## 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:Private	Organisation:		
Name: Mr & Mrs J Deakin	Name:		
Address:	Address:		
Postcode:	Postcode: 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:

Which site do you wish 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.)

Settlement (e.g. Natland)		Site reference number		
Sedgwick – land south of Back Lane		RN280#		
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	Support in part		Oppose X	
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)				
The road access to the planned residential development is totally inadequate.  The proposed development is in a prominent location in an area of natural beauty.  Back Lane is not suitable for more housing. It is narrow (single track) and not well maintained, particularly in the winter, when it is not gritted (along with most of the centre of the village) It has no footpath on either side.  The field suggested has a busy public footpath, used by walkers and runners, which runs from Force Bridge, across and field, across Back Lane and up to the stile, and then along the disused canal. Development would spoil this footpath.  The land proposed forms part of a valuable and attractive landscape not totally visible from the road. It is a steep bank that directly overlooks the cricket pitch, forming part of one of the prettiest cricket settings in the county, and it also directly overlooks also the patio, pool and some apartments of Sedgwick House. Development would spoil this picturesque setting in the heart of the village.				

2. <u>Time Span of Land Allocations Document</u> : Should the Land Allocations document plan period remain 2003 – 2025 or cover a shorter period, for example, 2003-2020?					
	er you support, support in part o s document (please tick as approp		time span		
Support	Support in part	Oppose 🗌			
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)					
• ,	•		ou oxpand		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			Устолрана		

## 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)		
<b>A</b> □	В	
Please explain your reasons/add your comme box if necessary)	nts below (continue on a separate sheet/expand	

Thank you for your views and suggestions.