



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: Mr David R Baxter		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 S E	ON50, RN302	
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>I refer to my previous opposition to R121M which also pertains to these two sites in regard to 1) increased risk of flooding , 2) serious loss of visual amenity, 3) grave environmental impact, 4) increased problems with traffic and 5) inappropriate housing configuration</p> <p>In addition I specifically oppose the public space proposed under these two site reference numbers. This is a risible and entirely cynical ploy by the developer to use a part of the site which the developer has calculated they either cannot develop due to its undesirable geography or geology or which would cost too much in terms of foundation construction to extract the maximum profit in terms of its cost/benefit strategy. The ground around this area both rises high but also has a large element of boggy ground. The developer wishes to dangle the carrot in front of SLDC of leaving ON50 as a public space, and in return be rewarded by being allowed to develop more of the greenfield space in R121M and RN302. The likelihood is that there may have been no intention to develop ON50 (or leave it as a development site of lower priority). The developer is therefore trading off part of site which they calculate would in any case be less profitable and which they would need to incorporate somehow into their massive housing development in return for more profitable development area.</p> <p>The developer is waving a complete sop of a 'public space' which will in reality be a patch of undesirable ground surrounded on three sides by a massive housing estate and which will be of little public use or utility to anyone. It is quite simply a 'kite-flying' exercise by the</p>		

developer to somehow display a purported generosity, philanthropy and environmental conscience and indeed which is utterly offensive in its vacuity and cynicism.

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)

Better for it to remain as it is to allow the longest possible consideration given the extremely grave and potentially disastrous environmental and economic outcomes which may result from inappropriate development.

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)

Decisions need to be taken locally by residential communities in conjunction, if appropriate and desired, with developers in partnership. Top down decisions by central government or politically/ideologically motivated local government possibly in cahoots with developers is undemocratic, morally wrong and liable to lead to environmental disaster and economically unsound and inappropriate outcomes.

Thank you for your views and suggestions.