

FCEM160

From: vic brown []
Sent: 10- Sep- 11 12:11
To: Development Plans
C
Subject: Additional Consultation : SLDC LDF : Vic Brown : Tythebarn House, HOLME

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Additional Sites suggested : Burton / Holme Areas

My apologies for responding to this outside of the consultation period - I have just returned from holiday.

I do not intend to comment on specific additional sites - and I am sure they will have provoked considerable comment from residents and those who have participated in the previous consultation.

I do however wish to submit the following observations :-

. The Core Strategy makes the role of the above settlements abundantly clear. Neither Burton nor Holme is a community identified for major expansion, and in both cases, there are significant constraints which limit major development e.g. school capacity, other service provision (shops, sewage capacity, community facilities) ,road capacity, and physical obstacles such as the crossings of the Lancaster/Kendal canal.

. Many of the larger areas put forward can, at best, be considered as speculative proposals, submitted by those familiar with the planning process, and anticipating the new era of Localism. I view this with considerable concern. It is therefore incumbent upon SLDC to ensure that a firm and robust framework for planning is in place. Without it, these sites will be tested on appeal - at considerable expense to the local planning authority, and potential significant detriment to the quality of village life and environment.

. In both villages, there is potential to allow a steady, controlled release of land, but, in my view, this must be related to local needs. Holme has accommodated a significant increase of dwellings in recent years, and there is a strongly held view that it is time for a period with only small-scale development. Many advocate a complete halt to development, but I cannot agree with this. Housing difficulties are faced by families on low incomes, and there is a shortage of social housing schemes - both of which are desirable. This suggests that development should be directed to small parcels of land and infill. Opportunities for the redevelopment of existing residential land should also be considered, together with the conversion of larger dwellings into 1-2 person apartments/accommodation. This equally applies to Burton.

. I will be most interested to see the response of both Burton and Holme Parish Councils to the proposed Neighbourhood Pilot Schemes. These are a great opportunity for local people to get involved in the (simplified ?) planning process, but there is equally a need to make the position of such plans abundantly clear. Localism does not mean that 'local views' (in themselves very diverse) will take precedence. This is a great challenge both for officers and elected representatives involved in the planning process within SLDC. The plans will however enable public sector investment to be effectively programmed and related to phased development. In particular, I have in mind the

desirability of public sector funding to underpin the community efforts that have been made to secure a sports/community facility with Holme.

. With regard to land for employment, my view is that wherever possible this should be in the vicinity of existing provision. The development at Clawthorpe Business Centre (and also at J36:M6) demonstrate what can be done with imaginative planning policies. In both cases the sites have good highways infrastructure, which should be a prime determinant. The proposed further expansion of the land at Burtlands Farm (SL/2011/0324 – Land to the South Of Burtlands Farm) is not, in my view, appropriate in view of the narrowness of the surrounding highway network. Holme Parish Council and residents have already commented on the traffic problems associated with the use of Station Road. Redevelopment of the existing Holme Mills Storth Engineering site (and possible expansion as proposed) would further exacerbate this problem.

. Nothing in the above should deter SLDC from its stated aim to make provision for housing appropriate for local needs. I am pleased that Burton PC has supported the idea of residential use for the Green Dragon site, which combined with approved redevelopment of the Royal Hotel, and other smaller sites, should ensure that sufficient developable land is available as and when social housing funding is available. In Holme, the situation is a little more difficult, but again, the need is for compact housing developments – to accommodate 2-3 person households, with additional provision that recognises the projected increase in one or two person households retiring or moving into the area. In my view, this should be through multiple occupation units, or developments of medium/high density appropriate to village character.

Please keep me informed of the outcome of this process – and also the emerging pilot Neighbourhood schemes, where they affect all settlements within the Burton/Holme ward

Vic Brown