

KPM19870225

*Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Meeting held at 7.30 pm on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> February 1987 in the Institute*

*PRESENT: J H Barkway (in the Chair), Messrs H & S Baldwin, Mrs V Barkway, Mrs Bialy, Mr & Mrs C Black, Mr T Birkett, Mr & Mrs K Dawson, Mr P Dawson, Mr I Dickinson, Mr & Miss Driscoll, Mr & Mrs G Fox, Miss G Fry, Mr & Mrs C Gregory, Mr & Mrs D Grundy, Mr & Mrs L Hayton, Mrs G Hayton, Mr & Mrs P Mitchell, Mr & Mrs M Mitchell, Mr & Mrs Otty, Mr & Mrs R Pighills, Prof. P Reynolds, Mr & Mrs F Salkeld, Mr & Mrs J Williams, Rev. J Woolcock*

*APOLOGIES: Mrs Reynolds, Mrs I Dickinson, Mrs J Walker, Mrs H Baldwin*

*CHAIRMAN'S COMMENT: Mr Barkway explained the purpose of the meeting, namely to discuss the Planning Board Document "Kentmere Parking and Toilets". He referred the problem back to the Minutes of 1979 and welcomed the opportunity to explore any avenue that would provide a solution to the following problems:*

- A) Visitors are welcome; the valley has much to offer*
- B) The present parking facilities are incapable of satisfying the demand*
- C) The abuse of the safety, ecological and neighbourly standards has reached an unacceptable level.*

*He went on to explain that previous Parish views had tended to polarise on three factors*

- i) Some recognise and welcome tourists with cars for the trade they give*
- ii) Some feel car parks are necessary but "not outside their homes"*
- iii) What are "They" (the Authorities) going to do about it, having been consulted by the Parish for over eight years.*

*Meanwhile, he said, the valley road becomes less safe and the margin of safety has declined sharply.*

*Parking problems are becoming 'erosion' problems.*

*Normal life in the Valley is centring around the Tourists instead of 'vice versa'.*

*Safety standards are now unacceptable insomuch that free passage for public service vehicles, e.g. fire engines, ambulances, is not always available. Roads built with an infrastructure suitable for horse-drawn traffic and repaired by Pothole filling and tar spraying, are now showing signs of serious deterioration. In some places there is a recognisable risk to human life and safety.*

*He felt that the questions and comments which would come from the meeting would tend to centre on four points.*

1. *PEACE* – Kentmere is designated as a quiet Valley in the Cumbria reconstruction plan and the Planning Authority have powers to resist any tendency to the contrary.
2. *SAFETY* – Road congestion and speed are the main factors. Outdated byelaws concerning permission for coaches, 32 seaters, are now both unrealistic and irresponsible.
3. *ECOLOGY* – The natural loveliness and rare vegetation will in a few years be so diminished that they will be lost to future generations.
4. *PARKING* – This was becoming a product of self-willed determination to get near the 'Advertised Walk' at any cost, no matter what danger or inconvenience is caused.

Mr Barkway asked that speakers should confine themselves to brief observations so that all present would have time to make a case.

There would be no formal resolutions proposed or asked for. It was important that the entire content of the meeting should be 'views expressed' so that all Parishioners would be able to understand all the implications involved when making their reply to the Planning Board.

Mr. Hayton outlined his plan for an extended carpark at the Institute. This plan would involve the purchase of the field below Capplerigg. It would, he said:

- a) Provide a carpark at a natural meeting point
- b) Which would be screened by the existing walk and natural tree screen
- c) It would be less prominent than the Board's proposed scheme at Low Bridge
- d) The capacity could be estimated at between 30 & 40 cars, depending on layout
- e) This park would provide a community balance, giving extra parking for Locals at
  1. Functions at the Institute
  2. Weddings, Funerals and Services
  3. Provide income for the Women's Institute and community who occasionally make teas to raise funds for the Parish and their own purposes

Other views were expressed (not necessarily in the order they were made)

1. Only one car park should be made available
2. Large car park at Staveley with restricted access to the Valley
3. No car parks at all, but possibly mini buses from Staveley
4. Staveley car park would have to be very big
5. The Planning Board's suggestion was a "temporary mopping up job"
6. It was "naive" to think that the plan would solve the problem
7. The ideal place of course, was the 'flats' near the tarn which belonged to, but were not used by, the British Industrial Sands plc.

A sounding was taken. In answer to the question "did people feel that car parks were now necessary, given the proviso that it was possible to outlaw any vergeside parking. A majority raised their hands.

*Low Bridge – The Planning Board suggestion was discussed and views were expressed:*

- 1. The Parishioners in the immediate vicinity, while recognising the need for a car park somewhere, would be against the plan.*
- 2. The car park would be visually unattractive from houses and property on the high ground.*
- 3. Attempts to landscape it would still not hide the glint caused by the sun on the vehicles.*
- 4. Landscaping should not produce the same effect as White Moss.*
- 5. The alternative suggestion of a car park where it was needed at the Institute would make this site unnecessary.*
- 6. The car park was too near the houses of the village*

*A sounding was taken. In answer to the question “Do you agree that the Low Bridge site is a good answer to the problem? A majority did not agree that it was a good answer.*

*Site E Waterfoot Bridge: The site was discussed and the following views expressed.*

- 1. It would be insensitive to use the land so near to the woodlands containing so much wildlife which would inevitably move away.*
- 2. That a flexible view should be taken since this site was suggested with a community view in mind.*
- 3. The proposed park was the first major viewpoint of the upper valley known so well and enjoyed by the Parishioners. It would be wrong to position it here.*
- 4. Why not think positively about the other side of the road.*
- 5. Why not enquire of the Senior as opposed to the local management of British Industrial Sands plc., as to the parking possibilities on ‘the flats’.*
- 6. If agreement could be reached with B.I.S. great care should be taken in the definition of the route taken by any vehicles to avoid any disturbance to the nature reservation zone on the North side of the tarn.*

*No sounding was taken because no collective viewpoint could be ascertained at this meeting.*

*Hartrigg Site : The following views were discussed and expressed*

- 1. The suggested site was a non-runner because water was extracted at that point for Brow Top Farm, The Heads and Capperigg. Possible pollution by humans or machines would be wrong.*
- 2. Rare Flora and Birdlife which it was reported existed at that particular site, would be damaged if not destroyed.*
- 3. Two alternative sites were suggested, either at the top of the rise or at the first grid gate which people tend to use now.*

4. *Why not use the top of the Valley*
5. *The road beyond Hartrigg is private*
6. *The practice in Ennerdale of a barrier with keyholders could be considered.*

*No sounding was taken because there seemed no collective disapproval of this site.*

*Brockstones Stile End: The following views were expressed*

1. *Strictly limited and disciplined parking was acceptable, though part of the suggested site would require draining.*
2. *Clear limitations were needed because already people were parking at the Tongue barn.*
3. *Gravengate passing place is constantly abused.*

*No sounding was taken as there seemed to be guarded approval of this site.*

*Further suggestions:*

1. *It was suggested that an alternative site should be explored, namely, where the Milk float used to be placed and the route to the Tarn used by the anglers. A flexible approach by the two landowners concerned would be needed.  
No adverse comment was received other than a nervousness expressed as to the possible promotion of another route which could become tourist dense.*
2. *The triangular gap (possibly council) on the head of the rise from Phillipsons Well to Ulthwaite barn. This could well be the final overflow car park which would be an acceptable walking distance.*

*Road Discipline: The following views were expressed*

1. *Any scheme would stand or fall on the disciplines which needed to be enforced.*
2. *There should be no vergeside parking as it was both dangerous and damaging*
3. *The Planning Board's estimate of catering for 60-70 cars was a gross under-estimate of what was happening in off peak periods.*
4. *If new parking facilities were given and no other discipline introduced the present problem would not go away but would become worse in the first weekend.*
5. *There must be a sign erected at Scroggs bridge clearly indicating Valley Full, no further parking available.*
6. *The Byelaw which allows 32 seater coaches up the valley road must be changed forthwith as it is now impossible for their drivers to negotiate the hazard caused by parked vehicles.*
7. *Clearly signed turning points should be indicated. An additional one was suggested at the Pound at the bottom of Church Hill. There was already a council made point at Greenhead.*

8. *The road should be designated and clearly signed as 'Narrow road with passing places'.*
9. *Does the Planning Board have the power to plan and create a Carpark,*
10. *The whole issue is the solution of a long term problem, and should be so treated. A patching job would make matters worse.*
11. *People should be let in but cars kept out.*
12. *Is it possible through the Byelaw route to restrict parking in places other than the car parks. If not it will be necessary to introduce yellow lines on certain key parts of the road and lanes.*
13. *If yellow lines were introduced it must follow that a car park would have to be created.*
14. *There should be a speed limit for the road.*
15. *It was impossible to fill in questionnaire.*
16. *There must be teeth to prevent parking on road.*
17. *Local Authors of guide books should be approached by the Planning Authority who should be told of the problem and should indicate that the valley is a walking valley and to try and reduce the pressures of the car.*
18. *Toilets should be provided but problems needed to be solved*
  - A) *An improved water supply would be needed and should not interfere with School House supply*
  - B) *Improved drainage and cesspool would be needed (present one situated very near to School House).*

SUMMARY *Endeavouring to conclude the meeting the Chairman summarised as follows:*

1. *It seemed that a respected minority were flatly against any movement in the form of car parks.*
2. *The Parishioners of Kentmere welcomed Tourists not only for the cash they bring but also because they liked to share the natural beauty of the valley. In return they insist upon respect for the locals peace, ecology and safety.*
3. *The road was no dangerous and positive action to prohibit vergeside parking was essential.*
4. *There was a duty by the local authority to*
  - a) *Sign properly*
  - b) *Create and enforce passing places*
  - c) *Restrict and discipline 'over parking' to preserve safety standards.*

*The Chairman thanked everyone for coming and for their honest contribution. He closed the Meeting at 9.53 p.m.*

*Jeremy H Barkway  
17 June 87*