

* prior to submission to the Secretary of State

Representations made by Colton Parish Council - Summary

1. On Policy CS28: Lakeshore Development

Is the policy legally compliant? Yes

Is the policy sound? No (because consider not justified and not consistent with national policy).

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound:

" In this final pre-submission document, the Windermere Waterfront Programme (WWP) appears under the 'Lakeshore Development' policy section for the first time. **In particular, the exclusion of Lakeside from the Lakeshore Development policy appears for the first time.** We have strong concerns about this.

Section 4.63.3 attempts to justify its exclusion by referring to the 'existing built-up nature of the WWP sites and the existing uses that are not related to lake use'. We assert that while this justification applies to Bowness and Waterhead, it does not apply at Lakeside, which does not even classify as a 'village' in the National Park. It is a small, quiet and relatively un-developed lakeside location, where the local community still coexists reasonably happily with the tourist developments. We feel that this actually enhances the tourist experience at Lakeside, and that relaxation of policy controls would be to its detriment not only for the local community but also a tourist experience consistent with the tranquil nature of this part of the Lake. In addition, we note that the two key existing developments there are consistent with lake use (Windermere Lake Cruises and the Aquarium of the Lakes). We fully support the idea of sustainable transport using the lake, and appreciate the importance of a southern terminus, but enhancement of this facility would not require the exclusion of Lakeside from the CS28 policy. "

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary:

"The CS28 policy should apply at Lakeside in order to preserve this small, tranquil lakeside location which does not conform to the justification in 4.63.3: 'the existing built-up nature of WWP sites'. To exclude Lakeside would lead to over-development which brings into question consistency with national policy on attaching greater weight to conserving and enhancing natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage, and the Sandford Principle to leave the natural beauty unimpaired for future generations.

The wording in the policy (4.63.1) does not prevent 'developments that have a requirement for a lakeshore location, where the development is related to lake-based recreation or transport'. This would support the sustainable transport initiatives in CS14.

We urge you to think carefully about this important issue which could have far-reaching consequences, and to remove Lakeside from the wording in 4.63.3 and the Policy box on CS28."

2. On Policy CS09 - South Distinctive Area

Is the policy legally compliant? Yes

Is the policy sound? No (because consider it ineffective).

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

Traffic and pedestrian safety on the road from Newby Bridge to Lakeside:

"First, we appreciate the proposed reduction in pressures on minor roads in our Parish (e.g. Bouth, Rusland), and the protection of quiet areas around Rusland and Dale Park. However, the proposed containment of traffic on the Newby-Bridge-Lakeside-Hawkshead road together with the encouragement for sustainable transport, walking, cycling etc., and proposed tourism development of Backbarrow/Lakeside, needs very careful management. This road is already very dangerous for pedestrians and in fact at present we urge people not to walk along the stretch from Newby Bridge to Lakeside. If more traffic (including pedestrians) is to be encouraged along this road then some kind of walkway improvements will be essential. We hope to be further consulted on more detailed proposals."

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary:

"Inclusion in the policy of the need to address road safety concerns and to find a way for a pedestrian walkway and cycle-way in the detailed proposals for development of the area."

3. On Policies CS25 (Protecting the Landscape) and CS28 (Lakeshore Development)

Is the policy legally compliant? Yes

Is the policy sound? No (because consider it ineffective and inconsistent with national policy).

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

"We particularly welcome Policy CS 25 Protecting the Spectacular Landscape and Section 4.54. Encroaching noise and visual intrusion are mentioned here. However they are only indirectly referred to in CS 28 Lakeshore Development, and **we suggest that CS 28 is not robust enough to protect lakeshores** 'in a manner and by such means as will leave their natural beauty unimpaired for the enjoyment of this and future generations' (Sandford Committee 1974. See 2.1.4 page 5).

In addition, we are surprised and concerned at the **lack of specific attention to water quality** in lakes, tarns and rivers. Water quality is becoming a big issue (ref South Cumbria Rivers Trust report) and should be addressed alongside the proposal to deliver high quality tourism (a cruise on a badly polluted lake would not be a high quality experience)."

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary:

"Strengthen policy CS28 and include a specific section on water quality. "

4. On Policy CS14: Sustainable Transport Solutions

Is the policy legally compliant? Yes

Is the policy sound? No (because consider it ineffective).

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound.

"The aim to reduce the need to travel within and through the National Park is very ambitious. However, we do need to enable residents and visitors to travel in such ways that considerably reduce our carbon emissions. In order to achieve a reduction of per capita carbon emissions to 11.5 % by 2011 (!) (4.14.6) will require urgent, radical and imaginative solutions. We welcome the sections on Climate Change (4.14) and Sustainable Transport Solutions (4.15) but **suggest that strategic transport management plans need to be addressed, with partners, urgently.** "