

# *Lindal and Marton Parish Council*

Chairman  
A Waite  
4 Silver Street  
Marton  
Nr Ulverston  
Cumbria LA12 0NQ  
Tel 01229 462922

Clerk  
J Smith  
7 East View  
Lindal-in-Furness  
Cumbria LA12 0LG  
Tel 01229 467261

Councillors:-

Mr A Waite (462922) Mr R Lord (464034) Mrs S Glover (462383) Mr D Howarth (463304) Mrs S Kelly (465343)

## **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> July 2016, at 7.30 pm in the Buccleuch Hall, Lindal.**

**Present**:- Councillors Mr R Lord; Mrs S Glover; Mr D Howarth; Mrs S Kelly

**Councillor Howarth in the Chair.**

**Apologies**:- Councillor A Waite.

**Also present**: 2 members of the public were present.

**In attendance**:- Borough Councillor Mrs Ann Thurlow,  
Apologies from County Councillor Barry Doughty; PCSO L Johns.

## **56/16 Urgent business. Items normally needing to be publicised but received too late for the agenda. (Section 100B (4) (b) Local Government Act 1972)**

None.

## **57/16 Disclosure of interests. Requests for dispensations.**

None.

## **58/16 Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2016 were taken as read and APPROVED.

PROPOSED:- Councillor R Lord: SECONDED:- Councillor Mrs Glover.  
Carried unanimously.

## **59/16 Matters arising from those minutes.**

The Clerk reported on the following:-

- a) 54/16 (d) Problems in relation to Lindal Park/Playing Field had been reported to the Barrow Borough Council (Parks Department) who confirmed that they would monitor

the condition of the play equipment. PCSO Johns had yet to report back on any discussions with the parents of the children involved.

- b) 54/16 (e) A response was awaited from Cumbria Highways regarding repairs to the wall and gate leading into the Park.
- c) 54/16 (f) Cumbria Highways had assessed the situation at Marton regarding the provision of no parking signs/yellow lines and were of the opinion that such arrangements were unnecessary. However, they would be prepared to supply warning signs regarding the children's playground and it was AGREED that this offer should be accepted.
- d) Cumbria Highways had similarly assessed the roads in Marton following the recent provision of a new surface dressing and had confirmed that this was acceptable as a way of extending the life of the road surface.
- e) PCSO Johns had not yet reported back regarding the provision of additional warning signs regarding dog-fouling.

#### **60/16 Attendance of officer from Cumbria Constabulary.**

PCSO Johns was unable to attend in person but had submitted a report confirming that there had been no reported instances of criminal activity in the Parish during May.

#### **61/16 Barrow Transport Improvement Plan.**

It was AGREED that the Council's comments would be limited to confirming its support for a bypass, to continue from the Dalton Bypass, passing Lindal and Ulverston, as had been mentioned recently and as had been suggested some 20 years previously.

#### **62/16 Planning applications relating to the Parish.**

There were no planning applications for consideration.

#### **63/16 Planning applications outside the Borough/Parish – (South Lakeland)**

*SL/2016/0600 Concrete batching plant, land opposite Bank Terrace, Lindal.*

The Clerk summarised the application which was for the creation of a plant to produce ready-mixed concrete, on land opposite Bank Terrace on the A590, between the main road and the railway line. South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) had given pre-application advice suggesting that such a development might be acceptable from a planning point of view and the applicant had submitted information suggesting that highways issues could be resolved with appropriate road-widening, together with reports from various consultancy bodies indicating that there were no particular difficulties relating to flood risks; subsidence, noise/dust pollution, etc etc.

It was also claimed that the forthcoming developments in Ulverston (Glaxo; various housing estates) would create a demand for concrete which would be difficult to meet from existing plants in Barrow and Kendal.

After a wide-ranging discussion *including the floor* it was PROPOSED by Councillor Lord and SECONDED by Councillor Mrs Kelly that the Council decline to support the application because of the total unsuitability of such an industrial development within the countryside, as indicated below:-

### SLDC policies

SLDC's own policy on industrial sites states that, regarding this particular site at Lindal "*The site might also be regarded as too close to houses for waste treatment use and would be better used for light industry, reflecting its historic use*". (page 262)

*"Although this is described as former sidings, the use was so long ago that the site should be regarded as greenfield;"* (page 263).

By implication, both these statements suggest that the site is totally inappropriate for a concrete batching plant.

### General observations

**1 Risk of expansion.** It was noted from the submitted documents that, whilst the application was for this one particular development, reference had been made to the possibility of the remaining part of the site being developed into an industrial estate at some future date. Approval of this application would make it easier for such additional development by being seen to be a precedent for any expansion, a prospect which the Council viewed as totally inappropriate for such a rural location.

**2 Ribbon development.** Any development on this land would add to the ribbon development along the A590, leading to the further urbanisation of the corridor of countryside currently existing between Barrow and Ulverston, with evidence of this to be seen with developments at Crooklands, Dalton, and the prospect of housing at Dane Ghyll, Barrow, and Cross-a-Moor, Swarthmoor – together with a major roundabout.

### Specific observations

**3 Overbearing height.** The plant would include two silos, 12 metres high, which would be a prominent visual intrusion of an industrial nature in the landscape, despite any attempts at screening. The Visual Appraisal report refers to the short, medium and long-term effects on adjacent residential properties, particularly Bank Terrace and East View, but insufficient detail has been provided to indicate the time-scale involved insofar as the mitigation planting is concerned, although there will clearly be a permanent negative impact. This deficiency warrants further investigation and explanations.

**4 Noise.** The Noise Assessment report specifically excludes noise from the use of the access road by HGVs, suggesting that such noise would be irrelevant when taking into account noise currently being created on the adjacent A590. This is misleading in that HGVs using the new access road, heavily-laden, would be traversing a relatively short road (road-surface noisy crushed stone?), with a 90 degree bend, in all likelihood remaining in a low gear with noise (and fumes), significantly greater than that produced by vehicles travelling on the main road.

Furthermore, such heavy vehicles will in all probability be subject to one or more episodes of stop-and-start as they seek to either leave or enter the access road from the A590, again, creating additional noise and fumes from revving engines in low gears.

As the report suggests, noise from concrete batching plants can be extremely variable but it is unreasonable to suggest that it is acceptable. Experience suggests that when plants are operating there are multiple sources of disruptive, intermittent noise, such as aggregate discharge from delivery vehicles into storage bays, the mixing of sand, gravel, cement and water in the batching plant, and its subsequent discharge into the concrete delivery trucks.

The report suggests that vehicles reversing within the confines of the plant should be able to use “white noise” as a safety measure instead of the usual beeping or voice noises. This will be, in itself, additional noise emanating from the plant but “white noise” is likely to be limited to plant-owned vehicles, with others utilising the other forms of warning signs, thus adding to the general cacophony of noise.

The overall increase in noise, from HGVs entering and leaving the site, together with noise from the plant itself, will constitute a distinct nuisance for, in particular, the residents of Bank Terrace and also East View, with the topography of the area tending to channel the sound westwards towards East View. No noise assessment appears to have been made regarding this latter area and this needs to be rectified.

**5 Lighting.** The document relating to the external lighting at the plant is devoid of any information useful to the layman, ie, local residents and appears to be limited to the plant itself with no mention of the access road, with nothing to indicate where any lampposts will be sited, their times of operation, what security lights might be in operation, and when etc. Lighting will be of most importance during winter months in that the visual intrusion from additional illumination will be apparent for the bulk of any 24-hour period.

**6 Power.** No reference is made to the power requirements of the plant, an important issue given that, in Lincolnshire some years ago, such a plant was known to cause some adjacent residential properties to suffer from power reductions whenever the product-mixing equipment was switched on.

**7 Ecological considerations.** Natural England has offered “no comment” on the application but advises that SLDC obtains “specialist ecological or other environmental advice....” There is no evidence, as yet, that such advice has been sought.

**8 Road safety.** The A590 in this area is of an undulating and twisting nature, there being a slight bend at the point where the access road meets the A590, and large, slow, and cumbersome 8-wheeled vehicles coming out of and entering the site, particularly from the west, would be potentially hazardous on an already busy trunk road.

**9 Pedestrian safety.** If it is intended to create the central reservation on the A590 by simply moving the east and west-bound carriageways sideways, by reducing the verges and footpaths, this will have a wholly detrimental effect on pedestrians. The existing footpaths are close enough to this busy highway already, which makes walking on them at times an unpleasant experience, and the planned development will add considerably to this discomfort.

**10 Operating hours.** Whilst the hours of operation for the plant are suggested as 07.00 to 19.00, Monday to Friday, and 07.00 to 13.00 on Saturdays, there is no reference to exceptional requirements which might necessitate working outside these hours and the measures to control such exceptions. The major construction developments referred to in the application (Glaxo etc) are quite likely to involve “big pours” necessitating more continuous activity regarding the production of cement, possibly outside the permitted hours.

### **11 Miscellaneous concerns**

- The disruption to be anticipated if and when any such road improvements were to occur, coupled with on-going improvements to cope with the flooding at Lowfield Bridge, would cause further problems for all users of this vital trunk road as well as local inhabitants.
- Despite the assertion that there are only two similar plants in the area, at Barrow and Kendal, approval has recently been given for a similar development in Barrow, in Anchor Line Road. (Barrow’s reference 2016/0209), casting doubt on the need for additional capacity.
- Insufficient detail is given as to the procedure for cleaning vehicles’ wheels before they leave the site so as to ensure that no contaminants are taken onto the highway, particularly vehicles carrying concrete.
- Reference has been made to the separation of solid wastes from run-off water but there does not appear to be any mention of what is planned for the disposal of such solids, which may contain contaminants.
- There is no reference as to whether the site will be a “designated operating centre” for HGVs and how many vehicles will be approved for such a site and what, if any, restrictions will apply regarding, for example, whether other HGVs would be allowed to use the site for temporary overnight storage.

The Council is aware that professional organisations commissioned by the applicant to report on matters such as noise, pollution, transport, flooding, subsidence etc, etc, have produced reports generally supportive of the application but would expect SLDC to subject such reports to rigorous scrutiny in order to test the validity of all the various claims regarding these issues.

As it is, if the development were to proceed, with the potential for further industrialisation of the remainder of the site, the rural ambience enjoyed by local residents could be severely diminished, leading to a reduced quality of life as well as a dramatic devaluation of properties.

There were three votes in favour of the proposal with one abstention – Councillor Howarth. The proposal was CARRIED.

### **63/16 Correspondence.**

- a) Planning applications relating to the whole of the Borough. NOTED.
- b) Community Information and Safety. (including product recalls.)
  - 1 Fake letter boxes  
(All such notices are displayed on the Lindal notice board.)

### **64/16 Finance.**

- a) Account balances:- *Current* - £50: *Festivals* - £1001.23: *Reserve* - £4870.68
- b) Reference was made to the most recent meeting of the Joint Rural Committee which had been scheduled to take place in the Buccleuch Hall on Wednesday, 15<sup>th</sup> June, but which had been transferred to St Peter's Church. The hire charge for the Hall would have been £18 and the Parish Council would normally reimburse the Church a similar amount.
- c) The Clerk requested reimbursement of his petty cash in the sum of £37.52.
- d) The Clerk reported on the gala held by the Pre-School and Toddlers Group on 11<sup>th</sup> June, for which £350 had been granted out of the Festivals Fund as "kick-start" money towards the event. However, the Group had been able to proceed with the gala without needing such funds and the cheque had been returned unused, with appropriate thanks. Reference was also made to the extremely bad weather which had affected the gala, the result being that the organisers had suffered a loss of around £234 on the day.

It was then PROPOSED by Councillor Lord and SECONDED by Councillor Mrs Glover that items (b) and (c) be approved and that the Pre-School and Toddlers Group be granted £100 as a donation towards the loss. Carried unanimously

### **65/16 Any Other Business.**

- a) Councillor Mrs Kelly commented on recent disturbances in Lindal with a motor-cycle travelling regularly up Pit Lane at an excessive speed, although this seemed to have stopped recently. NOTED.
- b) In addition, she and a neighbour were pursuing the question of having a slight extension to yellow/white lines in front of their properties. NOTED.
- c) Reference was made to the problem generally of speeding vehicles within the Parish and it was agreed that this would be an agenda item for the August meeting.
- d) Councillor Howarth and Councillor Mrs Glover both commented on the proliferation of weeds throughout the Parish and the Clerk undertook to pursue this.

### **66/16 Date and Time of next meeting.**

The Date and Time of the next meeting was AGREED as Thursday, 4<sup>th</sup> August, 2016, at 7.30 pm in the Buccleuch Hall, Lindal.

*(Council meetings are open to the public and all are welcome to attend. Agendas and minutes can be supplied by email to any resident on request and similarly, they can be seen, along with other documents, on the community website, [www.lindal-in-furness.co.uk](http://www.lindal-in-furness.co.uk))*