



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:	
Commercial Land		Savills – The London Planning Practice	
Name:		Name: Nigel Dexter	
Address: C/O Agent		Address:	
		Lansdowne House, 57 Berkeley Square, London	
Postcode:		Postcode:	W1J 6ER
Tel:		Tel:	
*Email:		*Email: ndexter@savills.com	

*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#)	
Heversham & Leasgill	RN310#	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>Our client fully supports the proposal to include site RN310# in the Land Allocations document as a site for residential development. However, they would contend that if a site is to be allocated, its boundaries should be extended to cover the full area previously labelled as R75 in earlier rounds of consultation.</p> <p>Given that site R75 has been suggested by several parties within Heversham & Leasgill, including Heversham Parish Council, it is clear that there is support for residential development of the site. This being so, we would argue strongly that the entirety of site R75, and not just the specific part now labelled RN310#, should be allocated as a site for residential development.</p> <p>A strong case for inclusion of site R75 was submitted under my name in the previous round of consultation in April 2011. I would urge you to consider these comments again since they provide robust justification to allocate not only RN310# for residential development, but the entirety of site R75.</p>		

Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

4. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
5. Time span of the Land Allocations document
6. 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.)

2. 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#)	
Heversham & Leasgill	RN325#	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>Our client fully supports the proposal to include site RN325# in the Land Allocations document as a site for residential development. However, they would contend that if this site is to be allocated, its boundaries should be extended to cover the full area previously labelled as R75 in earlier rounds of consultation.</p> <p>Given that site R75 has been suggested by several parties within Heversham & Leasgill, it is clear that there is support for residential development of the whole site. This being so, we would argue strongly that the entirety of site R75, and not just the specific part now labelled RN325#, should be allocated as a site for residential development.</p> <p>A strong case for inclusion of site R75 was submitted under my name in the previous round of consultation in April 2011. I would urge you to consider these comments again since they provide robust justification to allocate not only RN325# for residential development, but the entirety of site R75.</p>		

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
No comments on this matter		

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 <input type="checkbox"/>	B <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)	
<p>Given the drive towards localism that is inherent to the approach of the current national government and which is more than likely to be formalised in planning with the future adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework, it is important that local planning policy reflects this approach.</p> <p>As such, to ensure compliance with the national planning policy approach SLDC should be looking to move the emphasis of responsibility for bringing forward sites for development onto the local level. Making use of Neighbourhood Plans and similar initiatives would allow for localised decision making on development matters. Development should be based in housing need and not be based on a decision made at a point in time, as may occur with the ongoing implementation of a Land Allocations DPD over a longer period of time.</p> <p>The national government's planning approach is also heading in the direction of a presumption in favour of development, except where this would go against principles of sustainability. Such an approach should already be inherent to SLDC's Core Strategy policies and as such it is these policies which should form the basis for the consideration of the viability of any site for development.</p> <p>Too often, Land Allocations documents can impose arbitrary or outdated boundaries upon potential sites for development. Such a boundary in itself should not be the division between whether a site is suitable for development or not. Any proposal that conforms to Core Strategy policies and supports sustainable development should be considered as acceptable, with or without a supporting Land Allocations document setting.</p> <p>In this context, allowing the local proposition of development sites ensures that development can react to local demand or need. Effectively, the planning system should impose its own checks and balances upon development without the need to designate arbitrary development boundaries as part of a Land Allocations document.</p> <p>In addition, we would note that it is also essential to ensure that communities are not able to arbitrarily block housing developments that meet the criteria of sustainable development. This position must be enshrined in policy otherwise it is unlikely that any residential developments will be brought forward, especially if there is a risk that suitable proposals will be derailed for non-planning reasons.</p>	

Thank you for your views and suggestions.