

From: Ian Dudley <>
Sent: 16 July 2012 16:02
To: Development Plans
Subject: ADDITIONAL OBJECTIONS TO SLDC'S PROPOSED LAND ALLOCATIONS
RELATING TO THE NPPF.

1. Background

The core objections of APPT/APC to SLDC's proposed Land Allocations have centred round the Council's failure adequately to afford "the highest status of protection" to the greenfield sites proposed in Arnside which are located within the AONB. This protected status is an important provision of the new NPPF.

The new NPPF and the new Localism Act also require councils to cooperate with communities who are preparing Neighbourhood Plans. APPT/APC believe that SLDC have failed to take up this duty to cooperate with APPT's work on the development of a new Neighbourhood Plan.

This is partly because the timing of the publication of SLDC's Land Allocations exercise has overlapped with the publication of both the Localism Act and the new NPPF. These new provisions have stimulated the Arnside community to work on their plans at a relatively late stage as SLDC's Allocations were being finalised.

The central issues for our objections at this stage are therefore that;

- * The Arnside community is making good progress in producing an alternative plan for sites which will apply more effectively "the highest status of protection" required by the new NPPF.

- * The Arnside plan will also ensure more effectively that local needs - for social rented housing - are deliverable than the plan proposed by SLDC.

- * SLDC now have the opportunity to work with the Arnside community in the preparation of a new Neighbourhood Plan.

- * Notwithstanding the difficulties created by the overlap of the timing of the new legislation, SLDC's Land Allocations, and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, it cannot be said that SLDC have given "the highest status of protection" or have cooperated with the community in the preparation of neighbourhood plans if the Land Allocations go ahead in their present proposed form.

- * Part of our previous submission further illustrates this failure to afford "the highest status of protection" by referring to SLDC's adoption of a ratio of 65% market housing to 35% affordable housing. This requires the use of three times the area of land required to meet the essential local need for affordable housing. Because the other two thirds is not an essential local need, the use of that land goes against the spirit and against the letter of the NPPF of affording "the highest status of protection".

- * The proposed use by SLDC of a minimum site size of 0.3ha also imposes an inappropriate and unnecessary constraint on the opportunities proposed by APC/APPT to use smaller infill sites in the village which could help alleviate the adverse impact of the proposed Land Allocations. Smaller sites are also favoured by the Housing Associations (see below).

- * SLDC have failed to explain or to justify the commercial viability or necessity of either the above policies (65/35 and 0.3ha) against the alternatives available within the AONB as demonstrated by APPT/APC below. APPT/APC therefore propose that SLDC should be required to take up the opportunity to work with the Arnside community in the preparation of a detailed Neighbourhood Plan before a revised set of Land Allocations for Arnside is agreed.

To fail to do so when an improved alternative is available would not comply either with the letter or with the spirit of the new NPPF and the Localism Act.

2. Evidence of deliverability of APPT's alternative and emerging Neighbourhood Plan. APPT/APC's original objections to SLDC's Land Allocations were filed in April, 2012. Since then, considerable progress has been made on a deliverable, improved alternative plan under the following main headings;

a) Local needs.

Evidence is emerging that local need is for social rented housing in small numbers. This evidence is emerging from discussions with the local housing associations and reviews of applications for accommodation in the village. SLHA have also reported that Arnside is too far from the main centres of employment to be practical for accommodating many applicants. SLHA therefore have to be careful to match supply with demand and they would prefer to develop sites in small increments of 3-6 dwellings scattered around the community. They also need to be very careful to provide the right type of rented accommodation to meet local needs. This is very different to the broad brush, commercially driven, approach proposed by SLDC.

There is no evidence of unsatisfied need for new open market housing with over 70 dwellings of all types consistently available for sale in the village. The SLDC Housing Needs Survey updated in 2011 showed that open market supply and demand is broadly in balance.

This is important when considering whether supply of land in the AONB is at a level needed to meet essential local needs and whether the "the highest status of protection" duty is effectively applied.

b) Site availability.

APPT's research has identified a number of smaller infill and brownfield sites in the village which match the local needs identified by the housing association. Good progress is being made to establish that they can be made available during the period of the plan for the type of development needed by the housing association.

Clearly further work is needed to assess potential site designs and capacities but early indications are that they will be adequate to meet emerging local demand for social rented housing.

A summary of the progress made so far on site identification is attached. This is still work in progress but APPT/APC are confident that sufficient opportunities are available to meet local needs over the period of this exercise, while at the same time delivering "the highest status of protection".

c) Community support

Work to ensure that APPT/APC's plan has the necessary support to be adopted as a formal Neighbourhood Plan is progressing well.

WORK IN PROGRESS AS AT 27 JUNE, 2012.

SITES FOR POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL HOUSING IN ARNSIDE IN THE NEAR FUTURE- see map attached.

1. Station Yard

Large site (MN20 later MN32 on SLDC documents) ostensibly ideal for some housing development, but according to SLDC only suitable for small business units. This seems to be because of flood risk. Long term residents have never seen it flooded, houses already on the site suggest that flood risk is in fact minimal and, in any case, we are advised that mitigation measures would be possible

2. Trafalgar Garage

Small infill site on Ashleigh Road not registered.(RN 269) Owner lives next door. Owner now understood to be seeking planning permission to remove garage.

3. Land on Redhills Road opposite Heathcliffe

APPT has begun correspondence with owners who are interested in developing this infill site.(RN267, CU

156272) Previous history of rejected planning applications. May be difficulties regarding sewer connections and listed trees. Owners now employing an architect presumably with a view to development.

4.Land on Station Road next to Ashleigh Court

R88M according to SLDC who identified it originally as suitable for retirement flats. Eventually designated as "suitable for housing for people with limited mobility." (17dwellings). Russell Armer have confirmed availability.

5.Land on the North side of Briery Bank

A site not considered by SDLC in recent land allocation exercise.

CU156272 Next to existing affordable homes. Land owned by Persimmon Homes who have indicated that "this land could be made available for development in the near future if appropriate." Presently part of important open space, but only a small

section where development would not be significantly detrimental.

6. Land on Black Dyke Road opposite the end of Briery Bank in front of High Black Dyke farm. A brownfield site- ownership unclear for it is not registered.

7. Land between High Black Dyke farm and the railway crossing

A large site ie .7 hectare, ownership unclear. Another unregistered site. Numbered R694 by SDLC but rejected as a development possibility because of increased traffic and because "development could compromise the open nature and rural feel of the area, which contributes to the special character of the AONB as well as impacting on a range of views into and out of the area." Questionable commentary given the proposals for the Common.

8.. Land behind Kings Close

Where garages are situated. Owned by Southlakes Housing - ideal for a small development.

9. Land behind Stewart Close

Where garages are situated. Owned by Southlakes Housing - ideal for a small development

10. Land alongside two houses on right hand side of road to Milnthorpe.

Small site just outside village boundary. CU112316 Awaiting reply to our recent letter

11. The Telephone Exchange, Briery Bank/Park View corner

A series of discussions have taken place with the freeholder and the leaseholder (BT). It is agreed that BT will need a smaller footprint in future and that part of the site might become free for development. It is currently adjacent to an existing strip of affordable houses. BT are conducting a survey of the site to determine the scope for future development.