

13 May 2011

Mr D Hudson
Development Strategy Manager
South Lakeland District Council
South Lakeland House
Lowther Street
Kendal
Cumbria LA9 4DL

Dear Mr Hudson

SLDC Land Allocations DPD – Emerging Options

Thank you for inviting Cumbria County Council to participate in the consultation on the Land Allocations Development Plan Document – Emerging Options.

The county council recognises the importance of providing constructive comments to help develop the District's local development frameworks and we seek to provide detailed comments at each stage of the process. As a consultee it is important that the county council inform the production of development plan documents. In our responsibility for strategic planning, highways and transport, children's and adult services we seek to ensure that our comments can help to plan the services and facilities which the county council look after and ensure these are fully considered at a local level.

Please find enclosed the county council's response. The county council's response was considered and agreed by the county council's Cabinet meeting on 28th April 2011. Please also find enclosed minutes of that meeting.

The county council's Cabinet would like to highlight the need for co-ordination between all Districts and the Lake District National Park Authority to ensure that a strategic and coherent county wide approach to the delivery of sustainable development is achieved which meets the needs of communities within Cumbria. In particular it is important that SLDC ensure that the supply of housing in the LDF area is managed to ensure that evidenced needs are met whilst taking into account the delivery of new employment sites and associated infrastructure which is also required in the area to achieve sustainable growth. It is important that SLDC undertake impact assessments to judge which land allocation are most appropriate to be retained with the Land Allocation DPD.

I hope you find the comments constructive however, should you have any further queries regarding the response please do not hesitate to contact Leanne Beverley, Senior Planning Officer in the Spatial Planning Team (contact details can be found at the top of page 1). We look forward to receiving the next stage of the Land Allocations DPD for comment in due course.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Marie Fallon', written in a cursive style.

Marie Fallon
Corporate Director – Environment

CABINET
Meeting date: 28 April 2011
From: Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment Corporate Director – Environment

SOUTH LAKELAND LAND ALLOCATIONS EMERGING OPTIONS CONSULTATION

PART A - RECOMMENDATION OF CABINET MEMBER

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. *The planning system in England follows a ‘plan led’ system, i.e. it is a statutory duty to prepare a ‘Development Plan’. The Development Plan is an important document as it guides and informs day to day decisions as to whether or not planning permission should be granted. It also helps to guide investment decisions for important infrastructure provision. In September 2004 Government introduced legislation to replace the system of Structure Plans and Local Plans with Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and Local Development Frameworks (LDFs). Since coming into power the coalition government through the Localism Bill has stated its intention to revoke the Regional Strategies, this will take place once the Localism Bill is in force. However, until this takes place the Regional Strategies and saved Joint Structure Plan Policies still form part of the Development Plan, as well as LDF’s.*
- 1.2. *Each local planning authority in Cumbria (including the Lake District National Park) must produce a Local Development Framework. A Local Development Framework is a folder of documents which outlines how planning, should take place over a 15 year period. The folder contains a Core Strategy, Proposals Map, Site Allocations and other Development Plan Documents (DPDs).*
- 1.3. *The Local Planning Authorities in Cumbria are at various stages with the preparation of their LDFs. Previously, views have been expressed by Cabinet on the South Lakeland District Council’s Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document (November 2009). Since this date an examination was held and the Core Strategy was adopted and published in August 2010. This document took on board the previous representations made by Cabinet.*

- 1.4. *As a consultee, it is important that the County Council inform the process of the preparation of all the LDFs. As we are the strategic planning, highways and transport, children's and adult services authority, early dialogue with the local authority and seeking to influence planning policy is particularly key to us e.g. highways infrastructure (capital and revenue) planning, bus service reviews, school capacity planning, school travel plans, adult social and health care provision.*
- 1.5. *The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet Members of the content of the Land Allocation Emerging Options Document. Endorsement is sought on a number of comments noted in section 4, appendix 1 and 2.*

2.0 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1. *The County Council's policy on spatial matters is set out in the Cumbria Strategic Partnership's Sub Regional Spatial Strategy 2008-2028 and those policies of the Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan which have been extended and not replaced by the North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy (September 2008). It is important that LDF documents link to the Cumbria Sub Regional Spatial Strategy as they provide an up to date framework to deliver sustainable communities and ensure development is coordinated in Cumbria.*
- 2.2. *South Lakeland District Council adopted and published its Core Strategy in August 2010. This document broadly reflects the Cumbria Sub Regional Spatial Strategy which supports development in the Key and Local Service Centres. The Core Strategy sets the spatial strategy for the area and all other DPD's within the LDF (including the Land Allocations). As a result of the previous consultation response to the South Lakeland Core Strategy submission document, which was endorsed by Cabinet on the 3 November 2009, amendments were made by SLDC, which are considered to satisfy concerns raised.*
- 2.3. *The South Lakeland Emerging Options Land Allocation Document is an important document for future spatial planning in Cumbria, and has links to the Themes of wealthier, healthier, happier and greener of the Council Plan. The issues outlined below reflect the key priorities within these themes.*
- 2.4. *In relation to equality, Development Plan Document preparation follows detailed procedures for public engagement which South Lakeland will have to adhere to. Various media forms are used to advertise opportunities for consultation. Documents are available in various formats, there are a wide range of consultees involved crossing all equality strands. It is also important to note that there could be differing views expressed at all levels of engagement throughout the LDF consultation process due to the potential impacts on individuals and groups.*

- 2.5. ***The South Lakeland Emerging Options Land Allocations Document has no direct equality implications for Cumbria. Although the quantum type and location of development could have an impact on local communities and specific groups in society.***

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1. *It is recommended that Cabinet:*
- a.) *broadly support and welcome the majority of South Lakeland District Council's Land Allocation Emerging Options Document*
 - b.) *endorse the submission of a number of comments made in section 4 and specific comments made in appendices 1 and 2*

Tim Knowles – Portfolio Member for Transport and Environment

PART B – ADVICE OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR – ENVIRONMENT

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1. South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) is at an advanced stage with the production of their LDF. SLDC adopted and published their Core Strategy in August 2010. The Core Strategy establishes the development strategy for South Lakeland outside of the National Park upto 2025. The Core Strategy sets out that 8800 new dwellings should will be built between 2003-2025 and that around 4 hectares of new employment land are needed per annum between 2010-2025.
- 4.2. The Core Strategy has set the development strategy for South Lakeland this is encapsulated in the table below:-

Settlements	Approximate Amount of Development
Principle Service Centres	
Kendal	35%
Ulverston	20%
Key Service Centres	
Milnthorpe Kirkby Lonsdale Grange-over-Sands	13%
Local Service Centres	21%
Smaller Villages & Hamlets	11%

- 4.3. South Lakeland District Council are now in the process of developing their Land Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The Land Allocations DPD is an important document as it should guide development to happen in

the right place at the right time and in tandem with new infrastructure. The Land Allocations DPD also seeks to protect existing open spaces, outdoor sports facilities, employment land and green gaps where deemed necessary.

- 4.4. SLDC have reached a stage where they are consulting on 'Emerging Options'. Since 2005 SLDC have been collecting information on sites for future development. In total, approximately 900 sites have been suggested for consideration, of which approximately 300 were dismissed as they were considered too small to warrant an allocation. SLDC have put forward 152 sites as 'Emerging Options' for consideration.
- 4.5. The council has been involved throughout the development of the Land Allocations DPD. The 'Emerging Options' stage is a formal stage in the development of the DPD, hence it is appropriate for Cabinet to give a response on behalf of the Council.
- 4.6. It is important to note that because this is an 'Emerging Options' consultation final amounts of allocated land are not defined. Therefore, in some settlements, if all the suggested sites in this consultation were to be developed, it would result in more development than is required in the Core Strategy. However, it is important that SLDC ensure the final Site Allocation DPD will be able to deliver with the quantum of development which is set out in the adopted Core Strategy DPD.
- 4.7. In order for the final Land Allocations DPD to deliver the amount of development which is needed, it is important that SLDC demonstrate that the 'Emerging Options' suggested can meet the targets in the Core Strategy.

Key Strategic Comments

- 4.8. Below are the main strategic comments and issues raised in respect of SLDC Land Allocations 'Emerging Options', set out in key topic areas.

Employment

- It is considered that there is an appropriate amount of land identified for Kendal (29.19ha) and Ulverston (15.79) through the 'Emerging Options', given that some site allocations maybe amended as a result of the consultation. It is noted that the 'Emerging Options' would provide a small under supply of new employment land in the defined Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres. However, it is acknowledged that this under supply could be balanced out the higher provision in the Principle Service Centres where the need may be greater.
- The allocation of employment sites in Kendal is welcomed, given the current deficit of supply and the need to support economic growth in Kendal and the wider area. It is considered important that a choice of sites is made available across Kendal, with the focus being land that is well related to the trunk road network.

- The allocation of land at Kendal Fell for a household waste transfer recycling facility is supported, as it will help unlock Kendal Canal Head by relocating the HWRC to Kendal Fell.
- The Land Allocations 'Emerging Options' makes no assumptions about the potential contribution that the Canal Head Area Action Plan (AAP) could make to housing and employment targets. It is therefore important that when further detail of the Kendal Canal Head AAP becomes available, SLDC consider the mix and amount of uses, which could potentially affect the Land Allocations DPD.

Housing

- It is recognised that the overall amount of housing land proposed within the 'Emerging Options' total more than is required by the Core Strategy. SLDC justify this on the basis that sites are proposed for consultation and the responses made will inform the final location and number of sites contained within the Land Allocations DPD. This consultation is an opportunity to look at all reasonable options for the required number of sites. Even though there appears to be a short fall in the Local Service Centres and Small Settlements in Kendal Rural. It is important to acknowledge that there are sites which are below the 0.3ha in Local Service Centres and 0.1ha in Small Settlements thresholds which will also contribute to achieving the target.
- In order to ensure that the supply of housing in the LDF area is managed to achieve sustainable growth, SLDC should ensure that evidenced housing needs are met whilst taking account of the delivery of new employment sites and associated infrastructure which is also fundamental to meeting the economic objectives for the area. SLDC should use their own impact assessments to judge which land allocations are most appropriate to be retained within the Land Allocation DPD.

Highways and Transport

- Technical site specific comments are detailed in Appendix 2. Whilst indicative responses have been provided on the feasibility of individual development sites, the council would not wish these to pre-empt the outcomes of detailed highway assessments. As a general caveat it is important to note that the comments made in Appendix 2 are made on an individual site basis and have not taken into account the cumulative effects on the highway network. Larger sites will warrant a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, which may show further constraints which are not highlighted in Appendix 2.
- County Council officers will work with SLDC to identify more robustly the transport implications of development, so as to be able to provide developers and others with certainty in relation to requirements for enabling or mitigating highways and transport measures.
- There is on going work to assess the cumulative impact of development proposals in Kendal.

Historic Environment

- It is strongly recommended early, pre-application, consultation with the County Historic Environment Service by any prospective developer is needed. It is also considered that any development needs to be preceded by an assessment of the archaeological significance for each site.

Biodiversity

- There is a general concern that the degree of infill that would take place if all of these sites were to be developed could lead to the potential significant loss of general biodiversity. It is therefore recommended that the DPD seeks to incorporate significant enhancements.
- The biodiversity assessment appears to have been undertaken in an ad hoc way, relying on the comments of consultees rather than carrying out a full assessment. It is recommended that along with Cumbria Wildlife Trust, County Council representatives should meet with SLDC to discuss how the potential lack of evidence and consistency regarding biodiversity can be addressed.
- Concern is raised that the evidence base does not fully recognise the biodiversity designations and issues.

Adult Social Care

- The independent needs analysis, provided by 'Planning4Care' (2009) identifies the need for 320 extra care housing units across the SLDC area by 2019 (several schemes are already in operation which contribute towards this target). It is important that SLDC in preparation of the housing land allocations document ensure identified needs are met through adequate provision of land.

School Organisation

- Many schools in South Lakeland, particularly primaries, are experiencing pressure on places. The areas with most concern are Kendal and Milnthorpe. The position of schools is continually monitored, but no schools have currently been identified for rationalisation as this will be discussed through BEST meetings with Headteachers, governors and stakeholders during the summer term.
- It is important that school playing fields are recognised as being exclusively for school use and should not be considered available for any other use or access without the consent of the governing or other controlling body. As their use is for formal playing field purposes their designation as Amenity Open Space is not considered appropriate. Such designations on school playing fields should be removed.

County Council Owned Sites

- The County Council owns four sites which are identified as 'Emerging Options', three have been identified for residential, two are in Kendal RN69 (49 dwellings), RN117M (71 dwellings) and one in Heversham RN118M (56 dwellings). There is also one site Grange-over-Sands (R350M) for mixed residential (17 dwellings) and employment 1.26ha. Support is given to the inclusion of these sites in the 'Emerging Options'.
- The County offices site located off Busher Walk in Kendal, will be reviewed with a view to rationalising and transforming service provision. South Lakeland District Council is therefore asked to take account of the need for the County Council and its public sector partners to review and reprovide its facilities in the most appropriate way on this site and to ensure that the Land Allocations DPD allows for the campus, parts of the site and the buildings on the site to be redeveloped for appropriate uses in the future.

4.9. The South Lakeland Land Allocation 'Emerging Options' Document has been considered by South Lakeland Local Committee on the 4 April 2011. During the debate differing views were expressed as to how the County Council should respond to the consultation. There were members who expressed disquiet about land development in the area and considered the Land Allocations to be ill conceived. They supported a proposal calling for Cabinet to object to the housing development identified in the Land Allocations DPD. There were members who supported the Land Allocation Emerging Options stressing the need for affordable housing to be provided in the area, and for development to be planned for in a controlled manner.

4.10. Upon being put to the vote, it was resolved

'that the matters raised in the report be noted, and that given the severe reservations expressed by members of the Local Committee about the housing proposals across the district Cabinet be called upon to object to the housing development in the Land Allocations, whilst recognising the need for the sensitive development of affordable housing for local people'.

4.11. In consideration of the concerns raised by local committee members it is suggested that Cabinet requests SLDC to ensure that the supply of housing in the LDF area is managed to ensure that evidenced needs are met whilst taking account the delivery of new employment sites and associated infrastructure which is also required in the area to achieve sustainable growth. SLDC should use their own impact assessments to judge which land allocations are most appropriate to be retained within the Land Allocation DPD.

5.0 OPTIONS

5.1. Members can raise additional comments on any aspect of the report and Appendices and make suggestions to amend. Alternatively, Members can endorse the report and response as it stands.

- 5.2. An option might be for the Cabinet not to respond to the Land Allocations 'Emerging Options'. In which case as planning and local highways and transport authority, it would not be possible to effectively influence the spatial development of South Lakeland District Council. It is considered that this would not be a sustainable approach to take in this case.

6.0 RESOURCE AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations contained in this report.

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. The County Council is a statutory consultee and not a "decision taker" as such in the SLDC Local Development Framework process. Its views or comments in this process would not appear to hold any direct legal implications for the County Council as long as these have demonstrably been reasoned through as cogent land use considerations and are not arrived at on an unreasonable basis or have not been properly considered.
- 7.2. There are no other legal considerations.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1. It is considered that the majority of the South Lakeland District Council's Land Allocation Emerging Options Document should be supported. It is considered that SLDC should take account the comments made in of Section 4 of the main report and specific comments made in appendices 1 and 2.

Marie Fallon
Corporate Director – Environment

28 April 2011

Please ensure that every part of this section where there is an asterisk is completed in accordance with the instructions before sending the report to Democratic Services, following which please delete this sentence.*

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Detailed Comments

Appendix 2 – Site Specific Highways and Landscape Comments

Electoral Division(s): All of South Lakeland

** Please remove whichever option is not applicable*

Executive Decision	<table><tr><td>Yes*</td><td></td></tr></table>	Yes*		
Yes*				
Key Decision	<table><tr><td></td><td>No*</td></tr></table>		No*	
	No*			
If a Key Decision, is the proposal published in the current Forward Plan?	<table><tr><td></td><td></td><td>N/A*</td></tr></table>			N/A*
		N/A*		
Is the decision exempt from call-in on grounds of urgency?	<table><tr><td>Yes*</td><td>No*</td></tr></table>	Yes*	No*	
Yes*	No*			
If exempt from call-in, has the agreement of the Chair of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee been sought or obtained?	<table><tr><td>Yes*</td><td>No*</td><td>N/A*</td></tr></table>	Yes*	No*	N/A*
Yes*	No*	N/A*		
Has this matter been considered by Overview and Scrutiny? If so, give details below.	<table><tr><td></td><td>No*</td></tr></table>		No*	
	No*			
Has an environmental or sustainability impact assessment been undertaken?	<table><tr><td></td><td></td><td>N/A*</td></tr></table>			N/A*
		N/A*		
Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?	<table><tr><td></td><td></td><td>N/A*</td></tr></table>			N/A*
		N/A*		

N.B. *If an executive decision is made, then a decision cannot be implemented until the expiry of the eighth working day after the date of the meeting – unless the decision is urgent and exempt from call-in and the Corporate Director has obtained the necessary approvals.*

PREVIOUS RELEVANT COUNCIL OR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS **[including Local Committees]**

Cabinet 3 November 2009

South Lakeland Proposed Submission Core Strategy – Approved Officers Recommendation

South Lakeland Local Committee 21 October 2009

South Lakeland Proposed Submission Core Strategy – Made comments on draft Cabinet report for consideration by Cabinet

CONSIDERATION BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Not considered by Overview and Scrutiny.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

South Lakeland District Council Land Allocation Development Plan Consultation Documents

<http://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/dirlist.asp?subfolder=%2FLocal+Development+Framework%2FLand+Allocations+Emerging+Options+for+Consultation>

RESPONSIBLE CABINET MEMBER

Tim Knowles – Portfolio Member for Transport and Environment

REPORT AUTHOR

Contact: Leanne Beverley – Senior Planning Officer – 01228 226739 –
leanne.beverley@cumbriacc.gov.uk

Graeme Innes – Planning Officer – 01228 226599 –
graeme.innes@cumbriacc.gov.uk

E-Mail to: Democratic Services (Linda Graham –
linda.graham@cumbriacc.gov.uk)

DRAFT CABINET REPORT FOR MEETING ON: 28 April 2011.....

REPORT TITLE: South Lakeland Allocations Emerging Options
Consultation

AUTHOR: Graeme Innes...

PART 1 OR 2:

1. The above report has been agreed with the following corporate directors:

.....
.....

2. The Council's statutory officers below have also approved the report:

Name of approving officer

Assistant Director Finance (s151 officer) Yes/No*

Assistant Director Legal and

Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) Yes

Barry Devlin

3. The draft has also been discussed and agreed with the relevant Cabinet Member. Yes/No*

Signed:
[Corporate Director or Head of Service only]

Date:

PLEASE REFER TO THE INTRANET

(<http://www.intouch.ccc/eLibrary/Content/Intranet/536/653/39520101035.pdf>)

FOR TIMETABLE FOR REPORTS. ANY REPORTS WHICH DO NOT MEET THE DEADLINES ARE LIKELY TO BE DEFERRED TO THE FOLLOWING CABINET MEETING.

**Please delete as appropriate*

APPENDX 1

DETAILED COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO SOUTH LAKELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL'S LAND ALLOCATIONS EMERGING OPTIONS CONSULTATION

1. Employment

- 1.1 South Lakeland District Council's adopted Core Strategy sets a target of 60 ha of new employment land to be developed between 2010 and 2025. It has been acknowledged by SLDC in both the Core Strategy and the Land Allocations DPD that on the whole, in South Lakeland there is a shortage of available employment land and premises. The County Council's annual Employment Land Availability Assessment, for the monitoring year 09/10 shows that South Lakeland has 17.96 ha of available land which includes sites with planning permission, allocated in the Local Plan and under construction. SLDC has reported in their 09/10 Annual Monitoring Report that less than half of the 17.96 ha can be considered 'available' as defined in the definition "... fully serviced and actively marketed or likely to be fully serviced in the next three years". The table below shows how the 60ha identified in the Core Strategy is divided up for Principle Service Centres, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres compared to the amounts which have been identified in the Emerging Options.

Table 1

Settlement	Core Strategy	Emerging Options
Principle Service Centres		
Kendal		
Strategic Employment	9	18
Business / Science Park	9	6.52
Local Employment Site	3	4.67
Total	21	29.19
Ulverston		
Strategic Employment	6	6.42
Business / Science Park	6	3.99
Local Employment Site	1	5.38
Total	13	15.79
Key Service Centres	9	7.74
Grange-over-Sands		3.94
Milnthorpe		1.45
Kirkby Lonsdale		2.35
Local Service Centres	12	8.9

- 1.2 In relation to the Principle Service Centres Table 1 shows that overall there will be an adequate amount of land supplied through the Emerging Options, sufficient to meet the Core Strategy target throughout the plan period. It is important to acknowledge that the Core Strategy targets will be reviewed throughout the plan period. It is important that SLDC keep their Employment Land monitoring up to date, to inform this process. This emphasises the

importance that there is sufficient land identified to allow for changing demands.

- 1.3 The 'Emerging Options' would provide a small under supply of new employment land in the Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres. However, it is acknowledged that this under supply could be balanced out by the increased supply in the Principle Service Centres where the need may be greater.
- 1.4 The council is supportive of the allocation of land for employment purposes within Kendal, as there is a shortage of sites and premises which is undermining the potential for economic growth. There is evidence of the strength of demand for employment sites within Kendal in the Eden and South Lakeland Business Needs Survey Report, which was produced in June 2010. The production of development briefs will be important for securing high quality design and appropriate landscaping from residential areas in these prominent locations. It is considered that these strategic sites should be required to make provision for Next Generation Access (NGA) fibre to the premises (FTTP). A significant amount of the demand within Kendal is for B2 and therefore the brief should not necessarily be overly prescriptive about the type of occupier i.e. high tech business.
- 1.5 Many businesses want freehold or long leaseholds, it is therefore important that there is a choice of sites and premises made available across Kendal, as not all developers are willing to give freeholds.
- 1.6 It is considered that not all employment sites will come forward within the early plan period due to the complexity of sites and the commercial negotiations required. Hence, there should be recognition of other potential employment opportunities to help ensure a choice of potential sites that could come to the market and help meet established need.
- 1.7 It is important to note that SLDC through an Area Action Plan (AAP) are promoting mixed use regeneration at Canal Head in Kendal, which could deliver significant employment and residential development. However, at the present time SLDC are making no assumptions about the potential contribution, the AAP area could make to the housing and employment targets. It is important that when further detail of the Kendal Canal AAP becomes available that SLDC consider how the mix and amount of uses could potentially affect the Land Allocations DPD.
- 1.8 The council is supportive of the allocation of land at Kendal Fell for a household waste transfer recycling facility, as this will help unlock Kendal Canal Head by relocating the HWRC to Kendal Fell.

2. Housing

- 2.1 To predict the amount of housing land which needs to be allocated SLDC has taken into account completions from 2003-2010, current planning permissions, sites allocated in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and made an assumption that 80% of permitted dwellings will be built. Table 2 shows that SLDC have split the area up using

the Cumbria Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Housing Market Areas. It is recognised that the overall amount of housing land proposed within the 'Emerging Options' total more than is required by the Core Strategy. SLDC justify this on the basis that sites are proposed for consultation and the responses made will inform the final location and number of sites in the Land Allocations DPD. This consultation is an opportunity to look at all reasonable options for the required number of sites. Even though there appears to be a short fall in the Local Service Centres and Small Settlements in the Housing Market Area of Kendal Rural. It is important to acknowledge that there are sites which are below the 0.3ha in Local Service Centres and 0.1ha in Small Settlements thresholds which will also contribute to achieving the target. SLDC have also assessed sites which are in the open countryside, however none of these have been put forward as an 'Emerging Option'.

- 2.2 In order to ensure that the supply of housing in the LDF area is managed to achieve sustainable growth, SLDC should ensure that evidenced housing needs are met whilst taking account of the delivery of new employment sites and associated infrastructure which is also fundamental to meeting the economic objectives for the area. SLDC should use their own impact assessments to judge which land allocations are most appropriate to be retained within the Land Allocation DPD.

Table 2 showing amount of housing needing to be allocated

Settlement	Core Ambition	Strategy	Balance to be Found	Emerging Options
Kendal (including Oxenholme)	3080		2120	2624
Kendal Rural				
Kirkby Lonsdale	232		118	295
Milnthorpe	239		186	399
Local Service Centers	1114		1044	915
Small Settlements	622		499	241
Furness				
Ulverston	1760		1264	1477
Local Service Centers	421		90	293
Small Settlements	262		-11	31
Grange / Cartmel				
Grange	673		501	627 (includes outstanding planning permissions)
Local Service Centers	313		179	163
Small Settlements	84		67	31

3. Highways and Transport

- 3.1 Appendix 2 details specific technical comments raised to date in respect of individual sites and also raises further comments as required. Whilst indicative responses have been provided on the feasibility of individual development sites, the council would not wish these to pre-empt the outcomes of the additional works and outcomes. As a general caveat it is important to note that the comments made in Appendix 2 are made on an individual site basis and have not taken into account the cumulative effects on the highway network.
- 3.2 It is also important to note that larger sites will warrant more detailed assessments and require a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan as part of any planning application. The thresholds for these are defined in the DfT's guidance on Transport Assessments. The more detailed assessments may show further highways and transport constraints on development that are not highlighted in Appendix 2.
- 3.3 County Council officers will work with SLDC to identify more robustly the transport implications of development, so as to be able to provide developers and others with certainty in relation to requirements for enabling or mitigating highways and transport measures.
- 3.4 The County Council as Highway Authority is engaged in a number of discussions with South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) regarding developments in Kendal. There is also ongoing work to assess the cumulative impact of the development proposals in Kendal. There is limited scope for the highway network in Kendal to readily accommodate additional development traffic and due to space constraints in the town centre there is limited scope to upgrade existing junctions. A focus on sustainable transport improvements along with capacity improvements, where feasible, is likely to be necessary to allow any significant level of development within Kendal.

4. Historic Environment

- 4.1 In terms of the historic environment, there are not any designated buildings or sites within the proposed areas, although there is potential for archaeological remains within some of the sites, in both urban and rural locations. Whilst the presence of most non-designated historic environment assets will not prohibit development. It may mean that a programme of mitigatory archaeological works are requested in advance of construction, which will have cost and time implications for the developer. It is strongly recommended early, pre-application, consultation with the County Historic Environment Service by any prospective developer is needed. It is also considered that any development needs to be preceded by an assessment of the archaeological significance for each site.

5. Biodiversity

- 5.1 In relation to Biodiversity there is some concern relating to the consistency of approach to nature conservation across all sites. The County Council have

previously made comments in relation to Biodiversity informally in February 2009.

- 5.2 As a general point the site allocations document appears to be largely avoiding direct impacts on the land-based designated sites, though this is not a definitive assessment. As mentioned above assessments need to be made where any development may impact significantly on wetland habitat, rivers, streams and becks and coastal habitat.
- 5.3 There is plenty of opportunity for habitat enhancement, especially as mentioned above, incorporating significant green infrastructure through maintenance of any semi-natural (i.e., land of current biodiversity interest) habitat, habitat creation and connectivity.
- 5.4 There is a general concern that the degree of infill that would take place if all of these sites were developed would result in the potential significant loss of general biodiversity. It is recommended, that significant enhancements are incorporated at the land allocation stage, to help ensure that beneficial biodiversity features and connected links are built in prior to the development control stage.
- 5.5 There are issues of evidence and consistency that should be addressed. The biodiversity/nature conservation resource should have greater emphasis within the Fact Files and there should also be greater emphasis on biodiversity enhancement within the Emerging Options files, especially since this is given a relatively low emphasis in the open space sections. It is not clear which documents will be incorporated into the final Land Allocations DPD, those currently in the Fact Files appear to lack a standard approach to the existing biodiversity evidence, and the presentation of biodiversity issues.
- 5.6 The biodiversity assessment appears to have been undertaken in an ad hoc way, relying on the comments of consultees rather than carrying out a full assessment. It should be noted that the informal comments were not specifically provided on a site by site basis, hence it is also understood that Cumbria Wildlife Trust and others have made comments on a site by site basis, it is important that these comments are reflected in the final Land Allocations DPD document.
- 5.7 It is considered that the Key Characteristics within the section on Environment does not always adequately describe the natural environment of the areas. An example of this is in the Grange-over-Sands description there is much said about the landscape character and views but nothing said about the very significant nature conservation designations surrounding Grange.
- 5.8 The settlement plans only include Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas for wild birds (SPAs). They do not include the national designation of Limestone Pavement Order. An example of this is the Wartbarrow and Kirkhead Limestone Pavement Order (LPO) which is omitted from the Grange-over-Sands plan, this LPO includes a small part that is not identified on any of the maps. The plans also omit other designated wildlife features (biodiversity

evidence), such as County Wildlife Sites, for example the Natland map fails to show the County Wildlife Site just to the south of RN223; and R62 is mapped in the Phase 1 as unimproved grassland (possibly improved by now).

- 5.9 The Evidence sections does not fully recognise the biodiversity designations and issues, as do the Emerging Options justifications and mitigation sections, even when these have been highlighted by consultees and/ or listed in the Sustainability Appraisal list in Appendix 2 of the SLDC consultation document. I.e. they do not appear to have been adequately taken account of.
- 5.10 Measures should be taken within the final Land Allocations policies to ensure that green links, corridors, etc are maintained and enhanced. It is recommend that more emphasis is given to this in the Open Spaces section of the DPD to ensure that such links aren't broken. Reference should be made to Regulation 39 of the Conservation Regulations 2010. Regulation 39 (1) requires local authorities to have policies encouraging the management of features of the landscape which are of major importance for wild flora and fauna. Regulation 39 (3) defines this features as those, by virtue of their linear and continuous structure (such as rivers with their banks or the traditional systems of marking field boundaries) or their function as stepping stones (such as ponds or small woods), are essential for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of wild species. For example the development areas to the west of Grange (R350M, MN25M and R672M) would appear to risk the further separation of habitat in this area. The issues/ mitigation section of the Emerging Options notes should address this issue.
- 5.11 It is recommended that along with Cumbria Wildlife Trust, the County Council meet with SLDC to discuss how the lack of evidence and consistency can be addressed.

6. Adult Social Care

- 6.1 Joint working between SLDC and the County Council will allow independent demand estimates to be presented for South Lakeland by Strategic Housing Market Areas. This enables evidence of demand for such facilities to be embedded within the planning process. The independent needs analysis, provided by 'Planning4Care' (2009) identifies the need for 320 extra care housing units across SLDC area by 2019 (several schemes are already in operation which contribute towards this target). This is a recognised need, and the figures have been adopted and approved within the Commissioning Strategy for Older People and their Carers, agreed by Cumbria County Council in Feb 2010. This important evidence will need to be taken on board by SLDC in preparation of the housing land allocations document to ensure identified needs are met through adequate provision of land.

7. School Organisation

- 7.1 In relation to primary education it is possible to accurately project numbers up to 5 years ahead given that entrants within that timescale have been
- 7.2 because those children are already 'in the system'.

- 7.3 The estimate of pupil yield is, at this stage, fairly crude. It assumes that each house will produce 0.2 additional primary age children and 0.1 secondary age children. A more accurate analysis can only be undertaken once the exact scale and mix of dwellings is known, and this will be carried out as and when planning applications are submitted.
- 7.4 Several primary schools in the area are operating at or very close to full capacity and this is expected to continue. The scale of development proposed in some areas is likely to require section 106 contributions to provide additional places.
- 7.5 Secondary Schools cover very large catchment areas encompassing several of the potential development sites. Although numbers are generally expected to reduce to 2022, the expected increase in primary numbers feeding into the secondary system may see rolls recover beyond that. The scale of potential development in areas like Kendal will almost certainly mean additional secondary places being required. It is important to note that comment in table 3 does not prejudice the County Council from making future comment on School Organisation in South Lakeland at a subsequent date.
- 7.6 It is important that paragraphs 7.1 and 7.3 are read in context. Pupil projections are updated annually when new General Practitioner Register (GPR) data becomes available and when pupil counts are undertaken in schools. They are, therefore, subject to change. The brief analysis provided should not be seen as an exact indication of the need, for example, for s106 contributions. Detailed analysis will need to be undertaken at the appropriate time to determine the up-to-date position in schools and whether any contribution should be sought towards the provision of additional places.
- 7.7 In terms of the specific queries, pupil projections and updates can be provided to SLDC to ensure officers are aware of the latest position. The figures provided in the spreadsheet give the latest position, and an update can be provided in 12 months.
- 7.8 The county council continually monitors the school places position, but no schools have currently been identified for rationalisation. Full, public consultation would be required for any change proposed. The county council will be discussing with school clusters over the coming months the specific issues they face, whether that be falling or growing numbers, the need for additional facilities (including community facilities) and transport. The outcome may have implications for Spatial Planning.
- 7.9 Travel to school data is relatively complex, but could be provided on a case-by-case basis as required.
- 7.10 The school organisation team has provided a spreadsheet which sets out the potential sites/developments, 'mapping' them into school catchment areas. This will be provided to SLDC.

- 7.11 It is noted that there some discrepancies within the Proposals Maps of the Land Allocations 'Emerging Options' DPD, in relation to school sites.
- 7.12 In respect of school playing fields it is noted that they are allocated as areas to be safeguarded as Outdoor Sports Facilities, with some also being allocated as Amenity Open Space (which is not accessible to the general public)
- 7.13 It is important that school playing fields are recognised as being exclusively for school use and should not be considered available for any other use or access without the consent of the governing or other controlling body. As their use is for formal playing field purposes their designation as Amenity Open Space is not considered appropriate. Such designations on school playing fields should be removed

8. County Council Owned Sites

- 8.1 The County Council owns four sites which are identified as 'Emerging Options', three have been identified for residential, two are in Kendal RN69 (49 dwellings), RN117M (71 dwellings) and one in Heversham RN118M (56 dwellings). There is also one site Grange-over-Sands (R350M) for mixed residential (17 dwellings) and employment 1.26ha. Support is given to the inclusion of these sites in the 'Emerging Options'.
- 8.2 The County Council also owns other sites identified on SLDC's settlement maps but they have not been assessed due to them being below the 0.3ha threshold, both of which are located in Ulverston, RN112 and the former Dragley Beck Depot RN113.
- 8.3 The County Council has embarked upon a strategic review of its property assets across the County to drive and support the delivery of the Councils corporate priorities. Key to this principle is the desire to provide modern fit for purpose sustainable premises and the disposal of obsolete and inefficient buildings which are surplus to requirements.
- 8.4 The County offices site located off Busher Walk in Kendal not only provides services and back office function for the County Council but also serves as an emergency services centre with a Police Station, Fire Station and Ambulance Service facilities on site dating from the 1970s. Offices are provided across a number of buildings on site which have developed in a piecemeal fashion over the years.
- 8.5 The County Council will be shortly undertaking a review of the site with a view to rationalising and transforming service provision. As part of this process it will engage with public sector partners to examine opportunities for joint ventures and improving service delivery on this site. Whilst no detailed work has yet been done and there are no specific proposals at this time, should the County Council seek to rationalise its office accommodation, opportunities for development may arise on parts or all of the site and these opportunities could be suitable for a range of potential uses. Realising such

opportunities will be an integral part of any business case enabling modernisation of the County's office accommodation.

- 8.6 South Lakeland District Council is therefore asked to take account of the need for the County Council and its public sector partners to review and reprovide its facilities in the most appropriate way on this site and to ensure that the Land Allocations DPD allows for the campus, parts of the site and the buildings on the site to be redeveloped for appropriate uses in the future.

APPENDIX 2 – HIGHWAYS & LANDSCAPE SITE SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Settlement	Site Ref	Yield	Timescale	Site Area	Emp Ha	Employment Type	Notes	POTENTIAL ISSUES	ACCESS	NOTES
Allithwaite	R343M	35 units - 30dph to north and east of site potentially higher to south and west	2010				MODIFIED SITE	acesss proposed from Underfell to north -OK?		Acceptable in principle. But further assessment of junction Fell side/Wart Barrow Lane required.
Allithwaite	R69M	41	2010	Gross 1.53 Net 1.38	-		R69 & R21			Access from Cartmel Road. Pedestrian footway should be provided
TOTAL										
Arnside	MN20			0.54	0.2	Local	ORIGINAL PREF SITE			
Arnside	R393M	15	2010	Gross 0.42 Net 0.38	-					Access ok from Briery Bank
Arnside	R395M	1/3 of site open space (0.165) - total developable = 0.335 13 units at 40 dph - over 400m from station	2010					pl confirm if access ok off Briery Bank		No objection in principle. Visibility concerns due to gradient and alignment of Briery Bank.
Arnside	R693M	30 units at 40dph - 400m from station	2010							Lit footway to be provided
Arnside	R81	42	2010	Gross 1.47 Net 1.32	-					Access via Red Hills Road will need further consideration due to junction spacing. Lawrence Drive has limited capacity to serve the site. Ideally access road would connect from Red Hills Road to Lawrence Drive but subject to above point re junction spacing.

Arnside	R88M	13 at 50 dph		2010	Gross - 0.26 Net - 0.26			pl confirm if access ok off Station Road	Subject to detailed design and possible parking restrictions
Arnside	RN225		21	6-10 years time	Gross - 1.08 Net - 0.97		new site	pl confirm if access ok off Hollins Lane	Limited visibility not acceptable without major improvements to achieve forward visibility and junction visibility standards. Would require hedge to be removed. Protected ??
TOTAL									
Broughton Furness	in MN19					0.73	Local		Acceptable in principle. Provision of footways required.
Broughton Furness	in R163M		16	2010				is access ok off Foxfield Road to west of site?	Access is dependent on the achievement of acceptable junction visibility.
TOTAL									
Burnside	E32M				Gross - 1.18 Net - 1.06	3.7	Local	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	No footways, narrow road
									Lit Footway connection would need to be provided into Burnside. Preferable for access to be taken from adjoining site.
									In landscape terms only southern part (1.67ha) is the preferred site.
Burnside	R489M	79 - reduced to 72 units in emerging options		2015				MODIFIED SITE	no footways
									Although reduced yield, concerns remain regarding access arrangement and connectivity/accessibility. Development would require multiple access points through the adjoining estate. Consideration of emergency access should also be given to serve the existing estate and development.
									In landscape terms only northern part (2.4ha) is the preferred site.

Burneside	M38M	34 reduced to 30 in emerging options	2020		MODIFIED SITE	Acceptable in principle
	TOTAL	0				
Burton in Kendal	EN14M			1.11	Local	Acceptable in principle, highways improvements may be required.
Burton in Kendal	R681M	58	2015		site now reduced - is one access off Morewood Dr acceptable?	Unsure if one access is sufficient would need detailed investigation. TA/TS required. In principle one access would be acceptable.
Burton in Kendal	R76M	29	2010		is pedestrian access OK via A6070, or possibly via Bridleway on SE corner to Vicarage Lane?	Pedestrian access acceptable from both. Bridleway may require some improvement.
Burton in Kendal	RN145M	46	??	Gross - 1.69 Net - 1.52		
Burton in Kendal	RN226	23	2010	Gross 0.85 Net - 0.76	is access oK off Boon Town?	Likely highway improvements will be required along Boon Town in order to access the development.
Burton in Kendal	RN144			0.68	Open Space	
	TOTAL					

Cartmel	R112	47	2010	is access ok off Haggs Lane (on a corner) ?	Concern regarding viability of providing visibility splays at the access with Haggs Lane. Also issue re feasibility of connecting the site to existing facilities. In order to overcome constraints third party land would be required. Would not be acceptable to have site without pedestrian facilities to enable access. Access could not be provided through school grounds.
---------	------	----	------	---	---

TOTAL					
-------	--	--	--	--	--

Endmoor	M41M	79 - reduced to 68 in emerging options	??	1	Local	MODIFIED SITE
---------	------	--	----	---	-------	---------------

Endmoor	R83M	17 - increased to 18 in emerging options	2015			
---------	------	--	------	--	--	--

Endmoor	R670	54	2015	Narrow roads, no footway east side of site	Development feasible however improvements to narrow lane to serve development will be required in order to accommodate two way traffic and pedestrian movement.
---------	------	----	------	--	---

TOTAL					
-------	--	--	--	--	--

Flookburgh / Cark	EN42			1.6	Local	
-------------------	------	--	--	-----	-------	--

Flookburgh / Cark	R321M	20	2010	Gross - 0.56 Net - 0.50		MODIFIED SITE	we consider access is ok off Eccleston Meadows to the east - pl confirm	Would require confirmation of ownership of third party land and there seems to be a strip between highway and proposed site. There maybe insufficient highway land to accommodate possible widening of the carriageway and provision of a footway. Access via Eccles ton meadow would be acceptable in principle.
Flookburgh / Cark	RN20M	27	2020					
Flookburgh / Cark	R685	40	2020??	Gross - 1.11 Net - 1.0		ORIGINAL PREF SITE	pl confirm that access is acceptable off MarketStreet (B5277) and in addition off Manorside to the west	Footway should be provided on B5277 Market St to serve the site. Access of Market St would require significant earth works given the changes in levels which would impact on the number of dwellings. Access would need to be via manor side.
Flookburgh / Cark	R687	29	2015	Gross 0.80Net - 0.72		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Footway should be provided to connect with existing footway in Flookborough - would require pedestrian provision over existing bridge over railway.
TOTAL								
Grange	EN34M			0.81	0.81	Local	MODIFIED SITE	

Grange	MN25M	2.5 ha employment, 3 ha for residential, yield 120 at 40 per hectare, 0.5ha for open space. Western part of site to be retained as Important Open Space or Green Gap. Eastern areas to incorporate residential/care village.	2020	Gross - 12.26 Net 6.13	2.5 Local	Please confirm if access is OK of	pl confirm that access is acceptable off the Alliththwaite Road and approx. at what point	More than one access is required. Location of access would be subject to the detailed design of the development.
Grange	R110	60	2015	Gross - 2.15 Net - 1.61		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Transport Statement would be required. Upgrading to footways needed and gradient change would require addressing for suitable access
Grange	R350M	17	2020	Gross 1.26 Net - 1.13			pl confirm that access is acceptable - access road is very narrow	In order to achieve acceptable access it is necessary to combine Cardonia Road and the narrow access road. Possible land ownership issues.
Grange	R378M ** Emerging Option Site Ref M378M	60	2010	Gross - 1.11 Net - 1.00		MODIFIED SITE R376 & R378		
Grange	R381	43	2010	Gross - 0.78 Net - 0.70		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		

Grange	R383				0.35	0.35	Local		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Servicing arrangements would have to be considered as part of Berners Regeneration Scheme
Grange	MN21	22	2010	Gross - 0.31 Net 0.31					ORIGINAL PREF SITE		
Grange	R449	21	2010	Gross - 0.8 Net - 0.72					ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Footways and Associated Lighting on Cartmel Road to a minimum of 1.8 metres required for access to site
Grange	R672M	36	2015	Gross - 1.01 Net - 0.91					MODIFIED SITE		
Grange	R70	44	2010	Gross - 1.22Net - 1.10				pl confirm that access is acceptable off Ashmount Road			Concerns regarding access of Ash Mount Rd relating to visibility due to established mature vegetation, width of road and inadequate pedestrian access
Grange	R74	34	2020	Gross - 1.26 Net - 1.13					ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Footways and Associated Lighting on Cartmel Road to a minimum of 1.8 metres required for access to site
Grange	R89	45	2010	Gross - 1.65 Net - 1.48					ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Transport Statement would be required.
Grange	RN34	36	2020	Gross - 1.0 Net - 0.9					ORIGINAL PREF SITE		
TOTAL											

Great Urswick	/	Little	M10M	20	2020	Gross - 0.75 Net - 0.67	MODIFIED SITE	farm redevelopment for residential. Re highways access onto Church Road - be aware that stone farm buildings on the Church Road frontage may need to be retained/converted as part of any scheme. Bus stop on the other side of Church Road on village green. Advice re highway infrastructure needed/visiblity, mitiigation, car parking etc . Note public footpaths x 2 bisect the site.	whilst in principle proposed development is acceptable given previous use achieving a safe access to serve the proposed yield is extremely problematic if all existing buildings are to be retained. Vehicle access to the site should be via Park Garth
Great Urswick	/	Little	RN216M	23 - changed to 24 in emerging options	2015	Gross - 0.9 Net - 0.81		comments much the same as for MN10M - only greenfield site. Access assume either through MN10M or off Road next to access to Park Garth (south Little Urswick) Advice required re access and infrastructure provision/mitigtion.	It would be preferable for access to come off road to the south west of the site (via existing development) to serve both M10M and RN216M. Vehicle access to the site should be via Park Garth

TOTAL

Greenodd / Penny Bridge	RN152	21	2010			ORIGINAL PREF SITE		
TOTAL								
Holme	M35M				3.12 modified to 2.58 in emerging options	Local	MODIFIED SITE	is new access Ok off B6384 (Milnthorpe Road)? Access is acceptable subject to detailed design.
Holme	R653M	49	2015	Gross - 1.80Net - 1.62			MODIFIED SITE	is new access Ok off B6384 (Milnthorpe Road)? Pedestrian access to link the site to the village centre should be secured, vehicle access would require removal of established hedge in order to achieve visibility splays.
Holme	RN30M				0.68			
Holme	R675M	152	2015	Gross - 6.75 Net - 5.06				access is major issue -pl consider if acceptable options? Access problematic. Given proposed yield would require more than one access into development. TA would have to be undertaken to consider options.
Holme	R674HM	64 modified to 61 in emerging options	2015	Gross - 2.72 Net - 2.04				access seems oK Access needs clarification. If access in row of terrace cottages facing onto road, this would not acceptable. Insufficient width to serve development. Access from new development road acceptable subject to detailed design.
TOTAL								
Kendal	E31M			Gross 1.19 - Net 1.07	2.24	Local		

Kendal	E33			Gross 0.93 Net 0.84	0.93	Local	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	Assume quarry related activity on relatively small scale.
Kendal 7	E4M		2015		18	Strategic	MODIFIED SITE	
								In landscape terms The sites around Shenstone would be prominent on the side of the ridge, particularly when viewed from the A591 and the east. Very careful siting and design and sensitive landscaping might be necessary to make these sites feasible.
Kendal 5	EN28M			Gross 0.34 Net 0.34	0.34	Local		
Kendal 17	M2M			Gross - 6.50 Net - 4.88	6.52	Business / Science Park		
Kendal 12	M35KM	150 - modified to '15 ha open space Residential 5 ha gross / 3.78 net 113 dwellings (30 dph)' in emerging options	2015	Gross - 20.11 Net - 10.06		15.13 ha open space	MODIFIED SITE	
Kendal 6	M41KM	140 - modified to 141 dwellings	2015	Gross - 4.63 Net - 3.47			MODIFIED SITE	
Kendal	M4M	50	2015	Gross - 1.12 Net - 1.00		Natland Mill Beck Lane Narrow single track access		Existing road inadequate to serve yield. TA would be required to assess feasibility and necessary improvements

Kendal 9	R103M	246	2020	Gross - 8.19Net - 6.14	MODIFIED SITE		
Kendal 15	R107M	62	2010	Gross 2.06 Net 1.54			
Kendal 14	R121M	147	2010	Gross - 4.9 Net - 3.68	MODIFIED SITE	Access from Sedbergh Road acceptable?	Assume modified takes includes other sites. Main access would preferable from A684 with secondary access from Oak Tree Road.
Kendal 20	R129M	98	2015	Gross - 4.35 Net - 3.26	MODIFIED SITE		
Kendal 16	R150M	301 - modified to 240 dwellings in emerging options	2015	Gross 8.00 Net 6.00			
Kendal 4	R170M	251	2010	Gross - 8.36 Net - 6.27	MODIFIED SITE	Access acceptable from Burneside Road? - bend in the road	Achieving adequate visibility will be problematic given alignment of road and limited frontage. Such a large site would require a secondary access.
Kendal	R44	20	2015	Gross - 0.73 Net - 0.66			
Kendal 22	R46	21	2015	Gross - 0.76 Net - 0.69		Access where from?	Access could come from Moore Field Close.
Kendal	R552	25	2010	Gross - 0.55 Net - 0.49			

Kendal 2	R563	105	2010	Gross - 1.81 Net - 1.63		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Constrained by limited capacity in Kendal Town Centre.. Transport Assessment and Travel plan would be required. It is likely that some off site highways and transport mitigation would be required to realise this development site.
Kendal 1	R663	47	2010	Gross - 1.59 Net - 1.43		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Transport Statement would be required. May warrant joint assessment with RN137.
Kendal	R97M	64 - modified to	2015	1.4 - modified to 1.5 in emerging options	Local	MODIFIED SITE	Natland Mill Beck Lane narrow single track access	Existing road inadequate to serve yield. TA would be required to assess feasibility and necessary improvements
Kendal	RN117M		2015	Gross - 1.90 Net - 1.71			Access likely from adjacent residential streets acceptable?	Access from residential streets is feasible in principle subject to crossing 3rd party land.
Kendal 3	RN133M	182	2010	Gross - 4.85 Net - 3.64		MODIFIED SITE		
Kendal	RN169M	127	2015	Gross - 4.91 Net - 3.68		MODIFIED SITE	Access from Windermere Road or Hallgarth?	Primary access from Windermere Road with secondary off High Garth.
Kendal 10	RN181M	182	2015	Gross - 12.13 Net - 6.06		MODIFIED SITE		

Kendal 13	RN96 modified to RN96M in emerging options	49	2015	Gross 1.13 Net 1.01	- -				
TOTAL									
Kirkby in Furness	R189M	77	2010	Gross 1.75 Net 1.55	- -			MODIFIED SITE	Access from A595 and or road to Sand Side Existing junction A595/ Sand Side is substandard . The new access to serve the development and provide an alternative access to Sand Side could be provided on the A595
TOTAL									
Kirkby Lonsdale	MN24			0.24	0.24	Local			
Kirkby Lonsdale	R127M	187	2015	Gross 7.91 Net 5.93	- -	1.7	Local	MODIFIED SITE	access OK off A65 and Kendal Road? (same query for R118) Weight restriction on Kendal Road. May need substantial improvement subject to proposed employment use. Further detailed assessment would required to clarify access.
Kirkby Lonsdale	R640					0.41	Local	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	
Kirkby Lonsdale	R642M	11	2010	Gross 0.31 Net 0.28	- -			MODIFIED SITE	
Kirkby Lonsdale	R118	44	2015	Gross 2.94 Net 2.21	- -			50% residential	
TOTAL									

Levens	R682LVM	24 - modified to 44 in emerging options	2015	Gross - 1.67 Net - 1.50		MODIFIED SITE	access seems ok from road to east of site -pl confirm.	In principle, access acceptable from Brigsteer Road
Levens	R71M	17 - Modified to 10 in emerging options	2010	Gross - 0.73 Net - 0.66		MODIFIED SITE	pl consider if acceptable access?	In Landscape terms only southern part (1.67ha) is the preferred site Access arrangements would need to be clarified. Concern that 17 additional dwellings would be served from Hutton Lane as this is narrow with limited opportunity for passing places.
Levens	R51M	50	2015	Gross - 2.24 Net - 1.68		MODIFIED SITE	access seems ok off Greengate	In principle access of Greengate acceptable.
Levens	RN121M				0.48 Local	MODIFIED SITE		
Levens	RN125					Community use		
TOTAL								
Milnthorpe	M9M1			Gross - 1.45 Net - 1.45	1.45 Local	MODIFIED SITE	we assume accessible off Church Street and Grisleymires Lane?	Subject to TA, no objection in principle for access to come of Grisleymires Lane
Milnthorpe	M9M2	126 - modified to 125 in emerging options	2015	Gross - 4.18 Net - 3.13		MODIFIED SITE	as above	Need to separate employment access from residential. Access off Dallam Chase should be explored. Improvements to A6/Grisleymires Lane likely to be required.
Milnthorpe	R151M	102	2015	Gross - 3.4 Net - 2.55		MODIFIED SITE	pl confirm if new access is OK off A6?	In principle, access from A6 is acceptable subject to detailed design.

Milnthorpe	R462M	96	2010	Gross 3.18 Net 2.38	-	MODIFIED SITE	pl confirm if acceptable to access this site from site R151 above and if any access options to north of site ?	Access from A6 to serve additional dwellings would be problematic. TA would be required to assess feasibility.
Milnthorpe	RN57M	36	2010	Gross 0.99 Net 0.89	-		Accessible off St Anthony's Close?	In principle access feasible subject to detailed design. However concern regarding adequacy of existing pedestrian facilities in order to safely accommodate the proposal
TOTAL								
Natland	R62	14 modified to emerging options 28 in	2010	Gross 1.05 Net 0.94	-	ORIGINAL PREF SITE		
Natland	R680M	22	2020	Gross 0.80 Net 0.72	-	MODIFIED SITE		
Natland	R679 modified to R679M	17	2015				No footways on road to the north - narrow access	To achieve suitable access arrangements 3rd party land from neighbouring properties would be required.
TOTAL								
Oxenholme	R108M	81	2015	Gross 2.71 Net 2.03	-	MODIFIED SITE		
Oxenholme	RN223	32	2015	Gross 0.9 Net 0.81	-			
TOTAL								

Sandside / Storth	M683sM	68		Gross 3.29 Net 2.46	-	2.28	Local	pl confirm if access is acceptable off road to north west of site (private?) and also off Yans Lane to the south	Access from Yans Lane is unacceptable. Access would be problematic given scale of development and would require third party land. TA would be required to assess feasible of access from the road to the north west of the site. However this road may require improvement along its entire length.
Sandside / Storth	RN22	11	2015	Gross 0.37 Net 0.37	-			ORIGINAL PREF SITE	
TOTAL									
Swarthmoor	R684SWM	35	2010	Gross 1.31 Net - 1.17	-			pl confirm existing access Rufus lane junction / A590 is ok	Adequacy of junction of Rufus Lane/ A590 is a matter for the HA to consider.
Swarthmoor	RN109M	167 reduced to 94 in emerging options	2010	Gross 4.2 Net 3.15	-			pl confirm access is acceptable onto A590 or throughnew side entrance to site off Cross a moor lane which would serve all proposed properties	Adequacy of access of A590 is matter for HA to consider. Pedestrian facilities need to be provided on both sides of Cross a Moor. In addition pedestrian access would need to be provided to existing public transport facilities on the A590.
TOTAL									

Ulverston E30

4 Strategic ORIGINAL
PREF SITE

Site significant strategic scale (together with Site M26) site for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses to serve the Ulverston area. A low lying site potentially with high infrastructure costs, need to build up site levels min 800mm. Issue of surface water flooding - need to reinstate Newlands Beck. Existing access via Booth's roundabout then off Next Ness Lane. Access needed off Booth's roundabout to A590T possibly need land take off existing premises - Heron Glass etc. Widening - of existing access - need advice re principal of access onto A590T, any highway infrastructure required/mitigation etc. Advise re mitigation infrastructure likely to be required (scale/details if possible) and an indication of level of costs.

Transport Assessment & Travel Plan likely to be required. Access road would need improvement and may require 3rd party land. M26, M28 and E30 may warrant assessment together. Bus Stop should be within 400 metres of the site. Potential Impact on A590 Trunk Road so HA should be consulted.

Ulverston EN22

0.72 Local

Site is the remaining part of the Low Mill Business Park. Any issues re vehicular access? For the remaining part of this local employment site - general B use - B1, B2 and B8 (as per the existing local plan local employment allocation). The Business Park has existing vehicular access onto Morecambe Road. Access vi a Morecambe Road to A590T involves passing under rail bridge.

Ulverston	EN35M		3.1	Local	Existing SLDC depot , Waites premises and grazing land. Access onto North Lonsdale Road. North Lonsdale Road passes under rail bridge to give access to the Junction of North Lonsdale Terrace with the A590T. Any issues re traffic generation for a local employment use (local employment scale B1, B2, B8).Advise please re any highways infrastructure required/ mitigation.	No objection in principle, however height of bridge should be noted
Ulverston	M11M	4.07 modified to 3.99 in emerging options		Business / Science Park	MODIFIED SITE (Business/Science Park) - Need Highways comment/advice re any issues re principle of, and issues concerning direct vehicular access onto the A590T at this site, (e.g. traffic generation) nr to the end of Pennington Lane. The Only pavement is on the Pennington Lane side of the A590T.,there is also a bus stop. Details of highway works required / Mitigation required?Also, seek Comment re any surface water/flooding in the highway, & mitigation . Note recent flooding on the highway A590 T nr to the Stone Cross Mansion access.Site wraps around a Terrace of 5 or 6 houses incl. the former Beehive Public House.	Access is off trunk road, would need advice from highways agency

Ulverston	M26			2.31 modified to 2.42 in emerging options	Strategic	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	low lying site currently accessed off Booth's roundabout and Next Ness Lane. Site together with E30 will form Strategic employment area to serve the Ulverston area - B1, B2 and B8 uses. As for site E30, M26 will need significant building up of site levels and reinstatement re function of Newlands Beck. Public footpath runs from Next Next Ness Lane, nr. field access, along site boundary to the Canal. Advise re principal of vehicular access onto Booth's roundabout and A590T. Advise re access issues, see also comments for E30 above. Advise re mitigation infrastructure likely to be required (scale/details if possible)and an indication of level of costs.	Transport Assessment & Travel Plan likely to be required. Access road would need improvement and may require 3rd party land. M26, M28 and E30 may warrant assessment together. Bus Stop should be within 400 metres of the site. Potential Impact on A590 Trunk Road so HA should be consulted.
Ulverston	M28	86	2015		3.92	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	Ulverston Canal Area - site already developed - site redevelopment - mixed allocation to include element of housing. Inc. tourism/heritage leisure uses.Need advice re Principle of access onto A590T, any details/advice re highway works and mitigation, likely level of infrastructure works, advice re traffic generation issues, parking etc. Advice re bus stops, public transport/other modes of transport etc. public footpath runs alongside canal, next to the Williamson's scrap yard. Back Drain runs under site???canal towpath is also private access way.	Transport Assessment & Travel Plan likely to be required. Access road would need improvement and may require 3rd party land. M26, M28 and E30 may warrant assessment together. Bus Stop should be within 400 metres of the site. Potential Impact on A590 Trunk Road so HA should be consulted.

Ulverston	ON24			0.29		Community Use	Site suggested for community building/use. Any access issues?see comments re site EN35M	No objection in principle, however height of bridge should be noted
Ulverston	R126M	226	2010	Gross - 7.56 Net - 5.67		MODIFIED SITE	combined site, previous numbers R123,R126,R33 in conjunction with R691ULV & RN184 any access issues onto Mountbarrow Rd	Access from both Mountbarrow Road and Urswick Road will be required.
Ulverston	R242	157	2020	Gross - 5.26 Net - 3.87		ORIGINAL PREF SITE(R135)	comments re access through existing infrastructure onto Parkhead rd/ Birchwood drive and or new access onto Mountbarrow road	Would Warrant masterplanning assessment along with adjacent sites. Transport Assessment &Travel Plan would be required. All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop. Potential Impact on A590 Trunk Road so HA should be consulted.
Ulverston	R234	44	2010	Gross - 0.88 Net - 0.79		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop
Ulverston	R268	18	2010	Gross - 0.39Net - 0.35		ORIGINAL PREF SITE		All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop
Ulverston	R270M	30	2015	Gross - 0.68 Net - 0.61		MODIFIED SITE		In landscape terms Preferred site - WESTERN TIP ONLY

Ulverston	R274M	86	2015	Gross - 2.29 Net - 1.71		access from Lund farm development off existing monument way	Access looks to be off Sir John Barrows Way. Access across third party land.
Ulverston	R283M			Gross - Local 1.56 Net - 1.4	MODIFIED SITE		
Ulverston	R689ULVM	64	2020	Gross - 2.15 Net - 1.61		access onto Urswick Road	Principle of access from Urswick Road acceptable in principle, however existing dry stone wall will need to be realigned in order to accommodate footway and visibility splays
Ulverston	R690ULV	33	2020	Gross - 0.93 Net - 0.83	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	narrow lane to development, site part of proposed larger development with RN184, R691ulv, R126M is access ok,	Would Warrant masterplanning assessment along with adjacent sites. All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop

Ulverston	R691ULV	118	2020	Gross - 3.93 Net - 2.94	ORIGINAL PREF SITE	larger site in conjunction with R126M & RN184 any access issues onto Mountbarrow Rd	Would masterplanning assessment along with adjacent sites. Transport Assessment & Travel Plan would be required. All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop. Potential Impact on A590 Trunk Road so HA should be consulted.
Ulverston	R692ULVM	135 modified to 129 in emerging options	2015	Gross - 4.31 Net - 3.23	MODIFIED SITE	assume access ok onto W End lane, any mitigation required to improve junction, consider impact from possible further development at existing nursery with in development boundary. Access would also be feasible via Priory Road	Access appropriate in principle, footway along frontage of site would need to be provided. Possible road widening would be required
Ulverston	R697M		2020	Gross - 4.13 Net - 3.09	MODIFIED SITE	comments re access through existing infrastructure Birchwood Drive	Limited access via Birchwood Close, however preferable for access to come through R242
Ulverston	R90M		2015	Gross - 0.512 Net - 0.46	MODIFIED SITE		

Ulverston	RN131M	74 modified to emerging options	68	in	2015	2.48		Commenst access onto priory road through existing junction with Gacow farm	Existing junction would need substantial improvement, including road widening, improving radius and the provision of footways and would require removal a number of substantial trees
Ulverston	RN184		66		2020		ORIGINAL PREF SITE	comments re new access urswick road to serve site and adjacent sites R126M, R691ULV	Would Warrant masterplanning assessment along with adjacent sites. Transport Statement would be required. All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop
Ulverston	RN3		26		2010	Gross - 0.74 Net - 0.64	ORIGINAL PREF SITE		Pedestrian access is problematic with inadequate facilities nearby. All Dwellings should be within 400 metres of a bus stop. Site frontage would enable localised carriageway widening.
TOTAL									
PREFERRED SITES TOTAL									
SMALL VILLAGES AND HAMLETS									
Ackenthwaite	RN140		13		2010				
Barbon	RN4		8		2010	0.25		pl confirm if access OK?	Access by existing field gate acceptable in principle, subject to detailed design
Beetham	RN55		3		2010				

Beetham	RN163	6	2010	0.22		pl check if access Ok - narrow road	In principle access acceptable subject to detailed design
Bowston	R664M	9	2010	0.29			
Brigsteer	RN213	13	2010	Gross 0.48 Net 0.36			subject to detail design and achievement of adequate visibility splays
Brigsteer	RN214	11	2010	Gross 0.37 Net 0.27			subject to detail design and achievement of adequate visibility splays
Clawthorpe	MN14M			0.58	Local	pl consider this extension to existing site	Existing access arrangements substandard. Would require improvements. Query regarding the need for further employment in unsustainable location
Crooklands	RN16M			0.66	Local		
Grayrigg	RN68	10	2010			Narrow road access to west no footways	Access would need to off A685. Acceptability of access would be dependent on visibility splays being achieved

Heversham Leasgill	& E15M			0.24	Local		is access OK off the A6?	The layout of the adjacent employment use would need to be modified to accommodate extension to rear
Heversham Leasgill	& R41	18	2010	Gross - 0.68 Net - 0.61			we propose the site is accessed from the small lane to the north of the site	Northern boundary of site would need to be altered to provide footway and visibility
Heversham Leasgill	& R48M	25	2010	Gross - 0.68 Net - 0.61			we assume the site can be accessed from Dugg Hill, but could it also be accessed from the A6?	Access from A6 would only be considered if there was no other possible access. There seems to be an access from Dugg Hill.
Heversham Leasgill	& RN118M	56	2010	Gross - 2.49 Net - 1.86			is access OK from the north and east of Parkhouse Drive?	Access acceptable subject to detailed design. Would need to consider cumulative impact on junction of Dugg Hill and main road as it would serve two sites in addition to existing residential development.
High Biggins	RN219M	6	2010	Gross - 0.21 Net - 0.18				

Hincaster	EN43			0.86	Local	is access Ok from Viver Lane to serve a small housing and employment site?	No map
Hincaster	RN128	15	2010	Gross - 0.53 Net - 0.48			
Meal Bank	RN7	12	2010	0.38		Narrow lane access no footways	No map
Old Hutton, Bridge End	R632	5	2010			we assume access is OK	Access acceptable subject to detailed design
Old Middleshaw	Hutton, R666M	12	2010	Gross 0.43 Net - 0.38		we assume access is OK	Access acceptable subject to detailed design
Sedgwick	RN175M	6	2010	Gross - 0.22Net - 0.22		narrow lane, but small development?	Access acceptable subject to detailed design
Sedgwick	RN18M	13	2010	Gross - 0.49 Net - 0.44		narrow lane, but small development?	Access acceptable subject to detailed design
Hlome Mills Headless Cross	RN151M RN156M	16 modified to 15 in emerging options	2010	0.95 Gross - 0.56 Net - 0.50	Local		

High Carley	RN6M	10 modified to 11 in emerging options	2010	Gross - 0.37 Net 0.37	assume access to site (further residential development to link through to existing housing development to north of site - CCC views on most appropriate access. Any new access to the north of the site will cut through existing parking area to serve part of the existing cul de sac. Infrastructure provision - car parking requirements etc?	Access would have to be from the west off East Drive through the proposed recreation area and third party land
Leece	R206		10	2010	Gross - 0.32 Net -	
Ravenstow	R670aM		16	2010	Gross - 0.59 Net -	
Stainton Adgarley	with R207		10	2010	0.53	

It should be noted that the comments relating landscape were submitted to SLDC in June 2010, as part of a previous consultation stage.