

From: Philip Watkinson []  
Sent: 09- Sep- 11 18:54  
To: Development Plans  
Subject: Re: SOUTH LAKE LAND ALLOCATIONS - FURTHER CONSULTATION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Sir/Madam

Firstly, as regards the proposal I put forward on behalf of my client, Mrs J.M. Newton, via both my original document and the follow up e-mail 15th April 2011, I am surprised that neither myself or Mrs Newton has received any correspondence or feedback on the proposal in general or any specific matters that may have needed clarification.

I did offer the opportunity to discuss the proposal and/or to meet for a direct look at the site. However, we have heard nothing, other than an acknowledgement of receipt of my e-mail dated 15th April 2011 from Lorayne Woodend, which addressed me as Mr Wilkinson, all of which has not given me the impression that the appropriate attention has been given to my detailed, policy compliant proposal.

(Ulverston & Furness : Map no. 42 : Site ref. nos. RN207 / RN208).

I trust that the appropriate consideration has been / will be given to the proposal and the extensive merits that the site possesses / offers, as I have specified previously, hence I will not repeat them here. I have significant experience of the local plan / LDF processes after 21 years as a County Council land agent and the practical approach needed to blend policy with practicality, as well as an appropriate geographical spread of development. I firmly believe that this proposal meets all the necessary requirements and should be included in the LDF and not precluded by an over emphasis on areas with a greater population. The LDF surely needs to encompass a range of development opportunities, both in geographic terms and in scale.

Therefore with regard to the 3 points of further consultation I would comment that;

a.. In light of the above comments I deem it appropriate to incorporate sites for development in small villages / hamlets within the LDF. It is a long term plan (even if to 2020) and it must allocate the range of potential developments which will allow flexibility and a diverse range of proposals to be brought to fruition, particularly amid changes in central government planning objectives. The proposal put forward is further ratified by the government's very recent indications to allow green belt development to meet housing need and boost the economy. The presumption will be in favour of planning consent unless there is significant reason not to grant permission. I see no significant reason why this proposal would not be appropriate in planning terms. It is significantly compliant with planning objectives as I have previously detailed and as such I regard it as appropriate for inclusion within the LDF.

b.. I deem the Land Allocations document should be to 2020. This is a long enough term, as any longer period is likely to render the plan outdated and inconsistent with changing planning objectives as dictated by central government. Changes in government and in personnel will undoubtedly give rise to changes in policy. A greater term of planning 'rigidity' within the LDF will therefore be counter-productive and it thus makes sense to remain as flexible as possible at the local / district level, so a shorter period to 2020 would seem appropriate and more practical.

c.. The proposal put forward by my client is sustainable (and flexible) and significantly complies with planning objectives. I trust that you will see this to be the case and include this proposal within the LDF in order that it can then be taken forward to produce what I firmly believe will be a successfully sustainable and beneficial development.

I would be obliged if you would acknowledge receipt of this mail, and I would again state my availability and willingness to discuss any aspect of the proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Philip Watkinson MRICS

