

SA24 Rose Farm

Issue 3c: Housing Allocations - Site Specific Issues.
Day 3. Thursday 16th May 2019.

Statement to be read on behalf of Mr Grout.

I do not support development proposal as shown for site SA24. Rose Farm homestead is of historic value to the village. It is a good example of local architecture and needs to be preserved. It is a green field site and therefore should be primarily for agriculture or forestry.

There is no justifiable reason for further expanding Great and Little Broughton due to the lack of employment within easy reach. Limited public transport means the vast majority commute using private car. More traffic, more pollution, more noise is not sustainable.

The fact that the village boundary has been moved to show this area confirms it is 1) outside the present village boundary and 2) the existence of a village boundary is not being respected by ABC. Broughton Primary school has limited surplus capacity, and Cockermouth School nil.

No detail is included to explain how Mr Stamper intends to relocate his business or why this proposal has been submitted by Lakeland Building Design. While not part of planning it is very much linked to this proposal and therefore needs clear and transparent explanation. At the time of writing it appears the proposal has been submitted by Lakeland Building Design on the strength of nothing more than a preliminary discussion some years ago and without the knowledge and consent of Mr Stamper. It poses the question. Is Mr Boustead, director of Lakeland Building Design seeking some personal gain?

It beggars belief that ABC can accept a development proposal and include it in the local plan on this basis. Taking agricultural land from the only family farming business still working in the village, seeking "demolition of the main farmstead" and allocating it to housing is totally unacceptable.

Note; the words "demolition of the main farmstead" are a quote from the local plan document.

It would be best to remove it from possible development land as the villages as a whole are generally fed up with the level of development in recent years, also considering other proposals in the area it is not justifiable, e.g. Broughton Moor SA23 and land cross hatched red. Also Royal Navy Armaments Depot (RNAD) proposals. S 18 Derwent Forest.

Mr Stamper needs to transparently and clearly show that it is essential to the viability of his farming business, and without the sale of this land the business is in danger. That would be the only decent course of action to take to be right by the village. Otherwise remove the proposal.

General Matters, all development.

Firstly. When commenting on planning matters I have repeatedly made the case for all new builds to include solar or other renewable energy systems, suitable for site and location. Layout and orientation being planned to maximise gain. This is clearly not being

taken seriously by the local authority, developers or government. As a result of a lack of commitment to the above it means that each new build takes the UK further away from our ability to fulfil a legal commitment to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

Secondly. In relation to habitat assessments a key question to be asked should be. How can this development enhance biodiversity and improve the environment? If plans cannot be put in place to ensure this, then there must be some shortfall in the proposals and the question asked if it is right and proper to proceed.