

Subject: Local Development Framework - Allocations of Land Further  
Options  
Response

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Completed

The Development Strategy Manager,  
South Lakeland District Council

Dear Sir  
Consultation

## Allocations of Land - Further Options

We wish to oppose the development of sites RN326, RN316 and RN118M all for the same reasons.

RN118M is allocated 55 houses (SLDC)  
 RN316 will probably be allocated at least 43 houses and  
 RN326 likewise be allocated approx 160 houses (including RN316)  
 (RN326 was of course previously R168 the R168E)

The Rural Housing Survey suggested that 16 houses are needed in Heversham/Leasgill by 2025.

The proposed development of the above 3 sites is grossly disproportionate to the size of the village with currently only approximately 260 houses in total in the Parish.

The road access is quite inadequate for an increase in population of 130 or 100 or 385 people or a combination of the above for the 3 sites. There are no shops, post office, a limited bus service and there must be questions about the availability of health provision, schooling and social facilities in Heversham/Leasgill without a gross increase in car travel.

'Affordable' housing is likely in the main to be occupied by young people with families. The nearest shops a family frequently needs are Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness or Lancaster - some would say Preston or The Trafford Centre. This is against Core Strategy CS1.1 where it addresses Climate Change. Much of the travel will be by car. Milnthorpe has very limited shops now - and has to deal with 178 or more further houses as well. Parking is already difficult.

Each of the 3 sites probably has expensive sewerage implications - a sizeable part of the 3 seem likely to be rock.

The visual impact of development of RN 326 is very great when viewed from eg Arnside Knott, Heversham Head etc. - and it would open up development of adjacent sites which is forbidden under small village and hamlet planning

rules.

It is important to note that RN118M & RN 326 have been rejected by Planners and even on Appeal previously. What has changed?

SLDC rules state that if a site is not in fill or rounding off (and an Appeals Inspector has said specifically that RN118M is neither) then a development must be 100% affordable homes. No one has shown that 43 or 55 or 160 or a combination of these numbers as affordable homes are needed in this village by 2025.

In our view development should be limited to the current school car park R445 and small groups of houses to take the total to 20 by 2025 - THIS WAS VOTED FOR BY A LARGE MAJORITY OF THE PARISH AT A PUBLIC MEETING CALLED TO DISCUSS THE MATTER.

We and many others strongly oppose the action of our Parish Council action in their subsequent submission to SLDC which the Meeting did NOT support. This was quite undemocratic on their part. A small group of councillors seem to have their own agenda in defiance of the Public Meeting. The council has proposed site RN316 for 8 to 10 houses but on a site suitable for 43 houses. This suggests a future increase after the 8 to 10 are built - against planning rules.

The Residents Group opposing Site R48M appear to have their own Agenda and proposing site RN316 would appear to be retaliatory to deflect building from R48M.

We do not agree that the Land Allocations should cover a shorter period. This process has already taken a long time - and caused division in the village. We can do without another re-run in 2017.

Whether Small Villages and Hamlets should or should not have Allocations is impossible to answer as the Localism Bill is not finalised as we write. The exact wording will have a big effect on this issue.

Yours faithfully

John & Margaret Whitehead  
Woodhouse Lane  
Heversham  
LA7 7EW

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

---