



Consultation Response Form

How to make comments

You need fill out only one copy of your contact details. However, **please fill in a separate response form for each site or issue that you wish to comment on.** Please indicate in the box provided on the contact details form the total number of pages enclosed. Please complete the attached Equality Monitoring Form if you wish.

An electronic copy of this form is available at www.southlakeland.gov.uk/landallocations

Electronic forms or responses by email can be sent to developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk.

Responses on paper copies of this form should be posted or faxed to:

Development Strategy Manager
South Lakeland District Council
South Lakeland House
Lowther Street
Kendal
LA9 4DL
Fax: 01539 717355

You may also hand in your form to the council offices at:

- South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal; or
- Ulverston Local Link (Town Hall)

If you require additional copies of the form please call 01539 717490 or email developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk.

Internet access is available at your local library and at South Lakeland House, Kendal.

Please ensure that your comments reach the Council Offices at South Lakeland House, Kendal no later than Friday 9th September 2011.

Your contact details and privacy

Anonymous comments will not be accepted. Comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for public inspection. Your submitted comments will be used in the preparation of the LDF.

Contact details, signatures and private addresses will not be made public. Any data that you supply will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Viewing the relevant documents

The consultation document, which includes maps of the sites we would like comments on can be viewed at council offices and local libraries and downloaded from the Council website

Any questions?

If you need help completing the comments sheet, require further information or are unsure about any aspect of the consultation, our Development Plans Team will be pleased to advise.

Contact details are:

Tel: **01539 717490**

Email: developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk



Consultation Response Form

Your contact details

If you are completing a paper copy of this form please use CAPITALS and BLACK INK.

Your details		Your Agent's details (if you have one)	
Organisation:		Organisation:	
Name: Mrs M Mason		Name:	
Address:		Address:	
Postcode:		Postcode:	
Tel:		Tel:	
*Email:		*Email:	

*We aim to minimise the amount of paper printed and sent out. Therefore, where an email address is supplied, future contact will be made electronically.

This response contains pages including this one.

Please tick the box if you would like us to notify you when the Land Allocations Development Plan Document is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and when it is adopted by the Council.

Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.

(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)

1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Kendal	R124#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/> X
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>I would like to object to the re-introduction of R124 - Fields to the rear of Ullswater Road. I objected the last time this was put forward on grounds that building, with inevitable increased in hard impermeable surfaces from new roads, roofs and paving, would increase flooding to parts of Kendal further down Stock Beck. At the same time interruption and changes to ground water flows, springs and useful water storage in the soils of the fields would reduce the current dampening effect on flows of Stock Beck.</p> <p>I did not emphasise the highway access problems with these sites. This time I believe that the small field at the southern end of R124, west of Stock Beck, has been put forward by its landowner who has applied and failed to get planning consent several times, presumably in the hope that, by joining it to land north of Stock Beck, highway access would be secured from Peat Lane.</p> <p>I would like to make it clear that I object to the inclusion of this field, and in fact any land south of Stock Beck even more strongly than the rest of the site, firstly on highway access grounds, (although this interacts with the flooding problem), and also on sustainability and visual impact grounds.</p> <p>There are 3 directions where highway access might be attempted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) on to the lane/track to Birds Park Farm,2) on to Grizedale Avenue,3) across Stock Beck to join with a new service road to Peat Lane,		

Option 1 is not feasible because Birds Park Lane is narrow in itself, but also has a sub-standard access on to old Sedbergh Road.

Option 2 would need very substantial earthworks and deep concrete foundations to meet the level of the current road surface, creating an extremely un-natural land form and having a negative impact on surface water and flood water storage.

Option 3 would need either a substantial bridge or culverting of the Beck, with similar flood impacts and visual impacts. I believe culverting is against Environment Agency policy in flood susceptible areas.

The second reason for my objection at this stage is that houses built on this most southerly part of R124 would have to be built into the steep hillside and be solely north facing, with their southerly aspect cut into the hillside like the houses on the south side of Grizedale Avenue and east of Sedbergh Drive that also “cut into” the same hill. These homes would have no possibility of sunshine, passive solar warmth, or renewable energy from solar thermal or photovoltaics. I do not think that such homes could be considered “sustainable development” and thus they should not be subject to the proposed “presumption in favour of sustainable development”.

The alternative approach of raising them up above the hill to get a southerly aspect would have a very bad visual impact on neighbouring areas in both directions, while placing houses on the flatter land close to the Beck would give them a southerly aspect, but leave them subject to flooding themselves, as well as increasing flows in the Beck.

I am aware that prospective developers do make proposals to fill in small valleys such as this and culvert the streams to create “level” housing sites, as was done with the present houses west of R124. It is now known that, even where it may be acceptable on visual grounds, this causes flooding both above and below the area. I believe this is a completely unsuitable approach for R124, on visual, highway, sustainability and flooding grounds and I hope it will again be eliminated from the site allocations process.

In addition I think that the inevitable abolition of RSS, and with it the last remaining Structure Plan policies, means that the question of housing numbers in S Lakeland and Kendal in particular should be re-examined. Houses should not be so increased / concentrated in Kendal that the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment findings are ignored. Kendal as a whole is very susceptible to the increased flood risk from climate change and many of the Kendal sites have big impacts on flooding. If there is not enough land available in Kendal, and more homes are needed FOR LOCAL PEOPLE not second homes and retirees/commuters, then they should be permitted in the smaller S Lakes communities who want them and have capacity.

2. Time Span of Land Allocations Document:

Should the Land Allocations document plan period remain 2003 – 2025 or cover a shorter period, for example, 2003-2020?

Please indicate whether you support, support in part or oppose a reduction in the time span of the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)

Support

Support in part

Oppose

Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

3. Small Villages, Hamlets & Open Countryside

Do you think the future housing and employment land needs of small villages, hamlets and open countryside are best met by: -

- A. Allocating sites for houses and employment in the Land Allocations document; or
- B. Communities and/or developers bringing forward sites for housing and employment for consideration under relevant Core Strategy policies, through neighbourhood plans and/or other local initiatives.

Please indicate which of the above options you would support. (Please tick as appropriate)

A

B

Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

Thank you for your views and suggestions.