

-----Original Message-----

From: Kevin Price [mailto:
Sent: 08- Sep- 11 2:47 PM
To: Law, Damian
Subject: RE: Land Allocations

Dear Damian,

Thanks for your reply. It is both the minutes extract and the Parish Council's response as summarised by the Chairman the day after the meeting. Is this ok?

Regards

Kevin

From: Kevin Price [mailto:k
Sent: 07 September 2011 15:56
To: Hudson, Daniel
Subject: Land Allocations

Hi Dan,

Thank you to yourself and Damian for attending the meeting at Burneside last night.

The following is an extract from the minutes of the meeting. Do you require it to be sent in a different form or will this suffice?

11/81 SLDC Local Development Framework – Land Allocations:

Following discussions, it was resolved that:

a. The Council is content to see a shortened Time Span in relation to the Land Allocations exercise

b. Regarding the approach to development in Small Villages, and indeed Burneside itself, the Council continued to have serious concerns about adequate provision of physical and social infrastructure, and the likely community imbalance resulting from an inflow of large numbers of new residents. (Burneside already having a high proportion of “social housing”).

c. Concerning the new alternative sites:

i) E32# Alternative 3.61 Land to west of Hall Road:

No new objections were raised to this extended site

ii) RN304# Alternative 1.10 Land south of Hall Park and, ON53# Alternative 0.23 strip of land,

Both these sites had already been opposed with serious safety and sustainability objections in previous consultations and there were no new objections to add.

iii) ON46# New 0.34 Land north of Burneside Cricket Club,

The Council felt unable to support this, safe access and suitability being concerns.

iv) ON47# New 2.56 Land adjoining Burneside Football Ground

The Council felt able to support this as it would concentrate sports and social activities nearer to the village centre. However the main road leading to it (Hollins Lane) would need several modifications to make access safe.

v) RN28# Alternative 0.27 Youth Club and adjoining ground,

The Council felt able to support this site for sympathetic development providing a small number of dwellings to cater for local need as expressed in the CRHT survey (ie: 22 homes over five years).

Whilst it is not an ideal site, it is regarded as "brown field" and as such preferable to the loss of more "green field" sites.

FCEM243

All of the Councils previous objections to any large scale building in the Parish remain in force.

Many thanks

Kevin
