

# **TRIANGLE OPPOSITION GROUP (TOG) SUBMISSION TO SLDC LAND ALLOCATIONS DOCUMENT- FURTHER CONSULTATION EXERCISE**

## **Introduction**

**TOG has been reformed to oppose the development of the Green Triangle bordered by Oxenholme Road, Oxenholme Village, Burton Road and the Oaks Estate. TOG submitted a comprehensive response to the initial consultation exercise, containing ten strong reasons why development on the Green Triangle should be resisted. This further submission on the three consultation issues identified by SLDC represents the views of the TOG Committee as an organisation but we are confident of the full support of hundreds of local residents.**

## **Consultation Issue 1: Alternative Sites Proposed by Respondents**

**While welcoming the opportunity to comment further, we consider the timetable for consideration of alternative sites to be far too short for a sound investigation and consultation exercise to be conducted. From Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny papers over the summer it would seem that the intention is to take a report on the alternative sites and on the proposed contents of the DPD (Land Allocations Development Plan Document) to Cabinet by October. It is just not possible for 300 sites to be investigated thoroughly, including sustainability appraisals, infrastructure implications and ownership issues in that timescale and this narrow consultation window during the holiday period is most unsatisfactory. SLDC risks a challenge to the soundness of its DPD on the grounds that the suggested alternative sites have only been investigated in a perfunctory fashion.**

**As far as the alternative sites listed are concerned, TOG reiterates our earlier submission that sites M40# and R140# should be thoroughly investigated and consulted upon in order to assess their suitability for housing and employment purposes as an alternative to the proposed developments on the Green**

**Triangle, not in addition to them. We would expect to see a full report on the viability or otherwise of these sites.**

**We oppose all the new and amended suggestions for development on the Green Triangle itself, for the same ten strong reasons we gave in our original submission, which you have asked us not to repeat in detail but are in summary:**

- **History of public inquiries**
- **Public opposition**
- **Coalescence between Kendal and Oxenholme**
- **Damage to biodiversity**
- **Damage to landscape character**
- **Combined impact of separate proposals for the Triangle**
- **Infrastructure and traffic issues**
- **Access to education issues**
- **Air quality**
- **Soundness of housing and employment targets**

**We therefore oppose most strongly the following alternative proposals/sites:**

**Kendal SE**

**R120# Mixed housing/employment extension to RN133M  
RN301# Extension to R120M for housing on “Strawberry Fields”**

**Oxenholme**

**M2# and M5# Housing for over 55 year olds with community/open space facilities**

**Consultation Issue 2: Time Span of Land Allocations Document**

**In view of the forthcoming major changes in the planning system it makes perfect sense for the DPD to cover a shorter period than 2003-2025, however we contend that a reduction by five years does not go far enough. Our reading of the new draft national planning policy framework out for consultation is that councils will only be expected to have a rolling five year supply**

**of deliverable sites for housing. In view of the Localism Bill, the uncertainties in the macro-economy, and the Government's oft-stated drive to put planning back in the hands of local people, it is suggested that the DPD should cover only the next five years. Any sites identified for later development than five years should be provisional only and subject to a full review of the corporate strategy and its associated land allocations policy. This new review should be conducted with the full involvement of local people and community groups to ensure consistency with the new neighbourhood planning imperative.**

### **Consultation Issue 3: Development in Small Villages, Hamlets and Open Countryside**

**We support the concept that development in the above areas is best settled outside the DPD through such mechanisms as neighbourhood plans, neighbourhood development orders and the community right to develop land. However the implication of the consultation document is that such a policy should only apply outside Kendal and other major settlements.**

**We argue that to be consistent, development of the Green Triangle should also fall outside the DPD as it fits the criterion "green gaps between settlements-which are needed to prevent coalescence". As you are aware one of our key objections to development of the Green Triangle is the dramatic impact it would have on the coalescence of Oxenholme and Kendal, a view supported by previous public inquiries.**

**DENNIS REED TOG Chair on behalf of TOG Committee**