consideration should be given to potential linkages to the existing residential area immediately to the west – for example to Mouzell Bank. Pedestrian accessibility through the site should form a key consideration. Opportunities should be taken to link to the sports ground to the east.
- The currently undeveloped bank, which forms the southern part of the site, allows for open views outwards towards the east for residents in properties adjacent to the site. This is particularly important given the densely developed character of this residential area. Any development on this slope should be of a suitably low density, in order to avoid creating an overbearing sense of enclosure for existing residents
- An approach to material use which closely reflects the heritage of the site would be welcome. As a former limestone quarrying area, the use of limestone on key frontage buildings would be appropriate. The site is widely visible – particularly the southern section, and as such would merit a high quality design approach.
- BGS Radon Map

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>REC10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Barton Willmore Story Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCC considers the Site to be a “non-starter” due to insufficient access and highway safety concerns. No evidence or material has been provided by the Council to demonstrate that these concerns have been, or can be, adequately addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from Crooklands Brow may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Crooklands Brow and Mouzell Bank.

Flood Comments - Surface water concerns.

Landscape Comments - The northern part of the site lies within an area designated by the CLCGT as 3c ‘Disturbed Areas’. Key characteristics include: undulating glacial till; restored mine working landscape; patchy woodland cover, small areas of marsh, pond and reed beds; abandoned mine buildings, old limestone quarries and reclaimed agricultural land.

The CLCGT notes that “This disturbed hummocky land is fast becoming naturalised and taking on a bosky appearance... commonly covered by a mixed native scrub of willow, alder, hawthorn, gorse, elder, bramble and rose”, going on to draw attention to the “....rich diversity of semi-natural habitats (which) forms a valuable wildlife refuge bounded by pasture or built up areas.” The CLCGT Vision for 3c is: “These areas will be conserved and enhanced to retain their industrial legacy and wildlife interest.” The site reflects the characteristics described in the CLCGT.

The northern part of the site is relatively self-contained – being flat and low lying, and surrounded by mature hedgerow. The southern part is more exposed, and is steeply sided, sloping downwards to the west. The site is visible in its entirety from the short section of footpath to the immediate north and from various higher parts of the town to the south and west. The southern part is the more prominent. The industrial heritage of the area is reflected in the names of the dwellings which abut the southern part of the site – ‘Quarry Side’ and ‘Quarry Lodge’. In wider landscape terms, the site is well related to the existing settlement, and could therefore be sensitively developed. Attention is drawn to the following • Existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees should be retained where possible. These provide screening for the site, and may provide valuable habitats.

Consideration should be given to potential linkages to the existing residential area immediately to the west – for example to Mouzell Bank. Pedestrian accessibility through the site should form a key consideration. Opportunities should be taken to link to the sports ground to the east.

The currently undeveloped bank, which forms the southern part of the site, allows for open views outwards towards the east for residents in properties adjacent to the site. This is particularly important given the densely developed character of this residential area. Any development on this slope should be of a suitably low density, in order to avoid creating an overbearing sense of enclosure for existing residents.

An approach to material use which closely reflects the heritage of the site would be welcome. As a former limestone quarrying area, the use of limestone on key frontage buildings would be appropriate. The site is widely visible – particularly the southern section, and as such would merit a high quality design approach.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council, United Utilities and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan, to ensure issues regarding surface water and highways are sufficiently addressed.

The Highways Department initially felt that access to the land west of Crooklands Brow was limited with regards to housing development. Further assessment has since concluded that a single point of access from Crooklands Brow is considered sufficient, therefore the Council considers that REC10 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site.

Comments regarding the use of traditional materials on key frontage buildings have been noted and can be addressed at the planning application stage.
### REC25a Land at Greenhills Farm, Dalton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> REC25a Land at Greenhills Farm, Dalton</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 323306</th>
<th><strong>Northing:</strong> 473127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 5.09</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site adjoining the urban boundaries. Currently used for grazing with small farm buildings to the South East corner of the site.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** Agricultural land within the Green Wedge. Bordered by a hedgerow, which is likely to provide a habitat for various species.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None

**Highways Comments:**

Access from Long Lane and at least one of Greystone Lane, Adgarley Way, Skelwith Drive, and Buttermere Drive. Residential areas adjacent to each other should be well connected. Consideration should be given to extending the 30mph speed limit on Long Lane if access is proposed here. Pedestrian links should be created with Long Lane, Greystone Lane and the footpath between Long Lane and Buttermere Drive.

Visibility – 4.5m x 215m to connect to existing 60mph Long Lane. Reduces to 4.5m x 90m if speed limit is 30mph.

**Land Ownership – Private Ownership**

**Road Width** - 5.5m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

Surface water concerns north east quarter of site. There is no obvious discharge meaning this will require early consideration.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. The north east quarter of site is likely to be an ideal location for a SuDS basin/wetland although this would need to be in addition to the pond that already exists there.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
UU need to review the sewers adjacent the Parkers Pond site as they are not in a good condition.

Other Constraints:

This site is located in CLCGT landscape type 7b ‘Drumlin Field’. The site reflects the characteristic drumlin landform. The northern part of the site is self contained, and well related to the existing settlement. Development of the southern part would create more of an obvious encroachment into the open countryside however. The south-western boundary, located at the top of a slope, and bounded by an established hedgerow, forms a natural boundary to the settlement in visual and topographical terms. This part of the site is clearly visible from the road adjacent Preferentially, this element of the allocation should be deleted. If this is not a suitable option however, it is suggested that adverse landscape and visual effects should be mitigated by focusing development close to the aforementioned boundary, introducing substantial native planting to the new boundary, and including an area of open space to the south east of the site. This could include a SUDS pond – which would be suitable given the landform, and which would reflect the character of the landscape to the immediate north.

BGS Radon Map

Mine Working Shafts, Tunnels, Veins

Representations:

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC25
Contact/Organisation - E and C Walker
Consultee Reference Number – 359

With regard to volume of traffic and road safety our concerns remain as detailed below. We also have concerns about flooding and adequate drainage. We have frequently had flooding in our garage and on our drive when there is heavy rain. We have had our drains checked professionally and there are no problems with those on our property. The problem appears to occur when the drains in the street cannot cope with the volume of water. We have tried to raise this with Barrow Borough Council, but the position of the drains does not match those detailed on the plans. We are therefore concerned that more houses would overload the drains on Newton Road.

We are now in receipt of the latest copy of the plan. We note that the issues we raised in relation to school places have been addressed. We would like to raise 2 issues in relation to the proposed plan to build house on 3 sites in Dalton-in-Furness, namely REC25, SHL102 and REC34.

Our first concern is regarding volume of traffic and road safety. There is already a high volume of traffic at the Long Lane/Newton Road crossroads particularly at peak times. We have lived at our current address for 27 years and are aware that a number of accidents have happened here, so much so that it has impacted on the sale of houses near to the crossroads. There are also a large number (we have counted 1 every 10 minutes at times) of heavy lorries travelling to and from Stainton Quarry, sometimes a great speed. There is not enough room for 2 vehicles to pass resulting in damage to hedges and verges. Additional traffic from site SHL102 would only add to these problems.

The second issue is school places. The nearest junior school to all 3 sites is Dalton St Marys Primary. As a governor I am aware that most classes are at capacity and in the past when the school has been
oversubscribed children living at the bottom of Stainton Drive have not been offered a place.

We ask that these issues are considered before the plan is taken further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - J and M Appleby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objection to the option to build homes on site REC 34 at Dalton-in-Furness. It is our belief that, wherever possible housing should be built on brownfield sites as a first option, not on greenfield sites and particularly not on this Green Wedge area. This would result in the loss of a large section of productive farmland and natural habitat along with affecting the outlook of a number of properties within the area.

We also wonder why it is deemed necessary to build this volume of new housing in Dalton when property within the area currently often takes many months, or years, to sell. Also any new housing would inevitably have a detrimental effect on current house prices in the area.

Should this proposal go ahead, it would considerably add to the volume of traffic using this busy Newton Road/Long Lane crossroads, particularly at peak times. This crossroads is already an accident blackspot and, despite previous attempts to make the junction safer, there are still frequent accidents. It should also be noted that large lorries from Stainton Quarry use Long Lane on a regular basis, sometimes up to 5 or 6 an hour, causing further dangers and, as it is not possible to pass them at certain points along the road, they often render the lane single track. We have witnessed the aftermath of many accidents both big and small over our 22 years of living in the area and feel certain that a greater number of collisions would occur due to the inevitable increase in traffic.

We are also concerned about schooling should new housing be built. Although there is a nearby primary school within Dalton, having had associations with the school for many years, we know that there have been a number of occasions when the school has been at full capacity and children have not been offered places, including children living at the bottom of Stainton Drive. On this basis children living in REC 34 may also not be able to attend this school causing parents to have to consider schools in other areas. This could further add to the traffic volume or jeopardise the safety of children walking to school.

Many of our above concerns could also be relevant to sites REC 25 and SHL 102. We ask that these issues are taken into consideration before this plan is taken further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - B Cooper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to submit my objection to the proposed building development on the above greenfield sight this development would have a detrimental effect on all residents in this area. Any access point around this field would cause grave danger to the road (lanes) users and pedestrians. The network of streets in the surrounding area is almost at breaking point now. More traffic in the area will cripple it altogether; most households have 2 and sometimes 3 vehicles. It is difficult negotiating between the cars and other vehicles double parked now. More housing will make things extremely dangerous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - Mr R Dixon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As residents of Dalton we are concerned specifically about the proposed changes with regards to the aforementioned sites, and would also question the assumptions that form the basis of the plan as a whole. Why are 2,000 new houses required to be built over the next 15 years?

The Draft Local Plan states that there is a requirement for 2,000 houses over the next 15 years. However, this appears to contradict other facts stated in the Plan, for example: 1.4.8 “The population of the Borough is predicted to decline over the Plan period”. Figure 4 shows a predicted decline to 65,000 by 2031. 3.2.2 “Information from the 2011 census indicates that......Barrow Borough Council has experienced the country’s greatest population decline, falling by 4% to 69,100” “CLG 2012 household Figures project a continued
decrease in the Borough’s population over the period 2011 – 2013. This results in projected growth of only 249 households between 2011 and 2031.” The remainder of section 7.1 then seems to contradict 7.1.7. It therefore remains very unclear as to how the higher number of houses required has been arrived at. The Plan acknowledges that it is difficult to assess what increase may be required to take into account economic growth, primarily at BAE Systems, and of course it would be beneficial for the Borough if such economic growth did occur, but this still does not explain the need for a further 2,000 houses.

Traffic Problems
There are already significant traffic issues in Dalton particularly with Long Lane and Newton Road. The crossroads junction is a dangerous junction with a number of serious incidents occurring and many minor ones. There are already a number of problems with the lorry traffic from Stainton Quarry. Newton Road is also problematic – relatively narrow with many parked cars and end up being single file along much of its route already. Additional development can only make these problems worse.

Flood Risk
There is currently flood risk associated with site REC34. This area is known to flood and severe flooding has previously affected houses along Newton Road. Long Lane also floods regularly. Development at this site is likely to make things worse.

Local Amenities
There is concern about the amenities in Dalton. The nearest school to all three sites, Dalton St Mary’s is understood to be full already and we understand that children living on Stainton Drive have been refused places in the past. This means that children may well have to travel to schools further afield, which of course they will need to driven to. In addition, there will shortly only be one doctors surgery in Dalton. Previous Planning Applications Have Been Refused As you will be aware previous planning applications in the vicinity of site REC34 have been refused previously and the fact that these developments would affect the countryside setting / Green Wedge was a factor. The removal of Green Wedge status from these three sites of course removes that objection from a technical perspective but the benefits of these sites remaining as Green Wedge and for the good of the environment, wildlife and the quality of life of the community still remains and we do not believe that this status should be removed. In summary, we therefore would question:
The overall need for the number of new houses in the Plan.
The need to remove Green Wedge status from sites rather than focus on brownfield sites.
The justification for the removal of Green Wedge status specifically from sites SHL096, REC34 and REC25.
The suitability of SHL096, REC34 and REC25 as development sites.

Status - Comment
Site Ref - REC25
Contact/Organisation David Stewart Abbeyfield Furness Extra Care Society Ltd
Consultee Reference Number - 439

I am writing to record our concerns over the possible impact of the draft conclusions of the Local Plan on the Staveley House Care Home in Dalton in Furness. As you may be aware the Home is owned by Abbeyfield Furness Extra Care Society Ltd and provides accommodation for 38 [soon to be 40] frail elderly Residents many of whom also suffer from early stage dementia. In addition to the high quality care provided a major attraction for the Residents is the quiet rural setting with the majority of rooms having views over the tarn [Parker’s Pond] and the adjoining field. The birdlife resident on the pond and the farm animals in the field provide continuous entertainment for those living in the Home.

Any change in the usage of the strip of land in front of the Home adjoining the tarn such as if it became even a pedestrian shortcut to Dalton would be particularly serious. In addition the one area on our site remaining available for future developments is at the far end from the road and would require at least temporary access for contractors via the land adjoining the tarn and corner of the field. This was granted by the owner of the land for the construction of the Bechshaw Wing which opened in 2006.

For these reasons we are concerned about any changes which may affect our Residents or limit future developments at the Home. Our understanding of the current plans for this area, after raising questions at two of your Consultation Sessions, is that new building on the land in front of the Home, identified as REC25 and
Proposed Housing Site Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation – M Richards and D Berry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections and concerns to the housing development at Stainton Drive Dalton:
1. Heavy traffic using Long Lane, accidents on a weekly basis and even a number of fatalities over the years.
2. Drainage issues a problem in the area old drainage systems being used to tap into new builds/extensions etc. There is a constant problem with flooding at Parkers Pond at the very top of Greystone Lane and in winter months this road is closed for several weeks at a time.
3. Wildlife issues hedgerows along the boundary will be knocked down having an impact on wildlife on a large greenbelt of land. (Which I have now been informed is a brown belt of land) could you please tell me when this was changed and who changed it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from Long Lane or Greystone Lane (or both) may be considered sufficient. Consideration should be given to extending the 30mph speed limit on Long Lane if access is proposed here. Pedestrian links should be created with Long Lane, Greystone Lane and the footpath between Long Lane and Buttermere Drive.

Flood Comments - Surface water concerns north east corner of site. There is no obvious discharge meaning this will require further consideration.

Landscape Comment - This site is located in CLCGT landscape type 7b 'Drumlin Field'. The site reflects the characteristic drumlin landform. The northern part of the site is self contained, and well related to the existing settlement. Development of the southern part would create more of an obvious encroachment into the open countryside however. The south-western boundary, located at the top of a slope, and bounded by an established hedgerow, forms a natural boundary to the settlement in visual and topographical terms. This part of the site is clearly visible from the road adjacent.

Preferentially, this element of the allocation should be deleted. If this is not a suitable option however, it is suggested that adverse landscape and visual effects should be mitigated by focusing development close to the aforementioned boundary, introducing substantial native planting to the new boundary, and including an area of open space to the south east of the site. This could include a SUDS pond – which would be suitable given the landform, and which would reflect the character of the landscape to the immediate north.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Petition from local residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref – REC25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact E M Colver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A petition was received by the Council with approximately 400 signatures. The accompanying letter replicated in full the comments relating to REC34 (page 96). The Council is not required to respond to each individual signatory. Please see site response below.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments, the level of objections is noted. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural/grazing land. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation, biodiversity and quality of life is an important issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated. The Council have reduced the site size to take into...
account the contours of the site, the water body adjacent to the site and the comments received from residents/consultees. The amended site boundary incorporates a small part of REC44, and as such is now referenced REC25a.

As part of the development of the new Local Plan a review of all policies and allocations took place, this combined with changes in legislation has allowed the Council to assess sites as potential allocations which it may not have in the past. There is now less emphasis on the brownfield first approach, and although the Council will continue to promote and allocate brownfield sites for development none have been proposed in Dalton.

Existing sites and allocations which remain undeveloped will be taken forward in the Local Plan where the owner/promoter has demonstrated they remain deliverable within the Plan period. The new Plan will be regularly reviewed and those which are not progressing within the timeframe will be removed.

The Council considers that the site remains in a sustainable location despite a recent loss of some services/facilities in Dalton.

Objections have been raised on the grounds of congestion, traffic and the busy Long Lane/Newton Road crossroads. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval. It is considered that access could be satisfactorily achieved and that REC25a appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system

A query has been raised regarding the extent of housing development required during the plan period. The Council has calculated the OAN and housing requirement for the Borough over the Plan period based on the most up-to-date evidence available, which are CLG 2012 household projections. These figures project a continued decline in the Borough’s population over the period 2012 to 2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to fall. This results in a projected growth of only 362 households between 2012 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 19 additional households. This figure is then adjusted upwards to take into account future employment growth, future housing vacancies, and second homes to reach a housing requirement figure, which in the Publication Draft Local Plan is 105 dwellings per year. Please see the Housing Land Statement 2016 for more information.

The Education Authority have indicated that between the four schools in the Dalton there are likely to be sufficient spaces available to accommodate the potential increase in primary pupil numbers. Dalton lies in the secondary catchment area of Dowdales School. It is likely that there will be pressure on places in the future at Dowdales School given the cumulative effect of housing development in the area.
**REC34 Site at junction of Long Lane and Newton Road, Dalton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC34 Site at junction of Long Lane and Newton Road, Dalton</th>
<th>Easting: 322583</th>
<th>Northing: 473026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.68</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Greenfield site within the Green Wedge within the urban boundaries Prominent gateway site into Dalton from the South.</td>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong> This site lies within Flood Zone 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong> The site is within the Green Wedge and is bordered by a hedgerow and mature trees, therefore it is likely to provide wildlife corridors and habitats for a variety of species.</td>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong> None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways Comments:</strong> Access from Long Lane and Newton Road could be provided using road alignment and traffic calming measures to keep road speed down to below 15mph and avoid rat running. Pedestrian links should be created with Long Lane and Newton Road, as well as links to Abbey Road. Visibility – 4.5m x 90m. Land Ownership – Private Ownership Road Width – 4.8m + footways.</td>
<td><strong>Flooding &amp; Drainage Comments:</strong> <strong>LLFA:</strong> UU Discharge concerns if this is to be provided to the north of the site as there is a known flooding problem in this direction. There may be an unmapped culverted watercourse on the site. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.

Some surface water flooding in the middle of the site. These surface water features and any SuDS storage should be within a green corridor across the site.

UU
UU propose to run the Newton Road site through a model in order to identify the potential impact of the development of the site on the sewer network.
UU stated that the flooding that took place in the Newton Road area in Dalton in 2012 was a 1:617 year flood event, and that sewers are only designed for a 1:30 year flood event (which normally suffices for most situations). Although it was a significant storm event, UU believe that the flooding was an isolated case.

Other Constraints:
BGS Radon Map

Representations:
Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation T Kneale
Consultee Reference Number - 460

I have been informed that there are plans to build new Housing on Newton Road (Crompton Drive) and Newton Road (near to junction with Long Lane. My House was flooded 3 Years ago due to insufficient drainage. As far as I am aware no improvements have been carried out to improve this. Additional Housing can only add to the poor drainage. I believe this site had poor drainage before our House was built. I have still not been advised who was to blame for the construction of these Houses on a known “flooding” area. Was it the builders, United Utilities or the Council for approving the plans? or are all jointly responsible? I believe the proposed builders of these new Homes are the builders responsible for the building of my Home. I will strongly oppose any new Building until it can be proved that the drainage has been improved not only to improve our drainage but also any future new housing to be built.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation - E and C Walker
Consultee Reference Number - 359

With regard to volume of traffic and road safety our concerns remain as detailed below.

We also have concerns about flooding and adequate drainage. We have frequently had flooding in our garage.
and on our drive when there is heavy rain. We have had our drains checked professionally and there are no problems with those on our property. The problem appears to occur when the drains in the street cannot cope with the volume of water. We have tried to raise this with Barrow Borough Council but the position of the drains does not match those detailed on the plans. We are therefore concerned that more houses would overload the drains on Newton Road. We are now in receipt of the latest copy of the plan.

We note that the issues we raised in relation to school places have been addressed.

We would like to raise 2 issues in relation to the proposed plan to build house on 3 sites in Dalton-in-Furness, namely REC25, SHL102 and REC34.

Our first concern is regarding volume of traffic and road safety. There is already a high volume of traffic at the Long Lane/Newton Road crossroads particularly at peak times. We have lived at our current address for 27 years and are aware that a number of accidents have happened here, so much so that it has impacted on the sale of houses near to the crossroads. There are also a large number (we have counted 1 every 10 minutes at times) of heavy lorries travelling to and from Stainton Quarry, sometimes a great speed. There is not enough room for 2 vehicles to pass resulting in damage to hedges and verges. Additional traffic from site SHL102 would only add to these problems.

The second issue is school places. The nearest junior school to all 3 sites is Dalton St Marys Primary. As a governor I am aware that most classes are at capacity and in the past when the school has been oversubscribed children living at the bottom of Stainton Drive have not been offered a place. We ask that these issues are considered before the plan is taken further.

**Status**  
**Objection**

**Site Ref** - REC34  
**Contact/Organisation** - M and D Winlow  
**Consultee Reference Number** - 444

We are emailing our concerns re the above and would like to point out a few issues that are of concern to us.

1. The crossroads at Newton Road/Long Lane has, for many years, been a blackspot for accidents. There are cars coming in four directions, some at times, speeding along Long Lane, having to stop suddenly. This has led to the corner house on Newton Road having to have walls rebuilt when traffic has veered off the road on to the property.
2. Access on to the proposed site? There are two bus stops close to the field on Newton Road making access to the site dangerous and difficult. Long Lane is very narrow and cannot accommodate traffic turning several times each day. We have witnessed residents living on Long Lane struggling at times, to turn their cars on to their properties. This has been due to the constant traffic flow coming from both directions along Long Lane.  
3. There is H.G.V.s travelling with heavy loads daily along Long Lane from Stainton quarry.  
4. Can the sewage system accommodate more properties? As you are probably aware, there were major problems when houses were built at the top of Crompton Drive leading to major repairs.  
5. We assume surveys have been completed with regard to the mine workings in the area.  
6. It is our understanding the proposed plans are on Green belt land. We hope you take into account what we have mentioned; we look forward to reading the reports regarding these issues.

**Status**  
**Objection**

**Site Ref** - REC34  
**Contact/Organisation** - J and M Appleby  
**Consultee Reference Number** - 447

Objection to the option to build homes on site REC 34 – Dalton-in-Furness

We have various issues we would like to raise relating to the preferred option proposal to consider building new homes on site REC 34 at Dalton-in-Furness. It is our belief that, wherever possible housing should be built on brownfield sites as a first option, not on greenfield sites and particularly not on this Green Wedge area. This would result in the loss of a large section of productive farmland and natural habitat along with affecting the outlook of a number of properties within the area.

We also wonder why it is deemed necessary to build this volume of new housing in Dalton when property
within the area currently often takes many months, or years, to sell. Also any new housing would inevitably have a detrimental effect on current house prices in the area.

Should this proposal go ahead, it would considerably add to the volume of traffic using this busy Newton Road/Long Lane crossroads, particularly at peak times. This crossroads is already an accident blackspot and, despite previous attempts to make the junction safer, there are still frequent accidents. It should also be noted that large lorries from Stainton Quarry use Long Lane on a regular basis, sometimes up to 5 or 6 an hour, causing further dangers and, as it is not possible to pass them at certain points along the road, they often render the lane single track.

We have witnessed the aftermath of many accidents both big and small over our 22 years of living in the area and feel certain that a greater number of collisions would occur due to the inevitable increase in traffic.

We are also concerned about schooling should new housing be built. Although there is a nearby primary school within Dalton, having had associations with the school for many years, we know that there have been a number of occasions when the school has been at full capacity and children have not been offered places, including children living at the bottom of Stainton Drive. On this basis children living in REC 34 may also not be able to attend this school causing parents to have to consider schools in other areas. This could further add to the traffic volume or jeopardise the safety of children walking to school.

Many of our above concerns could also be relevant to sites REC 25 and SHL 102.

We ask that these issues are taken into consideration before this plan is taken further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>REC34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>G Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am a resident of Schoolwaters on Newton Road and feel strongly opposed to the building plans that would run adjacent to my property. I moved here due to the semi rural aspect of living surrounded by fields which give beautiful views. I fear the development will overlook my garden which runs along side the planned build site therefore stealing my privacy and views. I am also concerned about flooding risks and the impact the build would have on ground drainage and flooding of my land.

Also a few years ago my husband and I enquired about planning permission on our land (for a bungalow as I have chronic illness and disability that makes stairs painful and difficult) but were told it is part of the separation land that divides Dalton from Barrow, however your proposed build of 24 properties would be much more imposing on the green belt area.

Further more, I am deeply concerned about the impact on wildlife habitats; I know the fields are home to hedgehogs, foxes, shrews and voles to name a few as I have had multiple visits from them up to my back door.

Please consider all these issues and don't hesitate to contact me to discuss further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>REC34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>D Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have made aware of the potential development of a field bordering Newton Road & Long Lane, Dalton. If this proposal continues I would question firstly the volume of traffic, the added danger to the crossroad and the lack of privacy to all the houses on Scales Close. Please confirm if there are any pending applications in this vicinity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>REC34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>J Stoker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We live at Green Lane, Dalton and have for nearly three years now. This house we now own was once my grandparents’ house and is where my father, aunt and uncle grew up and where I spent many happy times as a child. We have concerns about the potential development of the field that is located on the opposite side of our hedge and the possible 11 dwellings that may be built.
Firstly, and I apologise if this seems selfish, we moved to this house as it was down a quiet lane near to the town centre and close to Barrow but also was quiet, peaceful, picturesque and not too heavily built up. This was the life we chose for us to raise our family and spend our lives. We have concerns that any further development will result in numerous repercussions for us.

These include but are not limited to loss of privacy, the property may devalue as its location will be less attractive and we also have concerns about increased sound and light pollution along with whether the drainage in the area will be able to cope.

Also more seriously will be the increased risk to our children and other children currently living in the area. We more often than not when returning home drive up Cemetery Hill and then turn right on to Green Lane driving to our house past the Newton Pub. This is a single track road and does get already a surprising amount of traffic and more dwellings will lead to more vehicles that may lead to more coming and going of new homeowners and visiting friends and families and that surely will be an accident waiting to happen.

Also travelling to our house via Barnes Avenue is also often busy and has many children running around. Parking is not great and often people park half on pavement etc. or on the road so more properties with more cars will make the situation worse. The field provides a too scarce a sight these days of a field to add some green beauty to a nearby residential area. It provides homes for numerous wildlife and the thought of losing this for all the aforementioned reasons plus too many more to mention seems a great shame and would be a poorly thought out plan.

We would like to keep in the loop at all times regarding any new developments surrounding this plan relating to our immediate area.

---

As residents of Dalton we are concerned specifically about the proposed changes with regards to the aforementioned sites, and would also question the assumptions that form the basis of the plan as a whole.

Why are 2,000 new houses required to be built over the next 15 years? The Draft Local Plan states that there is a requirement for 2,000 houses over the next 15 years. However, this appears to contradict other facts stated in the Plan, for example: 1.4.8 "The population of the Borough is predicted to decline over the Plan period". Figure 4 shows a predicted decline to 65,000 by 2031. 3.2.2 "Information from the 2011 census indicates that......Barrow Borough Council has experienced the country’s greatest population decline, falling by 4% to 69,100” “CLG 2012 household Figures project a continued decrease in the Borough’s population over the period 2011 – 2013. This results in projected growth of only 249 households between 2011 and 2031.” The remainder of section 7.1 then seems to contradict 7.1.7. It therefore remains very unclear as to how the higher number of houses required has been arrived at. The Plan acknowledges that it is difficult to assess what increase may be required to take into account economic growth, primarily at BAE Systems, and of course it would be beneficial for the Borough if such economic growth did occur, but this still does not explain the need for a further 2,000 houses.

Policy S7 (Page 45) highlights the fact that “Barrow Borough has suffered in the past from housing sites which have been allocated but developers have been reluctant to develop the site, in fact some allocations are yet to be built out over 15 years after allocation.”

Why are Greenfield Sites being proposed? You will be aware of the Government’s Planning Update in March 2015 which states the importance of brownfield sites and the importance attached to the safeguarding of green belt land to prevent urban sprawl. The proposed removal of these three sites in Dalton in Furness, SHL096, REC34 and REC25 from the green wedge is unsatisfactory.

Once this land is developed, then this green environment will be lost forever. This is a wildlife rich area with a diverse range of wildlife – some of which is under threat nationally - which will be negatively affected by any development. Can not brownfield sites and sites already allocated for development such as highlighted in
Policy S7 be built on first, rather than the permanent removal of green belt land? We strongly object to the arbitrary removal of green belt / wedge status from this land.

Traffic Problems
There are already significant traffic issues in Dalton particularly with Long Lane and Newton Road. The crossroads junction is a dangerous junction with a number of serious incidents occurring and many minor ones. There are already a number of problems with the lorry traffic from Stainton Quarry. Newton Road is also problematic – relatively narrow with many parked cars and end up being single file along much of its route already. Additional development can only make these problems worse.

Flood Risk
There is currently flood risk associated with site REC34. This area is known to flood and severe flooding has previously affected houses along Newton Road. Long Lane also floods regularly. Development at this site is likely to make things worse.

Local Amenities
There is concern about the amenities in Dalton. The nearest school to all three sites, Dalton St Mary’s is understood to be full already and we understand that children living on Stainton Drive have been refused places in the past. This means that children may well have to travel to schools further afield, which of course they will need to driven to. In addition, there will shortly only be one doctor’s surgery in Dalton.

As you will be aware previous planning applications in the vicinity of site REC34 have been refused previously and the fact that these developments would affect the countryside setting / Green Wedge was a factor. The removal of Green Wedge status from these three sites of course removes that objection from a technical perspective but the benefits of these sites remaining as Green Wedge and for the good of the environment, wildlife and the quality of life of the community still remains and we do not believe that this status should be removed. In summary, we therefore would question: The overall need for the number of new houses in the Plan. The need to remove Green Wedge status from sites rather than focus on brownfield sites. The justification for the removal of Green Wedge status specifically from sites SHL096, REC34 and REC25. The suitability of SHL096, REC34 and REC25 as development sites.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation  P and D Helme
Consultee Reference Number - 485

We would like to object to the above proposed development for 24 new houses. We have lived at our property (Long Lane House) for over 10 years and have seen Long Lane become much busier with large quarry trucks main bus route and increasing numbers of cars from the main housing estate - this has resulted in more serious accidents at the junction of Newton crossroads. Anyone observing traffic from that crossroad down Newton road towards Dalton will see many cars parked on the road / pavement on both sides restricting the traffic flow to nearly single file or standstill at busy times , any increase in housing will only see this problem increase.

The whole area is known to flood and the drain backing up is a constant problem. Is this area not a 'Greenfield site ' we observe lots of different wild life in these fields including hedgehogs , badgers , foxes and a family of 5 pheasants this year who where nesting in one of the hedges which would be disappearing with this development.

These fields act as a wild life haven between the three busy roads, Mill Brow, Newton Road and Long Lane. It is also a main walk for many Dalton residents who enjoy the nearby country side and green fields. Why do we need another housing estate in this area , there are hundreds of houses for sale in the evening mail and there seems to be plenty of development already underway on Thorncliffe road , Rating lane next to Furness college and the Arlington house site on Abbey road. If this proposed development does go ahead I would want the names of the persons who had approved it as it will be their responsibility when accidents / traffic and sewerage / flooding become a problem - someone has to be held responsible for bad decisions.

One final comment would be that we are really upset how quiet this has been kept and that we have not been informed of this proposal by the council - we heard of it from our neighbours.
Regarding the comments in the Evening Mail 27/8/2015.
I would like to comment on the article in the EM regarding the fields at Long Lane, Newton Road. I have lived at School Waters for 12 years and during that time I never saw or heard anyone speak about foxes, badges etc in those fields. If there were any of these animals there, I think they would move to the surrounding fields when the site was used for houses. Regarding road congestion, I think there is ample room to widen the road surrounding the fields. Also at the top of Mill Brow.

I should be grateful if you could look into the following concerns I have following the recent discovery that Barrow Borough Council have a preferred option for a local plan (June 2015 ) to initially build 24 dwelling houses on two green sites - Long Lane/Newton Road, Dalton in Furness. In view of this matter I have several queries and concerns as follows;

Why has no public announcement been made about these preferred housing developments? For example, the council could have provided a half page announcement in the local paper to inform the general public of the proposals. However, the only information I have seen was a tiny paragraph in the local paper - plus information that was hidden away in the Council website and I only found that after requesting further information from a member of staff in the planning dept. Are there nationally recommended guidelines for informing the general public about local developments and displays for information?

Recently, I attended a "consultation display" at the Drill Hall in Dalton which gave people in attendance the chance to see the preferred options draft local plan. The Local councillor, Mr Murray - rather than took any notice of opinion referred to this proposal as a good thing for Dalton so people could live and work here - traveling to BAE in Barrow and Glaxo in Ulverston - and also Sellafield on West coast of Cumbria! He did not take any notice of anyone’s opinions and concerns - just referred to this proposal as a good thing for Dalton so people could live here (where is the employment?) whilst travelling to BAE in Barrow - Glaxo in Ulverston and he also mentioned Sellafield on the West coast of Cumbria! Could you explain how this refers to the residents of Dalton in Furness?

When asked about new industrial buildings in Dalton for local employment Councillor Murray said there was nothing proposed - in other words there will be no local employment to encourage people to purchase a new property here - does this make sense? Councillor Murray indicated that this local plan was probably going to go ahead and objections should have been made known to him before now. He indicated that further information could be seen in the front window of his home - even though nobody knows where he lives in Dalton and he doesn’t appear to be on the council website?

Reasons for Objections
Road infrastructure during the working week is already at breaking point with the number of accidents at the Long lane / Newton Road crossroads. There is an enormous amount of traffic during the working week - both on Newton Road heading to and from the large estate on the South side of Dalton which already exists. In addition to this, Long Lane has to be approached by the crossroads where quarried rock (from Stainton Quarry) is taken every day to the docks and, on most days of the week, there are up to 100 wagon loads routinely using the narrow country lanes daily many of them going at an inappropriate speed (they are obviously on bonuses).

The local Primary School, St Mary’s in Coronation Drive, has up to 35 children per class - 30 being the recommended maximum - does this mean Dalton will therefore require a new build school to accommodate the children from the incoming families buying new houses?
In this area, the drains and sewerage are already stretched to the limit with Long Lane regularly flooding and Newton Road unable to cope with any access water especially during heavy rain fall.
A hedge which is at least 300 years old would have to be torn up which, in turn, would affect the various wild animals which abound in this area - including badgers and foxes. In addition to this, at least 36 types of birds have been recorded. Has the impact on the animals and birds ever been considered and assessed by the appropriate wildlife nature trust? Newton Road / Long Lane have two rural hay meadows - once a development of a minimum of 24 properties have been built the remaining fractured area would no longer be a viable area for farming - therefore it would be left to degenerate into a scrub area until it then became an eyesore thus leading to a total development of the two fields with up to 79 properties covering the entire fields - this option was initially outlined and requested by the proposed builder.

Alternatives
The area at the end of School Waters Terrace / opposite the semi-detached dormer bungalows along Newton Rd has had planning for a single house development refused twice - on various grounds one excuse being the area is a green wedge. Surely, this type of proposal would be much more acceptable then the development of two open fields? I am sure many smaller developments are available if land owners were made aware of the new Government planning rules e.g. by providing public announcements in the local papers/advertising in the free papers. It is reputed that there are 17 brown field sites in the Barrow area - how many homes are to be developed in these areas? If not why not? Surely Conservative Legislation would prefer to see this developed before open green field sites are needlessly destroyed?

The local estate agents have approximately 1000 homes for sale - many of which are struggling to sell does this mean that more houses have to be pulled down in Barrow for "regeneration" where lumps of land will remain empty for generations to come i.e. Marsh Street/Sutherland Street. Has the Council considered the possible impact on the medieval building remains and artefacts lying in the green site fields from an earlier period which have been discovered by local metal detectors? Records could be destroyed without a full exploration of these sites. Historically too, they must be of significant interest to local historians. In view of all of the above concerns I ask the Council to reconsider its proposals and await your reply.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation P Garside
Consultee Reference Number - 446

Local plan options Attachments: DSCN2175.JPG
I would like to lodge my opposition to your plans generally in the Dalton area and specifically the Newton Road plan. My objections in general are -
1) We are hardly geared up for an increase in development when we have seen the closure of both the local police station AND fire station.
2) Local schools are struggling as it is with local residents telling me that 35 pupils per class not unusual. (the recommended number being 30)
Objections specifically to Newton Road site -
3) Yet another road leading off Newton Road to the proposed site would create an unacceptable risk to road users and pedestrians alike.
4) The sewage/drains system could not take the extra load placed upon it. I include a photograph of a situation we had a couple of years ago - it was taken during a particularly bad thunderstorm but flooding along this road takes place regularly during much lighter rainfalls.
5) The fields on this "preferred site" include an ancient hedgerow that is the habitat of many species of animals and birds and I would expect that a report would be undertaken by the council in conjunction with wildlife conservancy to ascertain the impact of such a development.
I look forward to your comments.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation E M Colver
Consultee Reference Number - 424

1. Why does Barrow Borough Council claim that 2000+ NEW houses are required over the next 15 years.
2. There are already thousands of properties for sale in the Borough, of all types, in all areas and at all prices. These are currently taking anything up to a year or more to sell. How can the market cope with additional
3. Re Table 8 of the Local Plan What is meant by 'Future Vacancies' and why has 3% been added? Why has a further 2.8% been added for '2nd homes'? Why has the 229 dwellings (for which a grant has been received to renovate properties on Barrow Island) not been deducted? bearing in mind that: a) "Barrow Borough has experienced the country's greatest population decline, falling by 4% to 69,100 (Office for National Statistics).” Local Plan 3.2.2 b) "CLG2012 household figures project a continued decrease in the Borough's population over the period 2011-2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to decline. This results in projected growth of only 249 households between 2011 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 17 additional households." Local Plan 7.1.7 c) "The Housing Land Statement indicates that there were 1717 vacant properties in the Borough at the end of March 2015. SHMA recommends that the Council should continue to consider identifying reasons why properties are empty and to identify mechanisms for bringing them back into use." local Plan 7.1.5 d) Whilst there is evidence of expansion within BAE and Glaxo, the majority of these additional workers to the area are going to be (as now) contract workers requiring short term rental or B&B accommodation- NOT PERMANENT HOUSING. e) "Whilst the NPPF (National Planning Practice Framework) seeks to boost the national housing supply, it also recognises that there isn’t a 'one size fits all' method to achieve this and that each local planning authority must carefully assess local circumstances and need in order to develop an appropriate and sustainable strategy for the area." local Plan Key Facts- Housing

4. Why is Barrow Borough Council proposing to build on greenfield sites in preference to brownfield sites? a) Barrow Borough Council CLAIMS (under Part 3. Development Strategy of the new Local Plan) that their aim is: "To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations." How does this statement conform with their removal of land from greenfield/green wedge category whenever it is convenient to them? b) The Government’s Planning Update March 2015 states: "We are clear that brownfield land that is suitable for housing has a vital role to play in meeting the need for new homes and have challenged local authorities to have local Development Orders in place on more than 90% of brownfield land suitable for new homes by 2020. We have agreed funding for those local authorities who successfully bid for funding to help deliver 200,000 new homes on brownfield sites across the country. These councils will deliver Local Development Orders for housing on brownfield land which will help to speed up the delivery of housing on these sites." c) The same Update states: "The government continues to attach great importance to safeguarding the green belt. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence." d) Once Greenfield sites are developed, they are lost forever. Additionally, once a site has been partially developed, a precedent has been set. Further planning applications will inevitably follow, and the Council will have no grounds to refuse. e) Our Greenfield/green wedge land is home to diverse and, in many cases, rare and endangered animals and birds. REc34 (the crossroads at Newton Road/Long Lane) is part of a wildlife corridor and a hedge which is at least 200 years old will be torn out if the plans for housing go ahead- with a loss of habitat for all these various species. This area is a haven for hedgehogs and, it is believed, natterjack toads which are critically endangered. Has Barrow Borough Council commissioned a survey by Cumbria Wildlife Trust before further destroying our wildlife’s habitat?

5. Why is Barrow Borough Council not FIRST developing the housing sites which have already been allocated but which the developers have failed to develop? Are these sites included in the Preferred Options and, if not, why not? Where these sites and how many houses are were proposed? Why are the developers dictating to the Council what sites they will and will not use? a) Policy 57 (P45) of the Local Plan states 11Barrow Borough has suffered in the past from housing sites which have been allocated but developers have been reluctant to develop the sites, in fact some allocations are yet to be built out over 15 years after allocation." b) The 2014-15 Operation of the NPP Framework states reBuilt Out Periods: 11 If councils have clearly identified substantial amounts of housing in their plans, it is unfair that their communities should be left exposed to speculative development first because these sites will take longer than 5 yrs to deliver."

6. Why have previous applications for planning permission to build a single dwelling been refused, while a development of 24 houses is now being looked upon favourably? ie a) In 2012, plans were submitted for one detached house on land adjacent to Schoolwaters with vehicular access to Newton Road (within metres of the proposed Preferred Options site REc34). This was refused on the grounds: “The proposed dwelling would represent unsustainable development and encroachment into a designated Green Wedge.” However, this has not stopped BBC from proposing the site now for the building of 24 dwellings.  b) In 2006, it should be noted
that planning permission was also refused for the same site on the grounds: “The proposed dwelling would represent a new development in a countryside setting contrary to the BBC Local Plan Review 1996.

7. How is the Council intending to justify its approval for development on these Preferred Options sites bearing in mind its Policy S2 (p32) of the Local Plan ie: “Proposals will be required to meet ALL of the following criteria (a-k)”? eg. Criterion b) “Improving road safety and reducing congestion”. The crossroads at Long Lane and Newton Road are a renowned accident blackspot. According to Cumbria Police Traffic Division statistics, in the past 9 years there have been 10 separate incidents involving vehicle collisions either at the crossroads or within a short distance of them. These are only the accidents in which there were casualties and where the police were involved. Of the 10 incidents reported to the Police, 3 were classed as ‘serious’. Traffic in this area is already a big problem with a constant stream of lorries going to and from the quarry and travelling at speeds of well over 40mph up and down Long Lane. Parts of Long Lane are not wide enough to take a car and a lorry passing each other.

On Newton Road, congestion is severe, with extremely poor visibility due to parked cars down one side of the road. When a bus is passing, all traffic coming in the opposite direction has to come to a standstill as there is no room for a bus and a car and a parked car. Crompton Drive also has a problem already with congestion. The road is extremely steep and narrow and there is only access at one end. There are cars parked at the verges which again mean there is only room for one car to pass. A further development of (initially) 11 houses therefore, a possible further 22 cars would only increase the problem.

eg. Criterion c) (Improving access to necessary services, facilities and infrastructure” ie The nearest junior school for both sites, Dalton St Mary’s, is currently at capacity. In the past, when the school has been oversubscribed, children from Stainton Drive have not been offered a place. There will be only one doctor’s surgery in Dalton, once the Nelson St practice closes in September.

eg. Criterion k) “Ensuring that the proposed development mitigates against the impacts of climate change by the incorporation of energy and water efficiency measures and steering development away from areas at flood risk.” REC34 is an area known to flood. Water from Schoolwaters Terrace drains on to these fields with long lane often being flooded. In addition the drainage system along Newton Road is already completely inadequate, even when there is no heavy rain, with United Utilities being called out 2-3 times p/year to clean out the drains. Any heavy rainfall results in flooding within hours. Several houses along Newton Road and Barnes Avenue have been flooded up to a depth of 3 feet; the householders have been unable to return to their house for 6 months and cannot now get insurance. One house on Newton Rd is currently being investigated for subsidence due to the drainage system. Site REC34 currently acts as (in effect) a flood plain and building on this site will put an impossible strain on the current inadequate drainage system. SHI096, Crompton Drive- these fields are known to be flood sites and United Utilities have already been called out to deal with flooding issues and drainage problems surrounding the three new-build bungalows built within the last 18 months at the top of the road.

I would refer you to the letter from Jill Stannard, Chief Executive of Cumbria County Council to Councillor Doughty, dated 4 October 2012, following the floods of 2012, in which she states: (The majority of the drainage system in the Dalton area is a combined system which carries both surface water as well as sewage. Therefore any changes to increase the capacity of the overall system will require a coordinated approach by both Cumbria County Council and United Utilities, with funding coming from both parties.... The primary issue is that of the existing drainage systems to deal with the levels of water being experienced. These levels are greater now due to a number of reasons- increased development, hardening of grassed areas and ever greater levels of water use, and therefore discharge. It is not possible to simply increase the capacity of an existing system as further development occurs, not least because of the immense cost that this would incur, but also because of the disruption this would have on the road network.”

8. Why has Barrow Borough Council failed so demonstrably to inform the public of its Local Plan and its proposals for Preferred Options’ sites? You state you want to find out people’s opinions on the policies and sites within the Preferred Options but the lack of publicity about your plans is a disgrace. Whilst it is true the Plan is available to view online, in libraries and at the Town Hall, this is only of use if people know it is there to view. The consultation drop-ins, again, can only be attended if residents know about them -most did not. Even now, at the end of the consultation period, the vast majority of Dalton residents are unaware of the plans. It
has been left to the residents themselves to spread the word as best they can. The Council has done virtually nothing to ensure that everyone who is interested in the future of their town can participate- is this a deliberate ploy to try and minimise the number of objections you receive?

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation Mr R Thwaites
Consultee Reference Number - 441

I am writing with reference to the proposed building of 24 family homes in the field adjacent to Schoolwaters on Newton Road and Long Lane in Dalton-in-Furness. Ref REC34

My objections are as follows:- The lack of schooling and amenities for families, which has always been an ever increasing issue with the expansion of housing in the area.

But more importantly, during the 30 years I have lived in this property, I have witnessed a significant increase in the amount of traffic. As the existing estate (opposite the proposed site) has expanded and the only main access point is Stainton Drive/Newton Road, I feel this has been a contributing factor. Therefore a new development would only exacerbate these problems. This is not only due to an increase in more homes being built but also families owning more than one car. It is a well-known fact to the Highways Department and locals that the crossroads at Long Lane/Newton Road is an accident blackspot. To propose to construct another junction within 100 metres of this and also opposite the Stainton Drive junction would increase the risk of further incidents. Add to this the existing bus stops in the locality of the proposed junction, together with vehicles parked on the same side of the highway at Schoolwaters, I believe this will have major implications to visibility for vehicles exiting the site. I have also witnessed on numerous occasions, traffic at speed in this locality from various directions.

I feel that to have yet another junction (from the proposed site) in the area would contribute to more potential incidents. I noted that recently a speed monitoring programme was carried out and this would, I am sure, confirm my observations.

In summary the infrastructure of the area is in no way capable of supporting an increase in additional housing/traffic.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC34
Contact/Organisation R and V Davies
Consultee Reference Number - 442

Proposed Development, 24 Houses, Bottom Stainton Drive, Off Newton Road, Dalton in Furness, Cumbria

I wish to offer my objections to the proposed housing development, as above.

My first objection is to the proposed entrance to the site, which I am led to believe is to be situated at the junction of Newton Road, and Stainton Drive, which is already a busy stretch of road, and is also in close proximity to two public bus stops. There are also a large number of private vehicles which park on Newton Road close to the proposed entrance, which would increase the motoring problems that the increase in traffic would bring to the location.

The proposed entrance to the site is also in close proximity to a busy and dangerous road junction, between Long Lane and Newton Road, which already has a record for numerous road traffic accidents. It has been intimated that an alternative entrance to the proposed site, could be directly onto Long Lane, however in my opinion this would be even more dangerous, as it would have to be positioned onto Long Lane, at the bottom of a raised stretch of road, with traffic approaching from over the brow of a hill.

My second concern is regarding flooding problems, which have been prevalent on Newton Road from time to time. Could drains cope with the extra demands that they would be placed under? There is already a pumping station situated on Newton Road, and this has not been able to prevent homes, which border the proposed site, from being flooded in the recent past.
There are also concerns that sewerage facilities would not be adequate, or able to cope with the extra demands in this location, as the area is already heavily populated with residential housing. In my opinion, this proposed development, on a green site, would bring no improvements to the area, and would be detrimental to the local community. Would you please add our names to any mailing lists, regarding the above?

**Status - Comment**  
**Site Ref - REC34**  
**Contact/Organisation B Miller**  
**Consultee Reference Number - 487**

Possible Development on Greenfield Area Newton Rd/Long Lane. Dalton. In the event of building development on the above land, however small wonder if any consideration has been given to the extra demand there would be on the already inadequate sewerage drainage system? During 2012 flooding occurred in Newton Road and Barnes Avenue leaving many homes with sewerage in homes to a level of 2 to 3 feet and being uninhabitable for over six month. This owing to the system unable to cope with the demands of the extra level of water. I refer to a letter from Jill Stanard, Cumbria County Council Chief Executive. The relevant points regarding the inadequate system I have highlighted for your convenience.

This letter supports the fact that further development would be and unwise move until considerable cost and work was carried out to improve the present system. I therefore feel further thought should be given at this stage before any moves are taken to carry out development work. I would be grateful of your comments on this matter.

**Status - Objection**  
**Site Ref - REC34**  
**Contact/Organisation M Richards and D Berry**  
**Consultee Reference Number - 499**

Objections and concerns to the housing development at Newton Road/Long Lane Dalton

1. Heavy traffic using Long Lane, accidents on a weekly basis and even a number of fatalities over the years. If access is given via Newton Road there is already a problem with bad congestion in this area at times at Schoolwaters due to residents parking outside their property and busses passing every 20 minutes where traffic can not pass both ways.

2. Drainage issues a problem in the area especially at 45 Barnes Avenue, old drainage systems being used to tap into new builds/extensions etc.

3. Wildlife issues hedgerows along the boundary will be knocked down having an impact on wildlife on a large greenbelt of land. I have now been told this is a brown belt of land could you please tell me when this happened and who authorised it?

4. Our property will probably lose most value as a lot of money has been put into maximising the views which are fantastic and at the moment our outlook is of green fields and on a clear day we can see the sea and even Wales (the place not the mammals) we feel it is our “human rights” that we bought this property with this in mind to give us peace and tranquillity but if the build goes ahead this will cause us a great deal of stress and will be a blight on our landscape, the price of the property will be lowered even maybe taking us into negative equity and we would expect to be compensated should the plans go ahead we may have to take this matter to the Court of Human Rights.

**Status - Objection**  
**Site Ref - REC34**  
**Contact/Organisation Mr and Mrs Stilling**  
**Consultee Reference Number - 530**

We have lived at this house since 1966 and are aware of the faults with the drains example flooding in 2012 when our neighbours houses just 2 doors away from ours were flooded. Our house had the drive, gardens and patio flooded and the water was within half an inch of flooding our property. We object to the green field site to be used for more housing and the junction at the end of Newton Road is suitable and dangerous without adding more houses. Also the drainage is currently inadequate and the local junior school is at full capacity.
I just wanted to drop you a quick email to register my opposition to the potential development plans/earmarking of the Newton Road fields for future development.

One area of concern is the number of serious accidents the crossroads at the end of Newton Road/Long Lane. I’ve included links to a couple of Evening Mail stories from the past few months as an example. I feel further development in this area would lead to additional incidents at an already dangerous junction.

http://www.nwemail.co.uk/News/Dalton/----Casualties-released-from-hospital-after-Dalton-smash----38e13aba-914d-4b7d-b056-51c7ee2b5c6d-ds

http://www.nwemail.co.uk/News/Barrow/Police-appeal-after-Dalton-crash-31824d09-aa36-451b-94b3-2fb77576a6db-ds

Newton Road is already very congested with parked cars (often double parked) and when double decker buses are added into the mix, it makes negotiating the road very difficult at times. Further development would make this situation worse unless steps were taken to address the parking situation (enforced double yellow lines?)

I’m not sure if you’re aware, but there is a dip in the road Long Lane, just before Newton Road, which always floods if there is significant rainfall. I’m concerned that further residential development would contribute further to this, and the road would become impassable following rainfall.

From a personal point of view, it would be disappointing for a green field site to be developed when there are other brown field options in the borough.

A single point of access from Long Lane or Newton Road (or both) may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Long Lane and Newton Road, as well as links to Abbey Road. Flood Comments Discharge concerns if this is to be provided to the north of the site.

Landscape Comment. No comment.

A petition was received by the Council with approximately 400 signatures. The accompanying letter replicated in full the comments of EM Colver (ID 424 above). The Council is not required to respond to each individual signatory. Please see site response below.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments, the high level of objections is noted. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural/grazing land. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation, biodiversity and quality of life is an important issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated. The Council have reduced the site boundary to take into account the contours of the site and comments received from residents.

The site is currently part of the Green Wedge (Saved Policy D4) and as such has been protected from development in previous Local Plans, this has meant that planning applications have been refused in the past. As part of the development of the new Local Plan a review of all policies and allocations took place, this combined with changes in legislation has allowed the Council to assess sites as potential allocations which it may not have in the past. There is now less emphasis on the brownfield first approach, and although the Council will continue to promote and allocate brownfield sites for development none have been proposed in Dalton.
Existing sites and allocations which remain undeveloped will be taken forward in the Local Plan where the owner/promoter has demonstrated they remain deliverable within the Plan period. The new Plan will be regularly reviewed and those which are not progressing within the timeframe will be removed.

The Council considers that the site remains in a sustainable location despite a recent loss of some services/facilities in Dalton.

Objections have been raised on the grounds of congestion, traffic and the busy Long Lane/Newton Road crossroads. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval. It is considered that access could be satisfactorily achieved and that REC34 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site.

The Council and Cumbria County Council have jointly commissioned a Transport Improvement Study (WSP 2016) for the Local Plan, this looks at the impacts of proposed developments on the existing road networks, including cumulative developments, and has highlighted where improvements are required. A number of improvements have been suggested in Dalton and these include works to the junction of Long Lane and Newton Road with a roundabout being the preferred solution.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.

The Council have liaised with United Utilities regarding the nature and risk of historic flooding and failure of the sewage network in the vicinity of the site. UU stated that the flooding that took place in the Newton Road area in Dalton in 2012 was a 1:617 year flood event, and that sewers are only designed for a 1:30 year flood event (which normally suffices for most situations). Although it was a significant storm event, UU believe that the flooding was an isolated case. They are also aware that the sewers in the local area are of poor construction and new sewers/drains for this development would be required to meet higher standards than when the surrounding properties were constructed.

A query has been raised regarding the extent of housing development required during the plan period. The Council has calculated the OAN and housing requirement for the Borough over the Plan period based on the most up-to-date evidence available, which are CLG 2012 household projections. These figures project a continued decline in the Borough’s population over the period 2012 to 2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to fall. This results in a projected growth of only 362 households between 2012 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 19 additional households. This figure is then adjusted upwards to take into account future employment growth, future housing vacancies, and second homes to reach a housing requirement figure, which in the Publication Draft Local Plan is 105 dwellings per year. Please see the Housing Land Statement 2016 for more information.
The Education Authority have indicated that between the four schools in the Dalton there are likely to be sufficient spaces available to accommodate the potential increase in primary pupil numbers. Dalton lies in the secondary catchment area of Dowdales School. It is likely that there will be pressure on places in the future at Dowdales School given the cumulative effect of housing development in the area.

In relation to points raised regarding the Council failing to inform the public about selected sites for potential housing development, the Council has undertaken a number of consultations, throughout the development of the new Local Plan, in line with the Regulations set out in The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Council’s own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Methods have included sending out letters and emails, press releases, advertisements, publishing data on the Council’s website, public drop in sessions and making the documents available at public locations around the Borough, including in Dalton. This process is ongoing. The Council will endeavour to consult as widely as resources and timescales allow and in response to a suggestion at the last consultation site notices are being displayed on proposed development sites in the Publication Draft.

Dalton with Newton Town Council are a statutory consultee on the Local Plan and are in the process of producing a Community Led Parish Plan, which is hoped to be finalised in 2016. In addition, all Borough Councillors, including those for Dalton are informed of the consultations we undertake and production of the Local Plan.
### REC43 Land East of Greystone Lane, Dalton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> REC43 Land East of Greystone Lane, Dalton</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 323495  <strong>Northing:</strong> 473346</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.66</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Greenfield site adjoining the urban boundaries. Adjacent using include grazing and residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong> The site lies within Flood Zone 1.</td>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong></td>
<td>This is a greenfield site with a hedgerow bordering the site which is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong> None</td>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Highways Comments:

A single point of access from Greystone Lane considered sufficient. Access from Long Lane and Newton Road could be provided using road alignment and traffic calming measures to keep road speed down to below 15mph and avoid rat running. Pedestrian links should be created with Long Lane and Newton Road, as well as links to Abbey Road.

Visibility – 4.5m x 90m.
Land Ownership – Private Ownership.
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

#### Flooding & Drainage Comments:

**LLFA**

UU Discharge concerns if this is to be provided to the north of the site as there is a known flooding problem in this direction.

There may be an unmapped culverted watercourse on the site. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.

Some surface water flooding in the middle of the site. These surface water features and any SuDS storage should be within a green corridor across the site.
UU need to review the sewers adjacent the Parkers Pond site as they are not in a good condition.

Other Constraints:

BGS Radon Map

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status – Comment</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC43</th>
<th>Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes</th>
<th>Consultee Reference Number - 257</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Site is a field removed from the current built up limits of the settlement. Greystone Lane narrows prior to any potential access point to the Site. It is unclear whether safe and suitable access can be attained to the Site without significant changes to existing hedgerows or whether third party land will be required. The Pond located opposite the Site constrains further options to widen the highway. There is no footpath along Greystone Lane at the point where it passes the Site. Third party land may be required to deliver this infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC43</th>
<th>Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</th>
<th>Consultee Reference Number - 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single point of access from Greystone Lane may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Greystone Lane, connecting back to existing pedestrian links.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flood Comments- No surface water concerns on the site.

Landscape Comment- No comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC43</th>
<th>Contact/Organisation David Stewart Abbeyfield</th>
<th>Consultee Reference Number - 439</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to record our concerns over the possible impact of the draft conclusions of the Local Plan on the Staveley House Care Home in Dalton in Furness. As you may be aware the Home is owned by Abbeyfield Furness Extra Care Society Ltd and provides accommodation for 38 [soon to be 40] frail elderly Residents many of whom also suffer from early stage dementia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the high quality care provided a major attraction for the Residents is the quiet rural setting with the majority of rooms having views over the tarn [Parker’s Pond] and the adjoining field. The birdlife resident on the pond and the farm animals in the field provide continuous entertainment for those living in the Home.

Any change in the usage of the strip of land in front of the Home adjoining the tarn such as if it became even a pedestrian shortcut to Dalton would be particularly serious. In addition the one area on our site remaining available for future developments is at the far end from the road and would require at least temporary access for contractors via the land adjoining the tarn and corner of the field. This was granted by the owner of the land for the construction of the Bechshaw Wing which opened in 2006.

For these reasons we are concerned about any changes which may affect our Residents or limit future developments at the Home. Our understanding of the current plans for this area, after raising questions at two of your Consultation Sessions, is that new building on the land in front of the Home, identified as REC25 and REC44, is to be limited to a small area round the existing farm buildings. If actually limited in this way then it is unlikely to have a significant impact on Staveley House. However what if the developer decided it wanted to build more dwellings and offered to buy more of the land? Even if only the limited building that is part of the plan went ahead it is easy to envisage at some future date pressure to allow a “fill in” of housing between that area and the existing estate embracing Buttermere Drive, Eskdale Drive etc. Designation as a Green Wedge or other green area appears to provide little, if any, long term protection from future development. We would welcome the opportunity to show you our location and discuss our concerns with you in more detail.

Status – Comment
Site Ref – REC 43
Contact/Organisation - Mr Parker/ Richard Lomas/ Hourigan Connelly
Consultee Reference Number - 303

The Council will already be in receipt of a detailed representation by ourselves in relation to land at Dalton -in-Furness which we are promoting for residential purposes.

In reflection of the matters raised in those representations, specifically concerns regarding the Council’s preferred strategy in respect of housing need and the five year housing land supply, the Council should be aware of wider opportunities within the Dalton-in-Furness area. Accordingly, I enclose a site plan which details additional land which is available within Dalton-in-Furness for residential purposes.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

REC43 is close to the nursing home although it is separated from the site by Greystone Lane, and is therefore not likely to cause problems for construction access or affect the amenity of the home and its residents.
REC47 Land to West of Askam Road (including Elliscales Quarry) Dalton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC47 Elliscales Quarry Dalton &amp; Land to West</th>
<th>Easting: 322383</th>
<th>Northing: 474706</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 4.68</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Comprised of two distinct sections - Elliscales Quarry, a discrete site containing a commercial use designated as a SSSI, and a larger greenfield section, forming a gateway into Dalton.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
This is a greenfield site with a hedgerow bordering the site, which is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**
Should connect to Askam Road and St Helen’s plus pedestrian access to connect to the A590 the foot crossing at the A590/Askam road roundabout. Internally loops and links should be provided and cul de sacs avoided. Alignments and traffic calming measures should manage traffic speeds to below 20mph.

Visibility - 4.5m x 215m  
Land Ownership – Private Ownership  
Road Width – 5.5m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

There are major flooding concerns down stream of the site in Dalton In Furness and Goose Green area. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of rivers, streams, sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface out of site.

No surface water concerns on the site apart from an area to the east which may be the ideal location for a SuDS basin/wetland.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways. The site must be split up into multiple subcatchments with control features for each subcatchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible.
Other Constraints:

This site straddles two CLCGT landscape types: 3c ‘Disturbed Areas’ and 5c ‘Rolling Lowland’. In visual terms, the majority of site is relatively low lying, and self-contained. The most notable site feature is the well maintained limestone wall which forms a boundary to the east. This should be retained. The use of limestone in key frontage buildings should be encouraged where possible, particularly given the site’s ‘gateway’ location to the town.

Site of Special Scientific Interest – currently in an unfavourable condition, development provides an opportunity to improve this.

BGS Radon Map

Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>REC47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Michael Barry Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access from Askam Road may be considered sufficient, if an emergency vehicle access is also provided from Askam Road. Pedestrian links should be created with Askam Road.

Flood Comments No surface water concerns on the site, however there are major flooding concerns downstream of the site in Dalton In Furness and Goose Green area. This means developer would need to limit discharge to Qbar.

Landscape Comment This site straddles two CLCGT landscape types: 3c ‘Disturbed Areas’ and 5c ‘Rolling Lowland’. In visual terms, the site is relatively low lying, and self-contained. The most notable site feature is the well maintained limestone wall which forms a boundary to the east. This should be retained. As noted above in regard to REC10, the use of limestone in key frontage buildings should be encouraged where possible, particularly given the site’s ‘gateway’ location to the town.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.
## REC48 Land East of Askam Road, Dalton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC48 Land East of Askam Road, Dalton</th>
<th>Easting: 322500  Northing: 474414</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 1.39</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site with varying levels adjoining the existing built up area on the approach in to Dalton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Zone: This site lies within Flood Zone 1.</th>
<th>Impact on heritage assets:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a greenfield site with a hedgerow bordering the site, which is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highways Comments:

- A single point of access from Romney Park may be considered sufficient but access points to connect with any future development should be provided.
- External connectivity should be allowed for in all directions and it may be possible to have a pedestrian/cycle link through to Myrtle Terrace.

**Visibility – 4.5m x 90m**  
**Land Ownership – Private Ownership**  
**Road Width – 5.5m + footways.**

### Flooding & Drainage Comments:

**LLFA**

No surface water concerns on the site, however there are major flooding concerns down stream of the site in Dalton In Furness and Goose Green area. This means the developer would need to limit discharge to Qbar.

There are major flooding concerns down stream of the site in Dalton In Furness and Goose Green area. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of rivers, streams, sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface out of site.

No surface water concerns on the site. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
### Other Constraints:

- Tree Preservation Order
- BGS Radon Map

### Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Comment</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC48</th>
<th>Contact/Organisation</th>
<th>Consultee Reference Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- A single point of access from Askam Road may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Askam Road.

Flood Comments - No surface water concerns on the site, however there are major flooding concerns downstream of the site in Dalton In Furness and Goose Green area. This means the developer would need to limit discharge to Qbar.

Landscape Comments - No comment

### Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.
**REC49 Land at Hollygate Road**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC49 Land at Hollygate Road</th>
<th>Easting: 322911</th>
<th>Northing: 473629</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 0.59</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing / 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Greenfield site within settlement of Dalton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong> This site lies within Flood Zone 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong> This is a greenfield site with a hedgerow bordering the site, which is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.</td>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong> A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways Comments:</strong> Access seems very difficult and has to be taken off a narrow estate road (Loweswater Terrace) as the level difference with the main road is prohibitive without substantial improvements / earthworks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Ownership - Private</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flooding &amp; Drainage Comments:</strong> No Flooding issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Constraints:</strong> BGS Radon Map Mine Working Shafts Mine Working Tunnels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status - Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation Pieter Barnard Cumbria County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access seems very difficult and has to be taken off a narrow estate road (Loweswater Terrace) as the level difference with the main road is prohibitive.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:</strong> Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REC52  Land at Tantabank, Dalton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> REC52 Land at Tantabank, Dalton</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 323575  <strong>Northing:</strong> 473743</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.19</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing / 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site adjoining residential area.

**Flood Zone:** This site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Currently used for grazing, however mature trees and hedgerows border the site, which are likely to provide a habitat for a number of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
None

**Highways Comments:**
No Flooding issues on site. Small scale development of 15 dwellings should attract no highway concerns in land allocation terms.

**Land Ownership:** Private

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**
No flooding issues on site.

**Other Constraints:**
BGS Radon Map

**Representations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>REC52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>Pieter Barnard Cumbria County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>- 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**
Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.
**SHL005 Land at Crooklands Brow, Dalton**

**Site Ref:** SHL005 Land at Crooklands Brow, Dalton  
**Easting:** 323650  
**Northing:** 474322  
**Site Size:** 1.44  
**Use /Indicative Yield:** Housing/32

**Summary:** Previously developed, cleared site within the urban boundaries. Some material stored on site. Allocated for housing in the current Local Plan.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
This is a cleared site with a steep slope, adjacent to a railway line – low biodiversity value.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
None.

**Highways Comments:**
Ideally this should be a set out as a link between Crooklands Brow and Yarl Well designed for a road speed of 15mph.

Visibility – 4.5m x 90m.  
Land Ownership – Private Ownership.  
Road Width – 5.5m + footways.  
Pedestrian Access

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA:**
There are surface water concerns and flooding at Crooklands Garden Centre and any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
UU:
UU have requested for investment for Strategic Hydraulic Modelling to investigate sewer capacity issues in this area.

Other Constraints:
BGS Radon Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representations:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong> – <strong>Comment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation Barton Willmore Story Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number – 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site has been allocated since 2006 alterations Local Plan, now 9 years ago. It has yet to come forward for housing. There has been no evidence provided as part of this consultation to demonstrate why the Council expects this site to come forward now.

| Status - Comment |  |
| Site Ref - SHL005 |  |
| Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council |  |
| Consultee Reference Number – 9 |  |

A single point of access from Crooklands Brow, or frontage properties, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Crooklands Brow.
Flood Comments - There are surface water concerns and flooding at Crooklands Garden Centre.
Landscape Comments - No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:
Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance.
would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system
### SHL096 Crompton Drive, Dalton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> SHL096 Crompton Drive, Dalton</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 322488</th>
<th><strong>Northing:</strong> 473244</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 0.49</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site on edge of the urban boundaries, which is currently used for agriculture and grazing.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** This is a greenfield site. No trees or hedges – low biodiversity value. Site is located in the Green Wedge in saved Local Plan.

**Impact on heritage assets:** None.

**Highways Comments:**

The development should link Crompton Drive and Abbey Road but should use road alignment and traffic calming measures to keep road speed down to 15mph and avoid rat running. Pedestrian links should be created with Crompton Drive and Abbey Road.

Visibility – 4.5m x 120m to Abbey Road, 2.4m x 33m to Crompton Drive

Land Ownership – Private ownership

Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

The site is close to a known flooding problem at to the east of the site. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to reduce run off and to keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.

The site should be split up into sub-catchments with control features for each sub-catchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.
Flooding has occurred to the East of the site. Site levels fall from East to west meaning every effort should be made to prevent any surface water discharge to the east. This area is not sewered. Connecting to the sewer system in this location could be an issue as the land gradient flows in the opposite direction.

**Other Constraints:**

- **BGS Radon Map**

**Representations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref</td>
<td>SHL096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>M Richards and D Berry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objections and concerns to the housing development at Crompton Drive Dalton.

1. Drainage issues have been an on going problem in the area already especially at lower Barnes Avenue and the bungalows which back onto them on Newton Road flooded and residents had to move out for several months due to a pumping station unable to cope with the drainage and also at 45 Barnes Avenue old drainage systems being used to tap into new builds/extensions etc. This has only been a problem since building the new bungalows at Crompton Drive.

2. Wildlife issues hedgerows along the boundary will be knocked down having an impact on wildlife on a large greenbelt of land. (I now understand this has been changed to a brown belt of land I would like to know, when this was changed and who authorised the change.

3. Upper Barnes Avenue is presently a no through road should the housing estate be built residents are concerned that the opening at the top will make way for access and the flow of traffic will add to the congestion, we already have at the top with people not parking on their drives but on the road on both sides.

**Status** - Objection  
**Site Ref** - SHL096  
**Contact/Organisation** - T Kneale  
**Consultee Reference Number** - 460

I have been informed that there are plans to build new Housing on Newton Road (Crompton Drive) and Newton Road (near to junction with Long Lane. My House was flooded 3 Years ago due to insufficient drainage.

As far as I am aware no improvements have been carried out to improve this. Additional Housing can only add to the poor drainage. I believe this site had poor drainage before our House was built. I have still not been advised who was to blame for the construction of these Houses on a known “flooding” area. Was it the builders, United Utilities or the Council for approving the plans? or are all jointly responsible?

I believe the proposed builders of these new Homes are the builders responsible for the building of my Home. I
will strongly oppose any new building until it can be proved that the drainage has been improved not only to improve our drainage but also any future new housing to be built.

Status - Objection  
Site Ref - SHL096  
Contact/Organisation D Sheldon  
Consultee Reference Number - 450

We want to strongly object to the proposal of 11 houses to be built at the top of Crompton Drive Dalton-in-Furness.

Reasons being access one way in, one way out. The road is narrow, the condition of the road surface on the hill is not good so the increase in traffic and heavy lorries will only make it worse.

During the last development of 3 bungalows completed last year we had over 12 months of being constantly blocked in due to work vehicles and deliveries. On numerous occasions I was unable to get my car off the drive to go to work which resulted in having to get a taxi at the bottom of the hill and being late for work which is unacceptable.

Parking is a big issue with the 2 turning points being used by Non-Residents for parking making it hard for people to turn.

Drainage seems to be a problem; the recently built bungalows completed late last year have already had United Utilities out. The drains at a high level which resulted in the field next to them flooding which had horses in at the time and this is the land planned for development.

The builder giving NO Notification to residents regarding the access road to be dug up so no access again by car. Also Emergency Services not able to get access if needed.

Status - Objection  
Site Ref - SHL096  
Contact/Organisation J Foote  
Consultee Reference Number - 454

I wish you to take the following considerations into account when discussing the Local Plan being amended in 2016 regarding 11 dwellings behind Green Lane/Crompton Drive.

Whilst being unhappy about the proposed site (I live in Crompton Drive myself) I think a few considerations need to be taken into account.

We have traffic flow problems at the moment; this is before the additional intended housing. Access should be made available from Abbey Road to ease the problems already encountered in this street. I am sure this would alleviate many residents concerns about existing problems.

This should really be made a condition of any planning permission given. Crompton Drive is a narrow road, not particularly in good condition itself, which will be further damaged with extra lorries/traffic initially with the construction of houses and subsequently extra traffic, probably a minimum of an extra 22 vehicles just from residents alone. During the day parking on the street is comparatively light, but from tea-time onwards there are parked cars either side of the road all the way up Crompton Drive. On both sides of the road these cars tend to be parked half on the pavement, half off to enable the traffic to flow.

This in itself is illegal as per the following:
The Highway Code rule 244 says “You MUST NOT park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the pavement can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs. The street is so narrow that not to park on pavements would leave this street no room for traffic to go up and down. The extra traffic going up and down this street will exacerbate the problem and could endanger life if how cars need to be randomly parked leaving very little room on the pavements for pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs (as already stated above). Access for emergency vehicles and current residents will be restricted due to the layout and access of the road if and when construction is allowed. Part of the road/pavement at the top of Crompton Drive is private and part adopted by the Council. This has caused problems in the past to the residents of
I really do feel that the whole of the street should now be adopted by the Council and not sectioned off to be part private/part adopted. Problems have arisen in this street over the years with the sewerage which have now been made worse by the recent building of an extra 3 bungalow, which will inevitably be made worse yet again when more houses are built. What really needs to be addressed is the fact that there are other sites in the town that have been given planning permission (and more importantly on brown-field sites) and these sites have never been developed even after 15 years of granting the permission. The site at the top of Crompton Drive is a green-field site. Why this should be given permission when there are plenty of brown-field sites available - or is it the fact that the green-field sites are more profitable to the builders!!! The brown-field sites in Barrow should be made a priority to be built on.

As residents of Dalton we are concerned specifically about the proposed changes with regards to the aforementioned sites, and would also question the assumptions that form the basis of the plan as a whole. Why are 2,000 new houses required to be built over the next 15 years? The Draft Local Plan states that there is a requirement for 2,000 houses over the next 15 years. However, this appears to contradict other facts stated in the Plan, for example:

1.4.8 “The population of the Borough is predicted to decline over the Plan period”. Figure 4 shows a predicted decline to 65,000 by 2031.

3.2.2 “Information from the 2011 census indicates that……Barrow Borough Council has experienced the country’s greatest population decline, falling by 4% to 69,100”

“CLG 2012 household Figures project a continued decrease in the Borough’s population over the period 2011 – 2013. This results in projected growth of only 249 households between 2011 and 2031.

“The remainder of section 7.1 then seems to contradict 7.1.7. It therefore remains very unclear as to how the higher number of houses required has been arrived at. The Plan acknowledges that it is difficult to assess what increase may be required to take into account economic growth, primarily at BAE Systems, and of course it would be beneficial for the Borough if such economic growth did occur, but this still does not explain the need for a further 2,000 houses.

Policy S7 (Page 45) highlights the fact that “Barrow Borough has suffered in the past from housing sites which have been allocated but developers have been reluctant to develop the site, in fact some allocations are yet to be built out over 15 years after allocation.”

**Why are Greenfield Sites being proposed?**

You will be aware of the Governments Planning Update in March 2015 which states the importance of brownfield sites and the importance attached to the safeguarding of green belt land to prevent urban sprawl. The proposed removal of these three sites in Dalton in Furness, SHL096, REC34 and REC25 from the green wedge is unsatisfactory. Once this land is developed, then this green environment will be lost forever. This is a wildlife rich area with a diverse range of wildlife – some of which is under threat nationally - which will be negatively affected by any development.

Can not brownfield sites and sites already allocated for development such as highlighted in Policy S7 be built on first, rather than the permanent removal of green belt land? We strongly object to the arbitrary removal of green belt / wedge status from this land.

**Traffic Problems** There are already significant traffic issues in Dalton particularly with Long Lane and Newton Road. The crossroads junction is a dangerous junction with a number of serious incidents occurring and many minor ones.

There are already a number of problems with the lorry traffic from Stainton Quarry.

Newton Road is also problematic – relatively narrow with many parked cars and end up being single file along much of its route already.

Additional development can only make these problems worse.

**Flood Risk.** There is currently flood risk associated with site REC34. This area is known to flood and severe flooding has previously affected houses along Newton Road. Long Lane also floods regularly. Development at
this site is likely to make things worse.

**Local Amenities** There is concern about the amenities in Dalton. The nearest school to all three sites, Dalton St Mary’s is understood to be full already and we understand that children living on Stainton Drive have been refused places in the past. This means that children may well have to travel to schools further afield, which of course they will need to driven to.

In addition, there will shortly only be one doctors surgery in Dalton.

**Previous Planning Applications Have Been Refused** As you will be aware previous planning applications in the vicinity of site REC34 have been refused previously and the fact that these developments would affect the countryside setting / Green Wedge was a factor.

The removal of Green Wedge status from these three sites of course removes that objection from a technical perspective but the benefits of these sites remaining as Green Wedge and for the good of the environment, wildlife and the quality of life of the community still remains and we do not believe that this status should be removed.

In summary, we therefore would question:
- The overall need for the number of new houses in the Plan.
- The need to remove Green Wedge status from sites rather than focus on brownfield sites.
- The justification for the removal of Green Wedge status specifically from sites SHL096, REC34 and REC25.

The suitability of SHL096, REC34 and REC25 as development sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status - Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - SHL096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation L Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further to our visit to the Drop In Consultation event at Dalton Drill Hall, we wish to raise serious concerns over the proposed inclusion of a development at Crompton Drive, Dalton to the Local Plan. Land which was classified as 'Green'. The small pocket of 'Brown' land was used to erect 3bungalows in 2013. After the Council approved permission for 3 bungalows in 2013 the residents of Crompton Drive were submitted to 18 months of stress and aggravation from Moorsolve Ltd, builders and delivery drivers. Now we are left with a road/highway that is not wide enough to sustain the existing traffic, let alone a further 11 residences. Adjacent to the proposed new development, Crompton Drive is only 13ft wide - only 4ft wider than the driveway to my home. It is impossible for 2 cars to pass safely.(see attached pic) Over the development period Crompton drive was continually blocked denying ourselves access both in and out of our home. If there had been any type of incident, emergency services would have been unable to access the area, an infringement of our rights as residents of the Borough. Contractors vans parked blocking the highway and on a daily basis we had to ask these to be moved to get out - and ask again, when we returned home! (see attached pic)

We have been lead to believe since the 2013 development, that part of the existing private drive was to be adopted by the Council? We have no pavements, no safe walk way and the estate already suffers from parking/delivery/loading problems. Vehicles are often parked in an unsafe manner and the existing turning areas are being used for additional parking. Increasing the size of the estate will increase this problem. The 3 bungalows did put extra pressure on the sewerage/drainage system, as we feared would happen. Within the first month of the residents moving into the properties United Utilities were called to a blockage. A further 11 homes will put increased pressure on the already overloaded sewers. We suffered 18 months of stress and the Council were responsible - they approved the plans which allowed Moorsolve Ltd to ride roughshod over the existing residents. The site was left unsecure, on many occasions. The perimeter cyclone fencing was fixed together with plastic ties and blew down into the roadway several times, requiring the residents to clear this from the road to gain access. We were forced to seek legal help on three separate occasions:-

1. Legal advice received prior to planning meeting.
2. Legal action taken after Moorsolve Ltd threatened to remove 'party hedge' creating privacy issues.
3. Legal advice after Moorsolve Ltd sent a letter threatening legal action if we didn’t stop abusing Moorsolve to potential house buyers - something we had never done! If any future development is approved, residents will not be tolerant of the arrogance of Moorsolve Ltd. Every incident will be reported, immediately, to the relevant Council departments. Every time we are denied safe access to our home we will take action. If the Council gives permission to increase the size of this site, they must ensure that there is an adequate area, off the highway, to service the site ie - unloading of wagons, skips, contractors vans, diggers and storage of site materials.
We would welcome an opportunity to speak to Council Officials first hand and invite them to a site visit - that way they can understand exactly how they have affected our lives.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL096
Contact/Organisation R D Mallett
Consultee Reference Number - 502

I was horrified to learn that Barrow Borough Council are considering allowing a further 11 houses to be built on Crompton Drive. I objected to the 2013 plans explaining about my disabilities and mobility problems and once the Council approved the plan my life become a living nightmare for over 18 months. I cannot face such disruption again. I became a prisoner in my own home. I have no car and would be housebound if not for my family, friends and taxi services. All of these could not gain access due to the congested road. I also had two daily visits from carers who couldn’t get to me on occasions.

This may seem a minor issue to you but it can mean that I don’t see anyone for day after day. I was afraid to go out in case the taxi couldn’t get me back to the front door. I also use Ambulance Services for my hospital appointments and the driver had to request access- it was unacceptable. Now that the building work has been completed we are left with a narrow road with no pavement and no safe place to walk. I have to negotiate around parked cars. The new turning area is used as extra parking making it difficult for visitors to turn their vehicles around. I have to use a chain across the entrance to my drive as it is continually used as an extra turning area. The chain has snapped on several occasions and the gate post bent and damaged- the road is too narrow.

The estate is already overflowing and to increase the load would be disastrous, unsafe for both youngsters and older infirm residents like myself. Please come and inspect for yourselves before making a decision that impacts on the lives of your residents. (handwritten)

Status - Objection
Site Ref - SHL096
Contact/Organisation E M Colver
Consultee Reference Number - 424

I am writing to express my objections to Barrow Borough Council’s proposals to remove the sites below from Greenfield status and to nominate them as Preferred Options for the building of housing developments:

A. SHL096 -fields at the top of Crompton Drive
B. REC34 -fields at the junction of Long Lane and Newton Road

I am objecting on the grounds below, and request answers to the following questions:

1. Why does Barrow Borough Council claim that 2000+ NEW houses are required over the next 15 years?

2. There are already thousands of properties for sale in the Borough, of all types, in all areas and at all prices. These are currently taking anything up to a year or more to sell. How can the market cope with additional houses?

3. Re Table 8 of the Local Plan (Proposed Housing Requirement): What is meant by ‘Future Vacancies’ and why has 3% been added? Why has a further 2.8% been added for ’2”d homes’? Why has the 229 dwellings (for which a grant has received to renovate properties on Barrow Island) not been deducted? bearing in mind that: a) "Barrow Borough has experienced the country's greatest population decline, falling by 4% to 69,100 (Office for National Statistics)." Local Plan 3.2.2 b) "CLG2012 household figures project a continued decrease in the Borough's population over the period 2011-2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to decline. This results in projected growth of only 249 households between 2011 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 17 additional households." Local Plan 7.1.7 c) "The Housing Land Statement indicates that there were 1717 vacant properties in the Borough at the end of March 2015. SHMA recommends that the Council should continue to consider identifying reasons why properties are empty and to identify mechanisms for bringing them back into use." local Plan 7.1.5 d) Whilst there is evidence of expansion within BAE and Glaxo, the majority of these additional workers to the area are going to be (as now) contract workers requiring
4. Why is Barrow Borough Council proposing to build on greenfield sites in preference to brownfield sites? a) Barrow Borough Council CLAIMS (under Part 3. Development Strategy of the new Local Plan) that their aim is: "To preserve, enhance and manage landscape quality and character for future generations." How does this statement conform with their removal of land from greenfield/green wedge category whenever it is convenient to them? b) The Government’s Planning Update March 2015 states: "We are clear that brownfield land that is suitable for housing has a vital role to play in meeting the need for new homes and have challenged local authorities to have local Development Orders in place on more than 90% of brownfield land suitable for new homes by 2020. We have agreed funding for those local authorities who successfully bid for funding to help deliver 200,000 new homes on brownfield sites across the country. These councils will deliver Local Development Orders for housing on brownfield land which will help to speed up the delivery of housing on these sites." c) The same Update states: "The government continues to attach great importance to safeguarding the green belt. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of green belts are their openness and their permanence." d) Once Greenfield sites are developed, they are lost forever. Additionally, once a site has been partially developed, a precedent has been set. Further planning applications will inevitably follow, and the Council will have no grounds to refuse. e) Our Greenfield/green wedge land is home to diverse and, in many cases, rare and endangered animals and birds. REC34 (the crossroads at Newton Road/Long Lane) is part of a wildlife corridor and a hedge which is at least 200 years old will be torn out if the plans for housing go ahead - with a loss of habitat for all these various species. This area is a haven for hedgehogs and, it is believed, natterjack toads which are critically endangered. Has Barrow Borough Council commissioned a survey by Cumbria Wildlife Trust before further destroying our wildlife's habitat?

5. Why is Barrow Borough Council not FIRST developing the housing sites which have already been allocated but which the developers have failed to develop? Are these sites included in the Preferred Options and, if not, why not? Where these sites and how many houses are were proposed? Why are the developers dictating to the Council what sites they will and will not use? a) Policy 57 (P45) of the Local Plan states 11Barrow Borough has suffered in the past from housing sites which have been allocated but developers have been reluctant to develop the sites, in fact some allocations are yet to be built out over 15 years after allocation." b) The 2014-15 Operation of the NPP Framework states reBuilt Out Periods: 111f councils have clearly identified substantial amounts of housing in their plans, it is unfair that their communities should be left exposed to speculative development first because these sites will take longer than 5 yrs to deliver.

6. Why have previous applications for planning permission to build a single dwelling been refused, while a development of 24 houses is now being looked upon favourably? ie a) In 2012, plans were submitted for one detached house on land adjacent to Schoolwaters with vehicular access to Newton Road (within metres of the proposed Preferred Options site REC34). This was refused on the grounds: “The proposed dwelling would represent unsustainable development and encroachment into a designated Green Wedge.” However, this has not stopped BBC from proposing the site now for the building of 24 dwellings. b) In 2006, it should be noted that planning permission was also refused for the same site on the grounds: “The proposed dwelling would represent a new development in a countryside setting contrary to the BBC Local Plan Review 1996.

7. How is the Council intending to justify its approval for development on these Preferred Options sites bearing in mind its Policy 52 (p32) of the Local Plan ie: “Proposals will be required to meet ALL of the following criteria (a-k)? eg.Criterion b) “Improving road safety and reducing congestion”. The crossroads at Long Lane and Newton Road are a renowned accident blackspot. According to Cumbria Police Traffic Division statistics, in the past 9 years there have been 10 separate incidents involving vehicle collisions either at the crossroads or within a short distance of them. These are only the accidents in which there were casualties and where the police were involved. Of the 10 incidents reported to the Police, 3 were classed as 'serious'. Traffic in this area is already a big problem with a constant stream of lorries going to and from the quarry and travelling at speeds of well over 40mph up and down Long Lane. Parts of Long Lane are not wide enough to take a car and a lorry passing each other. On Newton Road, congestion is severe, with extremely poor visibility due to parked cars
down one side of the road. When a bus is passing, all traffic coming in the opposite direction has to come to a standstill as there is no room for a bus and a car and a parked car. Crompton Drive also has a problem already with congestion. The road is extremely steep and narrow and there is only access at one end. There are cars parked at the verges which again mean there is only room for one car to pass. A further development of (initially) 11 houses - therefore, a possible further 22 cars - would only increase the problem. eg. Criterion c) (Improving access to necessary services, facilities and infrastructure" ie The nearest junior school for both sites, Dalton St Mary's, is currently at capacity. In the past, when the school has been oversubscribed, children from Stainton Drive have not been offered a place. There will be only one doctor's surgery in Dalton, once the Nelson St practice closes in September. eg. Criterion k) "Ensuring that the proposed development mitigates against the impacts of climate change by the incorporation of energy and water efficiency measures and steering development away from areas at flood risk." REC34 is an area known to flood. Water from Schoolwaters Terrace drains on to these fields with long lane often being flooded. In addition the drainage system along Newton Road is already completely inadequate, even when there is no heavy rain, with United Utilities being called out 2-3 times p/year to clean out the drains. Any heavy rainfall results in flooding within hours. Several houses along Newton Road and Barnes Avenue have been flooded up to a depth of 3 feet; the householders have been unable to return to their house for 6 months and cannot now get insurance. One house on Newton Rd is currently being investigated for subsidence due to the drainage system. Site REC34 currently acts as (in effect) a flood plain and building on this site will put an impossible strain on the current inadequate drainage system. SHI096, Crompton Drive- these fields are known to be flood sites and United Utilities have already been called out to deal with flooding issues and drainage problems surrounding the three new-build bungalows built within the last 18 months at the top of the road.

I would refer you to the letter from Jill Stannard, Chief Executive of Cumbria County Council to Councillor Doughty, dated 4 October 2012, following the floods of 2012, in which she states: "The majority of the drainage system in the Dalton area is a combined system which carries both surface water as well as sewage. Therefore any changes to increase the capacity of the overall system will require a coordinated approach by both Cumbria County Council and United Utilities, with funding coming from both parties. The primary issue is that of the existing drainage systems to deal with the levels of water being experienced. These levels are greater now due to a number of reasons - increased development, hardening of grassed areas and ever greater levels of water use, and therefore discharge. It is not possible to simply increase the capacity of an existing system as further development occurs, not least because of the immense cost that this would incur, but also because of the disruption this would have on the road network."

8. Why has Barrow Borough Council failed so demonstrably to inform the public of its Local Plan and its proposals for 'Preferred Options' sites? You state you want to find out people's opinions on the policies and sites within the Preferred Options but the lack of publicity about your plans is a disgrace. Whilst it is true the Plan is available to view online, in libraries and at the Town Hall, this is only of use if people know it is there to view. The consultation drop-ins, again, can only be attended if residents know about them - most did not. Even now, at the end of the consultation period, the vast majority of Dalton residents are unaware of the plans. It has been left to the residents themselves to spread the word as best they can. The Council has done virtually nothing to ensure that everyone who is interested in the future of their town can participate- is this a deliberate ploy to try and minimise the number of objections you receive?

Status - Support
Site Ref - SHL096
Contact/Organisation Signet Planning Moorsolve Self Administered Pension Fund
Consultee Reference Number - 184

Further to the representations submitted on behalf of Moorsolve Self-Administered Pension Fund to the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Draft September 2014, representations are now made in respect of the current Preferred Options Consultation. These representations are made with specific reference to land owned by my client which is located at Crompton Driven Dalton in Furness and identified within the current consultation as site reference SHL096. In addition to representations being submitted in respect of the Local Plan Consultation, additional comments are submitted in relation to the Draft Green Infrastructure Study which it is intended will become an SPD and which the Council is also seeking comments on.
**Status – Comment**  
**Site Ref - SHL096**  
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry  Cumbria County Council  
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access from either Crompton Drive or Abbey Road (or both) may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Crompton Drive and Abbey Road.

Flood Comments - No surface water concerns on the site, flooding has occurred to the East of the site, site levels fall from East to west meaning every effort should be made to prevent any surface water discharge to the east.

Landscape Comments - No comment.

**Status – Petition from local residents**  
**Site Ref – SHL096**  
Contact E M Colver

A petition was received by the Council with approximately 400 signatures. The accompanying letter replicated in full the comments relating to REC 34(page 96). The Council is not required to respond to each individual signatory. Please see site response below.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments, the high level of objections is noted. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural/grazing land. The Council agree that retaining open space and green areas for recreation, biodiversity and quality of life is a critical issue. The Council have produced a Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure that the Borough retains areas of green space and each site has been considered on its merits and the extent to which development impacts can be mitigated. The Council have reduced the site boundary (and site size) to take into account the contours of the site and the comments received from residents.

Objections have been raised on the grounds of congestion, traffic and the busy Long Lane/Newton Road crossroads. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval. It is considered that impacts could be satisfactorily improved and that SHL096 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance.

This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.

A query has been raised regarding the extent of housing development required during the plan period. The Council has calculated the OAN and housing requirement for the Borough over the Plan period based on the most up-to-date evidence available, which are CLG 2012 household projections. These figures project a continued decline in the Borough’s population over the period 2012 to 2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to fall. This results in a projected growth of only 362 households between 2012 and
2031, which equates to an annual average of 19 additional households. This figure is then adjusted upwards to take into account future employment growth, future housing vacancies, and second homes to reach a housing requirement figure, which in the Publication Draft Local Plan is 105 dwellings per year. Please see the Housing Land Statement 2016 for more information.

The Education Authority have indicated that between the four schools in the Dalton there are likely to be sufficient spaces available to accommodate the potential increase in primary pupil numbers. Dalton lies in the secondary catchment area of Dowdales School. It is likely that there will be pressure on places in the future at Dowdales School given the cumulative effect of housing development in the area.

In relation to points raised regarding the Council failing to inform the public about selected sites for potential housing development, the Council has undertaken a number of consultations, throughout the development of the new Local Plan, in line with the Regulations set out in The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Council’s own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Methods have included sending out letters and emails, press releases, advertisements, publishing data on the Council’s website, public drop in sessions and making the documents available at public locations around the Borough, including in Dalton. This process is ongoing. The Council will endeavour to consult as widely as resources and timescales allow and therefore going forward site notices being displayed on proposed development sites.

Dalton with Newton Town Council are a statutory consultee on the Local Plan and are in the process of producing a Community Led Parish Plan, which is hoped to be finalised in 2016. In addition, all Borough Councillors, including those for Dalton are informed of the consultations we undertake and production of the Local Plan.
Askam & Ireleth
**REC01 Land at Saves Lane, Ireleth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC01 Land at Saves Lane, Ireleth</th>
<th>Easting: 321623</th>
<th>Northing: 477813</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 0.83</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield:</td>
<td>Housing/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Vacant, greenfield site outside but adjoining the current development cordon.</td>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong> This site lies within Flood Zone 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
This is a greenfield site on the edge of coastal floodplain and grazing marsh. This is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**
Access from Saves Lane potential future connections to the north must be provided; there should at least be a pedestrian connection with the lane to the south. Pedestrian links should be created with Saves Lane

Visibility – 4.5m x 33m.
Land Ownership - United Utilities
Road Width – Although only an indicative yield of 15 units there looks to be potential for future development to the north so a potential route should be future proofed with a 5.5m wide carriageway + footways Minor Access Road.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

NW quarter of site is in EA Flood Zone and is at risk of surface water flooding. Linear surface water feature runs across eastern edge of site.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space.

Linear surface water features may be unmapped watercourses. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up.
Any work within the channel of a watercourse will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.

Other Constraints:

Proximity to railway line.
BGS Radon Map

Representations:

Status - Support
Site Ref – REC 01
Contact/Organisation - Edward Harvey United Utilities
Consultee Reference Number - 423

We strongly support the identification of Land East of Saves Lane (Site Ref: REC01) as a proposed residential allocation. CBRE Limited previously made representations submitting the site for consideration to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in October 2012, and subsequently submitted comments in October 2014 supporting its proposed allocation in the Local Plan: Issues and Options document.

The site extends to approximately 0.84 hectares and is roughly rectangular in shape. It is bound by open land to the north, with residential properties to the east and south. An electricity substation and water pumping station are located to the west. We would like to reiterate our belief that UUPS’ site represents a sustainably located and deliverable housing site that could make an important contribution to the achievement of the Local Plan housing targets.

Footnote 11 of NPPF states that in order “to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that the development of the site is viable.”

In considering the deliverability of UUPS’ site, it is important to note the site is available for development now as it is no longer needed for United Utilities’ operational requirements. In terms of suitability, whilst we acknowledge the land at Saves Lane is not previously developed, Paragraph 7.2.11 of the Local Plan states that: “Greenfield sites will still be needed to help meet the housing requirement as well as in delivering housing choice and easing mobility within the housing market”. We strongly believe that the development of this site for residential use would complement surrounding established residential areas. The site is located directly adjacent to the existing development cordon and would form a natural extension to the settlement boundary. Furthermore, the site is within a sustainable location and is close to existing local services in Askam and public transport facilities, including bus and rail services. The site is therefore ‘suitable’ for residential development.
Further to being available and suitable for residential development, there is a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. The site therefore meets the ‘achievable’ criteria in the NPPF. Development of the site is viable given its close proximity to existing residential areas and the associated amenities and services within the surrounding area. Accordingly, development of the site meets the ‘deliverable’ criteria as set out within the NPPF.

Footnote 12 of NPPF states that for sites “to be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.” As demonstrated above the site is in a suitable location for housing development, the site is available and the site could be developed at the point envisaged. The site therefore meets the ‘developable’ criteria set out in NPPF.

**Status - Comment**

**Site Ref - REC01**  
**Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council**  
**Consultee Reference Number - 9**

A single point of access from Saves Lane may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Saves Lane.

**Flood Comments - Some surface water concerns.**  
**Landscape Comments - No comment.**

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council, United Utilities and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan. We acknowledge support received for this site.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
**Proposed Housing Site Assessments**

**REC02 Duke Street, Askam in Furness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC02 Duke Street, Askam in Furness</th>
<th>Easting: 321485</th>
<th>Northing: 477577</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Site Size:** 0.35

**Use /Indicative Yield:** Housing/9

**Summary:** Vacant, greenfield site within the current development cordon. Small flat block most appropriate to maintain adequate setting for site and adjacent memorial.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Wet and Marshy site with mature trees and bordered by a hedgerow. This site will most likely house a variety of species and habitats and has been vacant long term.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

**Highways Comments:**
A single point of access with Duke Street, or frontage properties, may be considered sufficient.

Loops and links are preferable but if a cul-de-sac is needed in this instance in order to make effective use of the space available its length should be minimised and turning areas must be provided to cater for service and refuse vehicles with pedestrian cut through available. Pedestrian links should be created with Duke Street.

Visibility – 4.5m x 70m needed.
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**
Surface water concerns affect most of the site requiring care with flood and drainage concerns. Will be a difficult site to build on without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. This is likely to be very difficult to achieve with so much of the site affected.
Other Constraints:

Proximity to railway line.

BGS Radon Map

Representations:

Status – Comment
Site Ref - REC02
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access with Duke Street, or frontage properties, may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Duke Street.

Flood Comments Surface water concerns affect part of the site requiring care with flood and drainage concerns.

Landscape Comments No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council, United Utilities and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong></th>
<th>REC03 Land at junction of Lots Road and Duke Street, Askam in Furness</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong></th>
<th>321327</th>
<th><strong>Northing:</strong></th>
<th>477181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong></td>
<td>Housing/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Vacant, greenfield site outside but adjoining the current development cordon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Zone:</strong></td>
<td>This site lies within Flood Zone 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):</strong></td>
<td>Greenfield site with some mature trees, which may provide a habitat for a variety of species – no hedgerow border. Wildlife area to the south of the site.</td>
<td><strong>Impact on heritage assets:</strong></td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways Comments:</strong></td>
<td>A single point of access with Lots Road may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Lots Road and Alexander Place (north of Wakefield Road). Visibility – 2.4m x 45m needed. Land Ownership – Private Ownership Road Width – 4.8m + footways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flooding &amp; Drainage Comments:</strong></td>
<td>LLFA Some Surface water concerns on site. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below. The site is close to a known flooding problem at Sharp Street/Steel Street where gullies are unable to cope with existing amounts of surface water. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Constraints:
BGS Radon Map

Green Infrastructure:

Need to ensure that development is set back to maintain setting for vista achievable across settlement and to maintain a softer edge to street scene and settlement edge character.

Representations:
Status - Comment
Site Ref - REC03
Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access with Lots Road may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Lots Road and Alexander Place (north of Wakefield Road).

Flood Comments Some Surface water concerns.

Landscape Comments No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:
Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council, United Utilities and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
**REC31 Land North of New Road, Askam**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC31 Land North of New Road, Askam</th>
<th>Easting: 321329  Northing: 477044</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.47</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Vacant, greenfield site used for grazing, outside but adjoining the current development cordon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1. |
| **Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** Flat site currently used for grazing. No trees or hedgerow – low biodiversity value. |
| **Impact on heritage assets:** None |

**Highways Comments:**

A single point of access with Lots Road or New Road (or both) may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Lots Road and New Road.

A road connecting Lots Road and New Road

Visibility – 4.5m x 70m.
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

**LLFA Flooding & Drainage Comments:** No concerns apart from no obvious discharge point.

Linear surface water feature runs along the middle of the site. Linear surface water features may be unmapped watercourses. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up.

Any work within the channel of a watercourse will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space.

The site is close to a known flooding problem at Sharp Street/Steel Street where gullies are unable to cope
with existing amounts of surface water. Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage, especially if drainage route is to the north. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.

**Other Constraints:**

BGS Radon Map

**Green Infrastructure:**

Need to ensure that development is set back to maintain setting for vista achievable across settlement and to maintain a softer edge to streetscene and settlement edge character.

**Representations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Ref - REC31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation - Michael Barry  Cumbria County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultee Reference Number - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single point of access with Lots Road or New Road (or both) may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Lots Road and New Road.

Flood Comments - No concerns apart from no obvious discharge point

Landscape Comments - No comment.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.
REC36  Land South of New Road, Askam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref: REC36  Land South of New Road, Askam</th>
<th>Easting: 321326  Northing: 476926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: 0.73</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary: Vacant, greenfield site outside but adjoining the development cordon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flood Zone: The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):
Flat site, used for grazing with bordering hedgerow and mature trees. This could provide a habitat for a variety of species.

Impact on heritage assets:
None.

Highways Comments:
A single point of access with Lots Road may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Lots Road and New Road.

Visibility – 4.5m x 70m
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

Flooding & Drainage Comments:
North of site is at risk of surface water flooding. Linear surface water feature runs to the south of the site and may be evidence of an unmapped watercourse.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere. These are likely to be the ideal locations to leave as open space.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified in the surface water flooding map below.
Other Constraints:

BGS Radon Map

Green Infrastructure:

Need to ensure that development is set back to maintain setting for vista achievable across settlement and to maintain a softer edge to street scene and settlement edge character.

Representations:

Status - Comment
Site Ref - REC36
Contact/Organisation  Michael Barry  Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

A single point of access with Lots Road may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with Lots Road and New Road.

Flood Comments - No water concerns.

Landscape Comments- No comment.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.
## SHL017 Urofoam Factory Site (UCS Part), Duddon Rd, Askam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Ref:</strong> SHL017 Urofoam Factory Site (UCS Part), Duddon Rd, Askam</th>
<th><strong>Easting:</strong> 321416</th>
<th><strong>Northing:</strong> 477869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Size:</strong> 1.22</td>
<td><strong>Use /Indicative Yield:</strong> Housing/48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Brownfield site currently occupied by factory building located within the development cordon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1. | **Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):** Some mature trees running along the eastern side, however brownfield site with former factory on site – low biodiversity value. | **Impact on heritage assets:** A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016). |

### Highways Comments:

The following would be required to serve 32 dwellings - 4.8m wide road, 2x 2m footways and splays commiserate with the speed limit (2.4m by 70m ? if 30mph) More than 50 dwellings would then require road to be 5.5m wide.

- Visibility – 4.5m x 33m
- Land Ownership -
- Road Width – 5.5m + footways

### Flooding & Drainage Comments:

**LLFA**

Some flooding concerns with main river near to the site and adjacent linear surface water feature within the site. Linear surface water features may be unmapped watercourses. Any development should restore and enhance water bodies to reduce flood risk and to conserve habitats and species that depend directly on water, for instance, culverts should be opened up. These surface water features and any SuDS storage should be within a green corridor across the site.

Any work within the channel of a watercourse or near a Main River will need Flood Defence Consent as well as Planning Permission.

Any development must be protected from surface water flooding and must not displace flood water elsewhere.

The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways including those identified below in the surface water flooding map below.
Other Constraints
BGS Radon Map
Health and Safety Executive Major Hazard Pipelines

Representations:
Status - Comment
Site Ref - SHL017
Contact/Organisation Michael Barry  Cumbria County Council
Consultee Reference Number - 9

The following would be required to serve 32 dwellings - 4.8m wide road, 2x 2m footways and splays commiserate with the speed limit (2.4m by 70m ? if 30mph) More than 50 dwellings would then require road to be 5.5m wide
Flood Comments - Some flooding concerns with main river near to the site.
Landscape Comments - No comment

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:
Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The Highways Department initially felt that access to site was unattainable. Further comments have since been received to confirm what would be required with regards to access from the highway network. The Council therefore considers that SHL17 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site. Should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:

- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to ensure the future integrity of the system.
Lindal & Newton
## REC37 Land East of London Road, Lindal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>REC37 Land East of London Road, Lindal</th>
<th>Easting: 325130</th>
<th>Northing: 475631</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size:</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield:</td>
<td>Housing/36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary:
Greenfield site, outside current development cordon.

### Flood Zone:
The site lies within flood zone 1.

### Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):
Grazing land bordered by hedgerow, which is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

### Impact on heritage assets:
A Heritage Impact Assessment has been completed for this site (see Heritage Impact Assessments July 2016).

### Highways Comments:
Should ideally have two points of access so that it forms a loop with London Road. Pedestrian/cycle links with London Road should be provided and ideally routes to connect with Ulverston Road and Railway Terrace can be provided.

Visibility – 4.5m x 33m.

Land Ownership
Road Width: At least 4.8m + footways.

### Flooding & Drainage Comments:
No surface water concerns on site. The layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways. The site should be split up into subcatchments with control features for each subcatchment. Surface water should be managed as close to source as is possible.
### Other Constraints:

- BGS Radon Map
- Adjacent to the Green Lindal Conservation Area.

### Green Infrastructure:

A ‘clustered’ form of development feasible. Development set back from London Road to maintain street scene character and reduce the massing of development.

### Representations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Site Ref - REC37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Emily Hrycan Historic England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/Organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is opposite to The Green, Lindal Conservation Area. The Council has a statutory duty under the provisions of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay “special attention” to “the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance” of its conservation areas. Therefore, before allocating the site there will need to be some evaluation of the impact the development of the site might have upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and its setting. The Heritage Impact Assessment (July 2015) undertaken for the site needs to be expanded (part 2) prior to the next stage of the plan. The significance of the heritage assets needs to be identified i.e. the conservation area, what are its historic interest and its setting etc.

This will help inform the impact on the significance identified in 2b of the assessment and to demonstrate that the principle of development and the quantum (numbers) can be achieved on the site without harm to the historic environment (the elements of which will have been identified above).

A heritage impact assessment needs to be undertaken in order to demonstrate that the principle of this development is acceptable in terms of harm to the conservation area. Where it is demonstrated that there is harm then the Plan will have to put forward mitigation measures.

### Status

- Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref - REC37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contact/Organisation | Andrew Tait Steven Abbott Associates |
| Consultee Reference Number - 499 |

I note that the Council are now carrying out consultation on preferred options for development throughout the Borough. With regard to the above I note that my client’s site to the east of London Road, Lindal has been included as site REC37.

I am simply writing to you to confirm that the land is still available for development and that we would support its allocation for housing. However, I would point out that the non-preferred site REC07 has been mapped as being included within REC37. This may just be a cartographical error but would confirm that the area in REC07 non-preferred is not in my client’s ownership. I note in terms of the information that is available as part of the Barrow Borough Site Assessments Desk Top Study that, while comments have been made by English Heritage, Cumbria County Council and also Lindal & Marton Parish Council, no objections have been made to the inclusion of the site.

With regard to the comments from English Heritage my client would give careful consideration as to the effects of any proposal upon the Conservation Area as part of any future planning application. I trust that the above is of assistance in enabling the site to be come forward to form part of the housing supply for the Borough.

### Status – Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref - REC37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REC37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contact/Organisation | Michael Barry Cumbria County Council |
| Consultee Reference Number - 9 |

A single point of access from London Road may be considered sufficient. Pedestrian links should be created with London Road. Flood Comments No surface water concerns.
Landscape Comments - No comment.

**Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:**

Thank you for your comments. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council, Historic England and other public bodies throughout the production of the Local Plan.

The Council has undertaken a Heritage Impact Assessment for the site due to its proximity to Lindal Conservation Area, which is separated from the site by the A590. Please see Heritage Impact Assessments 2016.
### REC39 Land to rear of Farmers Arms, Newton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref:</th>
<th>REC39 Land to rear of Farmers Arms, Newton</th>
<th>Easting: 323081</th>
<th>Northing: 471817</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Size:</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Use /Indicative Yield: Housing/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Greenfield site outside but adjoining current development cordon.

**Flood Zone:** The site lies within Flood Zone 1.

**Biodiversity (including proximity to designated site):**
Greenfield, currently used for grazing, bordered by a hedgerow with mature trees. This is likely to provide a habitat for a variety of species.

**Impact on heritage assets:**
None.

**Highways Comments:**
For 9 dwellings, the roads into the site will need to be to an adoptable standard. Due to the fact that it comes through a car park, it is doubtful if this will ever be adopted. This access onto the car park will need careful consideration to ensure the safety of all users.

Visibility – 4.5m x 33m
Land Ownership – Private Ownership
Road Width – 4.8m + footways.

**Flooding & Drainage Comments:**

**LLFA**

Major concerns with regards to surface water flooding from the land and the impact this surface water has on the village, Newton village hall has been flooded due to surface water on a few occasions.

Any development must not make this problem worse so SuDS need to be used to the maximum to keep surface water out of sewers and road drainage. Attention to detail is needed at the site boundary to ensure that flow pathways do not send excess surface water that way.

This site should be designed to slow the flow down the slope towards the flood problem and must make sure that any discharge at the base of the slope is controlled, including exceedance flows.
Within the site the layout and the sustainable drainage systems should be designed to mimic natural drainage flow paths, utilising existing natural low lying areas and conveyance pathways.

**UU**
United Utilities have stated that six houses in Newton would have no significant impact on United Utilities’ assets.

**Other Constraints:**

BGS Radon Map

**Green Infrastructure:**

Need to create ‘clustered’ form to allow development of green links to reduce exposure of site.

**Representations:**

Status - Support
Site Ref - REC39
Contact/Organisation T Edmondson
Consultee Reference Number – 361

I am the freehold owner of the field to the rear of the public house here in Newton. I have read through the documents that relate to the village.

I was pleased to see that the village cordon was proposed to be restated to its position of 10 years ago as we discussed at the first meeting in Newton village hall. I also agree with the draft plan idea to limit any proposed development to maintain a "green space". I appreciate that this is only the draft plan at the moment and await the final document.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC39
Contact/Organisation J Stewart
Consultee Reference Number – 452

On viewing the plans, it became clear that there was a proposed site for 6 dwelling houses on a field behind the Farmers Arms pub. I must stress my views against this application being agreed.

The traffic volumes will increase.... I am guessing that the entrance to any new development would be from Newton Cross Road effectively which is now the pub car park. This is situated on a very bad blind bend. The village children play up and down the lane and an increase in traffic would certainly increase the risk of accidents.

I understand the need for affordable housing but there are houses in the village that are certainly affordable.
and have been on the market 3+ years and even reducing the prices haven’t resulted in a sale. Why on earth would we want more houses in the village that are not going to sell? Why would any developer invest money into a project that would struggle to sell? The reason, I am told by a local estate agent, is that there is no public transport to and from the village.

The village is built on old mining sites...we have over the years had numerous cave ins which have resulted in both ends of the village being closed each time for 2 years. Which then resulted in all traffic having to use the same routes, more houses would result in more traffic this would certainly become a nightmare. The likelihood of another cave in happening is great. The whole area surrounding the village is undermined; there are numerous mineshafts that are now ponds dotted round the area around the village.

The village regularly floods when there is significant rainfall. I have in the past contacted Doug Coyle who is the flood manager for Cumbria County Council. He came to the village to see first hand how bad this was, a number of residents have the flood footage on tape. It runs from the fields surrounding the village down into and through the village, causing the drainage system to backup. One year we had residents in a canoe!!!! Would extra sewerage and pipe work have an effect on this making it worse? I was told by Mr Coyle that it is the farmer’s responsibility to sort this problem out. At lot of the fields are owned by farmers that do not live in the village.

Over the years we have had numerous power cuts, the last one was on Christmas day a couple of years ago....would more houses impact this?

Parking in the village is always tight.....more houses even with off street parking would result in more traffic due to more visitors to the village who maybe come to visit the new residents. The green belt including all the fields that surround the village are a natural habitat for many forms of wildlife...we have regularly seen the following in the area including the proposed site. Badgers, heron, stoats, foxes and toads regularly migrate through the village to the ponds in local fields. We have numerous species of bats and also the common newt and slow worms inhabit all the local fields.

We contend that no dwellings should be constructed at that site for a variety of reasons. The land immediately north of REC39 has been subject to subsidence over the last fifty years. Traffic at the eastern end of Newton on Newton Cross Roads is often impeded by parked vehicles on what is a relatively narrow carriageway. Another junction from REC39 would only exacerbate the problem. The proposed housing requirement OAN fails to note that in Newton house sales have stagnated for years. Any further housing built, regardless of type, is unlikely to find a buyer for some considerable time. To achieve its housing targets the Council should concentrate on allowing building on brownfield and infill sites within the existing urban areas of Barrow and Dalton.

The office for National Statistics published figures in May 2014 showing the lowest projected percentage population growth 2012-2022. Barrow headed the table and projections suggest a population decrease over the next ten years. In calculating the OAN using Experian data was this taken into account?

To Whom It May Concern,!!! We are taking the time to write to you in order to express our deep concerns over recent plans to further develop our local area. We feel this is the best way as we would like our voices to be counted and heard. We feel the council would rather orchestrate them selves so knowledge was not freely
given to residents which conveniently mean a lot of voices will not be heard.!!

We are both residents of Newton village and have lived here and raised our family here for the past twenty-five years. Both of our daughters attended the village school and we have always been involved in all that village life gives you.!! The idea of developing a small rural village like Newton is quite frankly ridiculous. The whole reason Newton is a village is because it is petite and small 85 homes at the last count – that is its charm and appeal. Change that and you will ruin what is already there!! We would both like to ask the very simple question why Newton? We understand over time places have to change and adapt but is Newton really the best choice? !!! If the proposed ideas to develop green areas go ahead how these new properties would be supported and sustained? The village is already massively under supported in many ways – there is no post office - that is now all but a distant memory instead replaced by having to trudge down to Dalton just to post a parcel, no shops - again even the most basic of essentials needs a trip to Dalton - if not Barrow, no bus route - having an ageing population this would be vital for the villagers, but is something we have never had. I myself suffer from asthma and frequently need to drop off and pick up prescriptions in Dalton; thankfully my daughters are willing to help with this to save me from the two mile walk just to get there to then come back again. The single service we as villagers receive is having our bins emptied!!!

There has been much discussion over the apparent “need” for further housing...this is a point we feel we strongly disagree with - population figures for our borough show a year on year fall and it has been publicly predicted this trend will continue - so why are more homes needed? Or is it that those resident of other maybe not so popular areas what to have something nicer – in which case why not invest in those area? There are already homes in the village on the market covering a wide spectrum of budgets from £115,000 all the way up to the £400,000-£500,000 area and whats more these properties are far from selling like hot cakes....often sticking on the market for anywhere between 3 - 7 years.....which to us does not say they are in high demand!!

Another point we feel appears to have been totally overlooked is the actual condition of the land within the village and its surrounding location. In recent years we have suffered flooding issues during the winter months - where yet again it is the villagers themselves who work together valiantly to protect our own properties....over the past three years we have stood on our main road battling flood water and overflowing drainage systems which are clearly inadequate with brushes and buckets in the freezing evenings just to keep the water away - where was our council then?! !!

Safety also needs to be considered - it took years of campaigning to get the 20mph speed limit installed while our children attended the school and equally as long to get the pavement supplied to allow the children to safely walk to school. It is a sad fact that many of the users of the roads in our village do not respect the speed limit and in doing so endanger all other road users and residents alike - observations teach us that the worst culprits are those running late on the school runs and those using the top end of the village as a free for all raceway through to Barrow. More homes would mean more residents, more residents would mean more cars - could our narrow country roads cope with that? Two cars meeting is already a hazard, plus the frequent horse riders and cyclists means these roads are going to only become dangerous if more traffic is added to them..... Roads which are already a challenge: narrow and not always maintained to the highest standard...apart of course from the road which leads to one of the ear marked sites which conveniently has recently been redressed...I wonder why? ! !!

One simple word which we feel needs to be said very clearly and actually be listened to is this......Mineshafts......in recent years many mine-shafts have opened up causing vast disruption to those living in the village....these are not mere pot holes the like of which are familiar to all -these are 350 feet deep pits which cause huge problems. It is not just one either we know of at least four or five which have opened up. We assume we don't need to remind the council of the fact that when one of them opened up the access to one end of the village was completely cut off for two years!. We assume facts like that will be left out of any glossy sales brochure....! When we asked local councillors, MPs etc at the public meeting about the mines no one could tell us if there were indeed any more and if there were anymore where were they...this I find rather alarming where potential residential developments are concerned! !

We look forward to hearing you response on this matter!!
I refer to the local plan for development in the Borough. Many areas would be suited to development but others are not- Newton being one of them. We really don’t want the village to be enlarged as we feel it would lose its “village” appeal.

The approach roads to the village would not support increased traffic and as you know we have had our fair shares of mine collapses causing chaos. The corner with the junction with Johnson Street is particularly awkward if traffic was to increase and there is no way round that problem.

We have had problems with flooding over the last few years and further run off would be a problem to an already overworked system as would increased amounts of sewage. Regarding the present proposal we feel that although only for 6 houses, this would be the “tip of the iceberg” and many more would follow. Where would access be? The approach to the field between the Farmers Arms and Cavalier Cottage is not wide enough for traffic. The owner of the Cavalier Cottage has a legal right of way onto the access route on her deeds. If the access was to be across the present pub car park this would dangerous due to the position near the corner. Viewing the village from the surrounding hills and roads new housing would be a “blot” on the landscape and we really hope that the proposal does not go ahead. (handwritten)

Re the proposed preferred option site behind the Farmers Arms Public House, we are worried about the flooding it will cause. We have had several occasions when the water has come over the front steps of our homes and sandbags do not stop it all. The drains are inadequate. We also have had several sink holes in the fields and roads in this area. The village has had a quite a few houses for sale over a couple of years which are not selling, so we cant se building any more will help the situation.

Planning for 6 Dwellings at the rear of the Farmers Arms Newton in Furness Ref: REC 39 I would like to inform you of my objection to the above proposed plan.

1) Traffic: The volume of traffic through the village has obviously increased over the years, with the second/third family car now being parked on Newton Cross Road. (The only road through Newton Village) This has caused congestion and danger on a narrow road with a blind corner and a one sided footpath.

2) Infrastructure: Drains and sewers need sorting to accommodate extra dwellings in the village. Newton Cross road has been flooded on several occasions, on one occasion canoes were used to convey pedestrians near the village hall. The village hall has suffered severe damage due to flooding.

3) Mine workings/Shafts: It is a well-documented fact that the village has suffered from major road collapsing due to the old mine shafts.

One particular collapse (near the proposed site) was so large it took years to repair, receiving at least two Birthday cards on its annual anniversary and creating misery for residents of both Newton and woodbine. This collapse was just one of five in our area. These are just some of my reasons why I object to the above proposed plans.
Consultation regarding 6 Dwellings at Newton in Furness at the rear of the Farmers Arms. Reference REC 39

Regarding the Newton in Furness Village Hall consultation event organized by Barrow Borough Council on 20th August 2015, from 3 to 6pm, I wish to object to the Proposed Local Plan to build 6 dwellings at the rear of the Farmers Arms, Newton on the 0.36 acre site for the following reasons:

1) Infrastructure: The drains and sewers in the Village need improving before any more properties are built. The street alongside the Village Hall was flooded and the water came up under the new Village Hall floor a few years ago when there was a thunder burst. The drains just could not cope with the run off. This would be worse if any properties were built on the proposed site behind the Farmers Arms.

2) Gas supplies: I have heard that the gas supply to the village is only just sufficient for the properties here already. Is this going to be upgraded?

3) Traffic: Many of the Villagers are concerned about the traffic going through the village. The corner of Newton Cross Road where Johnson Street is particularly dangerous as it is a blind corner. The traffic flow will only increase, with the likelihood of a serious accident if any more houses are built.

4) Mine workings and Mine Shafts. Has this been considered? In the last ten years we have had five collapses in the area to my knowledge due to old mine workings. Two collapses shut access roads to the village and one half closed an access road ALSO where the proposals are for the affordable dwellings that the Government has been requesting and indeed Barrow Council were proposing in the previous Draft? If any of these are built the above points would still be appropriate.

If any affordable houses are built we need to be on a bus route here at Newton in Furness. I did suggest a proposal to John Woodcock when he had a Surgery here a few years ago for the Number 6 (Now 6X) Bus coming to the Village and turning around outside the Village Inn Pub. I suggested a "Dial-A-Ride" type of idea so that every bus did not come here, only the requested ones. This was rejected by Stagecoach who ran the buses then.

Lastly, I would not be writing this letter if I had not been told about the Consultation Meeting by the Owen Family who live near to me at Newton Cross Roads. I do not get the N.W. Evening Mail so missed the "apparently" miniature Advertisement for this event. I feel that consultations affecting us here in Newton in Furness should be advertised more widely.

Status - Objection
Site Ref - REC39
Contact/Organisation O Jones
Consultee Reference Number – 494

Proposal for the construction of 6 dwellings to the rear of the Farmer’s Arms. Newton. In relation to the above proposal, I object to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. First and foremost this is a Village with a population including many retired people who moved here for the quiet village atmosphere. An additional 6 dwellings constructed at the same time will cause a change to the culture of the village. An odd single construction every Preston Guild would probably be acceptable.

2. The infrastructure would need upgrading. There has been severe flooding at the lowest point of the village along the road by the village hall caused by heavy rainfall and run off. Any construction of additional dwellings/pathways/access roads will reduce soakage and increase run off so at the very least the pumping capacity of the discharge pumps and/or drain capacity (I guess) would need upgrading.

3. One can almost guarantee a power outage on Christmas Day when everybody switches on the ovens to roast their turkeys. What will an additional load on the system cause?

4. The roads are not in good shape and an increase in traffic can only be more damaging.

5. I was led to believe that the field where the proposed dwellings would be sited is undermined in any case.
In addition:
1. I am concerned that the council has changed position from the original proposal for up to 80 houses including affordable and/or social housing to this new, less ambitious proposal for 6 dwellings. There are some who may suspect that this new proposal is simply a stealth measure in order to open the floodgates to a massive urbanisation as first proposed and we will in fact end up with a town instead of a village, irrespective of the wishes of the current residents?
2. The BBC planning website is neither up to date nor user friendly. I could not find any relevant maps of the current or previous proposals for Newton and trying to navigate it is very frustrating. Some might say it is deliberately designed like that to ensure that accurate assessment of proposals and timely objections are impossible for the general public?
3. The almost clandestine way in which the notification to residents that a consultation would take place at Newton Village Hall regarding the new proposals was shameful. One miniscule insertion in the Evening Mail on one night only, weeks prior to the event, almost ensured that nobody would turn up. As it was, photocopied the article and distributed it to residents in order to guarantee it did not pass unnoticed.

Barrow Borough Council Response to Representations:
Thank you for your comments, the high level of objections is noted. Objections have been raised on the grounds of road safety and traffic. The Council will continue to work closely with Cumbria County Council and should development proceed at this site then highway impacts would need to be addressed prior to approval. It is considered that access could be satisfactorily achieved and that REC39 appears to be developable in principle and should therefore remain as a selected site.

This document highlights constraints which may be present on the site and that would need to be investigated prior to development. Regarding mine workings, our Geographic Information System (GIS) has not picked up any mine workings, shafts, sops or veins within the site that is not to say they are not present as they are known to be in the area and site investigation would need to be undertaken prior to development.

With regards to surface water concerns, development proposals will be required to robustly demonstrate how foul and surface water will be dealt with by the submission of a Drainage Strategy accompanying a planning application. A draft SuDS Design Requirements document produced by Cumbria LLFA as Statutory Consultee asks for the submission of such a Strategy to support planning applications and that all drainage is designed in accordance with the Non Statutory Technical Standards For Sustainable Drainage Practice Guidance. This would help to ensure that:
- Existing flood risk and flows from off site are managed without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- The ultimate drainage destination is resolved with reference to the SuDS hierarchy, including any third party agreements as may be necessary.
- That the full range of SuDS components has been investigated and used where they can be.
- That the full drainage design and layout is provided, including a pre and post development impermeable areas plan.
- A summary should be submitted going through the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems one by one, explaining how the proposed drainage system meets each relevant standard, and directing to where design details that show this can be verified.
- A maintenance program and assignment of on-going maintenance responsibilities in order to
ensure the future integrity of the system

A query has been raised regarding the extent of housing development required during the plan period. The Council has calculated the OAN and housing requirement for the Borough over the Plan period based on the most up-to-date evidence available, which are CLG 2012 household projections. These figures project a continued decline in the Borough’s population over the period 2012 to 2031. The size of households in the Borough will also continue to fall. This results in a projected growth of only 362 households between 2012 and 2031, which equates to an annual average of 19 additional households. This figure is then adjusted upwards to take into account future employment growth, future housing vacancies, and second homes to reach a housing requirement figure, which in the Publication Draft Local Plan is 105 dwellings per year. Please see the Housing Land Statement 2016 for more information.

The Council considers that REC39 is in a sustainable location, and is of a scale appropriate to the village.

In relation to points raised regarding the Council failing to inform the public about selected sites for potential housing development, the Council has undertaken a number of consultations throughout the development of the new Local Plan, in line with the Regulations set out in The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Council’s own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). In fact over one third of the properties in Newton/Woodbine have requested to be on our consultation database. Methods have included sending out letters and emails, press releases, advertisements, publishing data on the Council’s website, public drop in sessions and making the documents available at public locations around the Borough, including in Dalton. This process is ongoing. The Council will endeavour to consult as widely as resources and timescales allow and therefore going forward site notices being displayed on proposed development sites.