



Land Allocations Consultation Room to Live, Space to Breathe

Consultation Response Form

Your contact details

15 APR 2011
 RESOURCES
 SOUTH LAKELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

If you are completing a paper copy of this form please use CAPITALS and BLACK INK.

Your details		Your Agent's details (if you have one)	
Organisation: Russell Armer Ltd		Organisation: Barden Planning Consultants	
Name:		Name: Brian Barden	
Address: c/o Agent		Address: 130 Highgate, Kendal, Cumbria	
Postcode:		Postcode:	LA9 4HE
Tel:		Tel: 01539 724766	
*Email:		*Email: bpc@ktdbroadband.com	

*We aim to minimise the amount of paper printed and sent out. Therefore, where an email address is supplied, future contact will be made electronically.

This response contains pages including this one.

Please tick the box if you would like us to notify you when the Land Allocations Development Plan Document is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and when it is adopted by the Council.

If you have any questions, or no longer wish to be consulted on the South Lakeland Local Development Framework, please call the Development Plans Team on tel: 01539 717490.

Completed forms can be sent to:

**Development Strategy Manager
 South Lakeland District Council
 South Lakeland House
 Lowther Street
 Kendal
 LA9 4DL**

Comments about suggested site allocations (and other map designations)

Please use this form to comment on emerging options and other sites as they appear on the settlement maps. **Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Map Number (e.g. 11)	Site reference number (e.g. R62)	Other designation – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here
Kirkby Lonsdale	3 (1 of 2)	R127M	
Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)			
I support / do not support /support in part the suggested site allocation/ designation for the following use(s) Housing/employment/ retail/community uses/open space/ other (specify).....			
Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)			
<p>As developers, Russell Armer have had discussions with the two major land owners with a view to bringing the land forward for development.</p> <p>Whilst generally supporting the allocation of this land there is some concern about the way in which it is designated. That is because it is shown to be a mixed use site and the available information suggests that 6.2 hectares will be housing and 1.7 hectares will be employment.</p> <p>If the Council is able to reach a conclusion as to how much land will be designated for each purpose, it has presumably worked out which areas of land are to be utilised for which purpose.</p> <p>A mixed use designation gives the impression that the two things will be mixed together which is not terribly practical or sensible and there seems to be no good reason why the Council could not designate one area for housing and the other smaller area specifically for employment use. This would allow anyone commenting on this allocation to be able to asses it properly, whereas at the moment that is difficult given the uncertainty as to where the employment element will be located.</p> <p>By way of suggestion, it would seem sensible to locate the employment uses closest to Kendal Road near the all-weather sports pitch because employment uses would not be subject to the same adverse impact on amenity that would arise in relation to residential properties from a floodlit all-weather pitch.</p> <p>It is also important to query the suggestion made in the Land Allocations Development Plan Document itself that the employment element can be accessed directly onto the A65. Whether the intention was to state that there can be access direct to the A65 via Kendal Road without going into the town is perhaps unclear, but the allocation itself is not contiguous with the A65 from which it is separated by significantly elevated ground. It is also fairly clear that the Highways Agency would not be prepared to countenance a direct access to the A65.</p>			