



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: SEDGWICK PARISH COUNCIL		Organisation:	
Name: VIV TUNNADINE – CLERK TO COUNCIL		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 **12**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	
Sedgwick	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 <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)		

1. This represents a ribbon development along the lane rather than an infill development
2. The existing limit of the village would be extended resulting in the erosion of the village nature of Sedgwick.
3. The current grazing land with public footpath provides significant amenity value to local walkers and hikers from further afield. The path which runs from Force Bridge, across to Back Lane and up to the stile, and then along the disused canal. This development would spoil this footpath.
4. The development would be visually intrusive.
5. There would be a significant increase in traffic requiring road widening and further urbanisation of the village.
6. The road access to the planned residential development is inadequate.
7. Back Lane is not suitable for more housing. It is narrow (single track) and not well maintained, particularly in the winter. It has no footpath on either side.
8. The proposed development is in a prominent location in an area of natural beauty. The land forms part of a valuable and attractive landscape not totally visible from the road. It is a steep bank that directly overlooks Sedgwick Cricket Club, forming part of one of the prettiest cricket settings in the county.

- 9. The development site is over a sloping parcel of land would overlook the patio, pool and some apartments of Sedgwick House. The development would spoil this picturesque setting in the heart of the village**
- 10. Sedgwick village is picturesque a historic, beautiful village with a stunning vista as you enter the village. This development would ruin this view.**
- 11. Building over a sloping land resulting in an elevated development**

Which site do you wish to comment on?

Settlement
(e.g Natland)

Site reference number

Sedgwick

ON56#

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 ☒

Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

1. This is good quality grazing land and creates a clear area of undeveloped land between Sedgwick and Natland.
2. Any development would ruin the character and nature of Sedgwick and would lead to traffic widening schemes to accommodate increased traffic flow.
3. The site exceeds the existing size of the village three times over.
4. The canal is not developed for this development.
5. The infrastructure and road system is insufficient to cope with this nature of development.
6. Due to the Concern the size and nature of the proposal this site requires its individual planning application and environmental impact assessment.
7. Access over Coppers Hill is detrimental to the area and inappropriate.
8. The Lancaster Canal Trust is unaware of the development.
9. The council are very concerned that this sets a precedent to be developed as a recreational space even if the canal is not redeveloped in the future.

Which site do you wish to comment on?

Settlement
(e.g Natland)

Site reference number

Sedgwick

E50 -55#

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 ☒

Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

1. This proposed development is of a scale that would fundamentally change the area which is currently sparsely populated small villages, hamlets and houses on the tourist approaches to Sizergh Castle and Levens Hall and is therefore not in keeping with the area.
2. A Mixed residential and employment development at an already very busy roundabout, where all the traffic from Barrow heading for the M6 turns right, would increase traffic problems, noise and pollution.
3. The area is a green corridor between Levens and Sedgwick and development would lead to the two villages merging in to a small town and resulting in urbanisation of the countryside.
4. There will be potential increased incidence of flooding in an area which experiences flooding in adverse weather.
5. The development would result in the loss of good quality agricultural land.
6. This development proposal requires its own separate planning application and environment impact assessment.
7. Levens Hall Estate is against this development and is the current land owners.
8. The National Trust who own Sizergh Castle have assured council that this development will be opposed by them and they are the land owners.

Settlement (e.g Natland)		Site reference number
Sedgwick		E56#
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)		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will be a potential increase in flood risk from straddling the River Kent. 2. There would be a potential hazard of river pollution both during the development and after it was complete. 3. This area is of historical interest to English Heritage, and includes a Scheduled Monument No 1365841, 19th Century Formal Garden at the former Bassingill Gunpowder Works created by Isabella Wakefield of Sedgwick House. 4. Not in keeping with the area and exceeds the existing area of the village 		

SUMMARY

Sedgwick Parish Council is opposed to the development of these proposed sites. The council is concerned about the impact of these developments would have upon the infrastructure, appearance, and environment of the village and surrounding areas.

Councillors expressed their concern with regards the implementation of the consultation process identifying:

1. The deadlines were too short and not practical especially over the summer to provide sufficient time for due consideration.
2. There was a lack of information and insufficient support/training to councillors to enable them to manage the process and engage with the community.
3. Councillors felt that only land proposed by land owners should have been proposed. Speculative proposals by non-land owners have not been an efficient use of public resources or time. For example: Proposing land owned by the National Trust is not a viable use of council time.

--

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)

Sedgwick Parish Council **resolved to abstain.**

The council feel that they do not have enough information to make an informed decision in this matter.

BLANK

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)

Sedgwick Parish Council resolved to abstain.

The council would like to work in partnership with SLDC to enable the community to become actively involved in planning and development issues that affect the parish.

Council members are aware that there are impending planning legislation changes with the impending approval and implementation of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Localism Bill. The council will abstain until these changes become law, fully understood and implemented.

Thank you for your views and suggestions.