

Sent: 04 September 2011 18:15
To: Development Plans
Subject: Land allocations

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Sirs

You have invited comments on recent proposals for alternative land allocations in South Lakeland (for residential and business development).

SLDC published a list of preferred sites in Autumn 2010. I assume that the list was devised after due consideration of the relevant criteria, informed by the views and information supplied via public consultation.

Certain land areas, that had appeared on the original proposals, were omitted in this list of preferred sites. It is to be assumed that they were omitted for good reason.

It came, therefore, as a shock, to see that several of the areas reappeared in the recent list of "alternative" sites, apparently proposed by individuals during a more recent consultation process.

We are asked not to reiterate our reasons for objecting to sites if this involves repeating what we have already said (during the original consultation period).

This is frustrating and unfair - whilst an individual(s) who disagreed with the original preferred list has been able to reintroduce areas that were omitted, those who raised valid objections (that presumably met with the agreement of SLDC at the time) are not permitted to reiterate them.

The area that I am focused on, because it affects me personally, is R656 but I do not doubt that the same issue applies to other allocations.

Whilst we are not permitted to reiterate arguments in relation to land allocations, I can only hope that the force of the original arguments made is not lost just because certain individuals have seen fit to disregard the findings made in Autumn 2010, to have a "second bite at the cherry".

Yours faithfully

Liz Ingledew

For more information please visit <http://www.message-labs.com/email>
