



# 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: Home Owner		Organisation:	
Name: Stuart Robertson		Name:	
Address:		Address:	
Postcode:		Postcode:	
Tel: 0		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.)

<b>Which site do you wish to comment on?</b>		
<b>Settlement</b> (e.g. Natland)	<b>Site reference number</b> (e.g. RN298#)	
North Ackenthwaite	R656#	
<b>Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document</b> (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please explain your reasons/add your comments below</b> (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>I have already submitted objections to land development in north Ackenthwaite during the first round of consultation, those being that I oppose development on the grounds of:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Poor initial consultation;</li><li>b. Inability to improve necessary infrastructure (roads and pavements) on Ackenthwaite Road due to existing housing;</li><li>c. Retaining Ackenthwaite as a green belt site and avoiding a “patchwork” effect of urban development in rural areas;</li><li>d. Poor drainage on the site;</li><li>e. Inconsistency of the proposed plan with the Land Allocations document and South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) Core Strategy planning policy, and;</li><li>f. More suitable alternative sites existing in Kendal and Milnthorpe.</li></ul> <p>Therefore, I will not repeat all my arguments in detail here, as my original letter remains extant. I do however, express deep concern that despite my original objection and several others from the local community, it has only taken proposals by only two parties (Mr and Mrs Conway and Mr Steve Gilyatt) to require this second consultation period for area R656#; this is despite the SLDC having discounted R656# after the first consultation period. As such, there appears to have been excessive weight given to the sponsors of the latest development proposals in this area for what is essentially, a minority interest and does not represent the majority view in the local community. Equally concerning is the fact that this</p>		

second consultation period has been instigated to explore ‘alternative sites for consideration.’ As site R656# was in the original consultation document it is, by definition, not an alternative site and therefore, does not warrant a second consultation period. In short, this second consultation period for area R656# is undemocratic, unnecessary and a waste of SLDC resources and taxpayers money.

Local residents were also lead to believe that the SLDC preferred sites (decided after the first round of consultation) west of St Antony’s Hill and east Milnthorpe (site R624M), more than met the housing targets that SLDC had set. Why this situation has suddenly been reversed on the strength of an application by two parties, simply lacks credibility and transparency towards objective council planning.

I would again highlight that this area is a green field site, which supports local agriculture. It should be remembered that agriculture is a key economic employer in the local area and needs robust support from the council following the recent foot and mouth crisis and economic downturn; taking away viable agricultural land would be counter productive in this sense. Green sites should only be used for irreversible housing development if the Ackenthwaite area is critically short of housing; the situation after the first consultation period suggests the housing problem is no longer critical after the identification of preferred sites elsewhere.

Should development be granted on R656#, subsequent housing would simply cause a patchwork of urban development in a green area when alternative brown sites or natural areas for expansion already exist in larger urban areas such as Kendal. Also, the inevitable increase in local traffic could not be sustained given the current road and pathway network. Given the local topography of housing in Ackenthwaite, network expansion would be impossible unless existing housing is demolished. Therefore, I strongly believe that the plans to build in north Ackenthwaite (R656#) and surrounding areas around the village, lack intellectual rigour and should not be supported.

## 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)

Given that the current Land Allocations Document (LAD) has so far, been ongoing for eight years and has yet to come to a final conclusion that is fit for ministerial approval, (not to mention currently enduring a second and arguably unnecessary consultation period), this strongly suggests that shortening the LAD to by say five years, will simply cause a situation where local land planning will be under constant review. When considering current progress to date, it is conceivable to suggest that by the time this LAD has been completed under a shorter timeframe, another plan will have to be started. As such, local residents and planners will be in a perpetual state of uncertainty and turmoil with no realistic, clear or sustained housing policy. Instead an ever-changing policy with moving goal posts is likely to evolve which will lack coherence, focus and credibility for local industry, developers and residents. Therefore, I oppose a reduction in the time span of the LAD.

### 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)

Without doubt, by empowering local communities, businesses and developers to bring forward and argue plans in an open manner via Core Strategies and local plans and initiatives, it is a more credible method of development planning than using a single Land Allocations Document (LAD). If the local council provides an overarching development policy or strategy, local communities can use this as a “handrail” in assessing and considering local development. Local communities are best placed to decide on development decisions, as they logically understand local topography, mood and aspirations better than a centralised and distant coordination cell or LAD.

The current situation ultimately gives the council exclusive judgement in matters that are often extremely sensitive and important to local residents, which cannot be fully understood by a centralised planning team. By empowering local communities to make development decisions, residents will not only take ownership and responsibility for key strategic planning, but will increasingly take pride in their local area. This naturally leads to a stronger sense of community, greater social well-being, more proactive citizens in the political process and happier residents in South Lakeland. The current method of allocating land via a LAD does not offer these benefits and is ultimately disingenuous to local aspiration or thought.

**Thank you for your views and suggestions.**