

1 November 2011

Dan Hudson
Development Strategy Manager
South Lakeland District Council
South Lakeland House
Lowther Street
Kendal
LA9 4DL

Dear Mr. Hudson

**South Lakeland District Council Land Allocations Development Plan Document
– Further Consultation**

Thank you for inviting Cumbria County Council to participate in the consultation on the Land Allocations Development Plan Document – Further Consultation.

The county council recognises the importance of providing constructive comments to help develop the District's Local Development Frameworks and we seek to provide detailed comments at each stage of the process. As a consultee it is important that the county council inform the production of Development Plan Documents. In our responsibility for strategic planning, highways and transport, children's and adult services we seek to ensure that our comments can help to plan the services and facilities which the county council look after and ensure these are fully considered at a local level.

The county council's response was considered and agreed at the county council's Cabinet meeting on 13th October 2011. Please find enclosed the county council's response in the form of a Cabinet report and the minutes of the Cabinet meeting. Meetings are currently taking place between Cumbria County Council and South Lakeland District Council officers regarding the comments provided in relation to highways. It is hoped that the round of meetings will be concluded soon.

I hope you find the comments constructive however, should you have any further queries regarding the response please do not hesitate to contact Leanne Beverley, Senior Planning Officer in the Spatial Planning Team (contact details can be found at the top of this page). We look forward to receiving the next stage of the Land Allocations DPD for comment in due course.

Yours sincerely



Marie Fallon
Corporate Director – Environment

CABINET

Meeting date: 13 October 2011

**From: Cabinet Member for Transport and
Environment
Corporate Director – Environment**

SOUTH LAKELAND LAND ALLOCATIONS – FURTHER CONSULTATION

PART A - RECOMMENDATION OF CABINET MEMBER

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1** *The current planning system in England is ‘plan led’, whereby it is a statutory duty for Local Planning Authorities to prepare a ‘Development Plan’. The Development Plan should seek to guide decision making in relation to planning applications, as well as to guide investment decisions for infrastructure provision. Since September 2004, the system has comprised of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) and Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) policies. The coalition Government has stated its intention to abolish RSSs. However, until the Localism Bill is enacted, the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West still remains part of the Development Plan, as well as the saved policies of the Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan.*
- 1.2** *Each Local Planning Authority in Cumbria currently must produce a LDF which comprises of a Core Strategy, Proposals Map, Site Allocations and other Development Plan Documents. Changes proposed as part of the Localism Bill and the draft National Planning Policy Framework do not alter the statutory requirement for LPA’s to prepare a Development Plan. Indeed it makes it all the more important given the proposed presumption in favour of sustainable development.*
- 1.3** *The Cumbrian Local Planning Authorities are at different stages with their LDF production. South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) adopted their Core Strategy in October 2010 and is now currently preparing their Land Allocation document. SLDC previously consulted on their Land Allocations Emerging Options in January-April 2011; this was brought to Cabinet on the 28 April 2011. SLDC is carrying out further consultation on three issues which emerged from this earlier consultation. The first consultation issue asks for comments on more sites that have been put forward since the last consultation. The second consultation issue relates to the period the Land Allocations*

document will cover, with the third issue relating to how sites in smaller settlements should be identified.

- 1.4** *As a consultee, it is important that the County Council informs the process of the preparation of all LDFs. As we are the strategic planning, highways and transport, children's and adult services authority, early dialogue with the local authority is important in order to successfully be involved in the development of district planning policy.*
- 1.5** *The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet Members of the content of the Land Allocation Further Consultation.*

2.0 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1** *The County Council's policy on spatial matters is set out in the Cumbria Strategic Partnership's Sub Regional Spatial Strategy 2008-2028 and those policies contained in the Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan which were extended and not replaced by the North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy (September 2008). It is important that LDF documents link to the Cumbria Sub Regional Spatial Strategy to ensure development is co-ordinated throughout Cumbria. It is considered that the adopted South Lakeland District Council Core Strategy broadly reflects the Cumbria Sub Regional Spatial Strategy. This is important as the Core Strategy sets the spatial strategy for the district and all other DPDs within the LDF (including the Land Allocations document).*
- 2.2** *The South Lakeland Land Allocations Further Consultation document is an important document for future spatial planning in Cumbria. It also has links to the aspirations for Cumbria of the Council Plan (2011-2014) – a thriving economy where we challenge poverty in all its forms; a place where you can live in a high quality and sustainable environment and you can move safely and easily around the county; a great place to be a child and grow up in; a place of opportunity where young people are able to live happy and productive lives; a place where young people will want to live and work in the future; a place to enjoy an independent and healthy life and to be safe from harm, with more control over your life and a say in the decisions which affect you.*
- 2.3** *In relation to equality, Development Plan Document preparation follows detailed procedures for public engagement which South Lakeland will have to adhere to. Various media forms are used to advertise opportunities for consultation and documents are available in various formats as there are a wide range of consultees involved, crossing all equality strands (e.g. issues relating to affordable housing and Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites – see Appendix 4). It is also important to note that there could be differing views expressed at all levels of engagement throughout the LDF consultation due to the potential impacts on individuals and groups.*

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:

- a) endorse the detailed comments on the Alternative Sites as set out in Appendix 2;*
- b) raise concern to the proposal to reduce the Land Allocations DPD period from 2003-2025 to 2003-2020 (Appendix 3); and*
- c) support an approach whereby future housing and employment sites in small villages, hamlets and open countryside could be allocated in the Land Allocations DPD together with an approach which allows communities and developers to bring forward sites (Appendix 4).*

Tim Knowles, Portfolio Member for Transport and Environment

PART B – ADVICE OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR – ENVIRONMENT

4.0 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 The planning system in England is ‘plan led’, whereby it is a statutory duty for Local Planning Authorities to prepare a ‘Development Plan’. The Development Plan should seek to guide decision making in relation to planning applications as well as to guide investment decisions for infrastructure provision. Since September 2004, the system has comprised of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs) and Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) policies. The coalition Government has stated its intention to abolish RSSs. However, until the Localism Bill is enacted, the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West still remains part of the Development Plan, as well as the saved policies of the Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan.
- 4.2 Each Local Planning Authority in Cumbria must produce a LDF, which comprises of a Core Strategy, Proposals Map, Site Allocations and other Development Plan Documents.
- 4.3 South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) is at an advanced stage with the production of their LDF. SLDC adopted and published their Core Strategy in October 2010. The Core Strategy establishes the development strategy for South Lakeland outside of the National Park up to 2025. The Core Strategy sets out that 8,800 new dwellings should be built between 2003-2025 and that around four hectares of new employment land are needed per annum between 2010-2025. The proportion of development is set out in the table below:

Settlements	Approximate Amount of Development
Principal Service Centres	
Kendal	35%
Ulverston	20%
Key Service Centres	
Milnthorpe	13%

Kirkby Lonsdale Grange-over-Sands	
Local Service Centres	21%
Smaller Villages & Hamlets	11%

Table 1: Proportion of development in South Lakeland settlements in the plan period

- 4.4 South Lakeland District Council is now in the process of developing their Land Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The Land Allocations DPD is an important document as it should guide development to happen in the right place at the right time and in tandem with new infrastructure. The Land Allocations DPD also seeks to protect existing open spaces, outdoor sports facilities, employment land and green gaps where deemed necessary.
- 4.5 In January-April 2011, South Lakeland District Council consulted on their 'Emerging Options' where 152 sites were offered for consideration. Cabinet received a report outlining the County Council's response at their meeting on 28 April. This report highlighted a number of strategic issues. The response also highlighted a number of site specific comments.
- 4.6 South Lakeland Local Committee also considered this consultation on 4 April 2011. Differing views were expressed as to how the County Council should respond to the consultation. There were Members who expressed disquiet about land development in the area and considered the Land Allocations to be ill conceived. They supported a proposal calling for Cabinet to object to the housing development identified in the Land Allocations DPD. There were also Members who supported the Land Allocation Emerging Options, stressing the need for affordable housing to be provided in the area, and for development to be planned for in a controlled manner.
- 4.7 Upon being put to the vote, it was resolved that:
- "the matters raised in the report be noted, and that given the severe reservations expressed by Members of the Local Committee about the housing proposals across the district, Cabinet be called upon to object to the housing development in the Land Allocations, whilst recognising the need for the sensitive development of affordable housing for local people".*
- 4.8 In consideration of the concerns raised by local committee Members, it was suggested that Cabinet request that South Lakeland District Council ensures that the supply of housing in the LDF area is managed to ensure that evidenced needs are met, whilst taking into account the delivery of new employment sites and associated infrastructure which is also required in the area to achieve sustainable growth. It was recommended that South Lakeland District Council uses its own impact assessments to judge which land allocations are most appropriate to be retained within the Land Allocations DPD.
- 4.9 The Cabinet report for the previous consultation (dated 28th April 2011) highlighted that further work to assess the cumulative impact of development in Kendal was ongoing. The County Council are currently undertaking a

Transport Modelling exercise to understand the highways and transport implications of the proposed levels of development in Kendal. This will consider what the base flows of traffic are at 2011, 2020 and 2025. It will then consider the quantum of development proposed during the period 2010-2020 and then 2020-2025 and the impact these amounts will have on the highway network; committed developments are also included within the assessment. It will then identify suitable mitigation measures to offset any adverse impacts. This work will further inform the Land Allocation document.

- 4.10 Cumbria County Council has now been consulted on the South Lakeland Land Allocations – Further Consultation document. Initially South Lakeland consulted the County Council on over 300 new and alternative sites which were suggested by developers, landowners, community groups, parish and town councils and individuals as a result of the previous consultation.
- 4.11 Ideally, South Lakeland District Council would have welcomed responses on all of the latest consultation sites. However, due to the significant number of sites, timescales and staff resources present, it was determined that this would not be possible. Whilst South Lakeland had no wish to limit the scope of comment received, it suggested that the County Council might consider giving priority to certain sites using the following criteria: those new/alternative sites which do not obviously conflict with South Lakeland's Core Strategy; which are supported by evidence of availability, suitability and deliverability; are in sustainable locations; and might otherwise be considered to be reasonable potential development options. South Lakeland District Council has not made any decisions on any of the 300 new/alternative sites and no site is ruled in/out at this stage. Therefore, in line with the agreed approach, the County Council will be responding to 101 new and alternative sites that satisfy the suggested selection criteria.
- 4.12 In addition to the new sites which came forward, South Lakeland District Council is also re-consulting on a number of Emerging Options which were part of the previous consultation. It was decided to respond to 20 of these sites, as these were considered the more strategic sites and the sites which raised highways concerns. Appendix 2 contains the detailed site comments for all the consultation sites.
- 4.13 It is important to note that because this is an 'Emerging Options – Further Consultation', land allocations have been put forward as options or potential development sites. Therefore, not all of the sites included in this consultation will form part of the final allocations. It is important that South Lakeland District Council ensures the final Land Allocations DPD will be able to deliver the need for development which is set out in the adopted Core Strategy DPD.
- 4.14 There are two further aspects to the latest consultation – the second consultation issue looks to the option of reducing the Land Allocations document. The third and final consultation issue questions whether it is best to allocate sites for future housing and employment sites in small villages, hamlets and the open countryside through the Land Allocations document or through communities/development bringing forward sites through local initiatives (e.g. Neighbourhood Plans).

- 4.15 The South Lakeland Land Allocations Further Consultation document was considered by South Lakeland Local Committee at their meeting on the 23rd September 2011. The minutes of the meeting remain in draft form until the next Local Committee (18th November). The debate is summarised below.
- 4.16 A member expressed his surprise that the landscape/biodiversity aspects of the sites had not been commented upon and he urged that Cabinet should do so. He was advised that due to resource and time constraints it had not been possible to look at such issues in respect of individual sites.
- 4.17 In relation to the second consultation issue Members supported the view that there should be no reduction in the period of the Land Allocations DPD to ten years.
- 4.18 With regard to the third consultation issue there was support to a hybrid approach of the two options identified by the District Council. A member referred to the Taylor Review on Rural and Affordable Housing published in 2008 entitled Living Working Countryside. He advised that the review, which aimed to provide guidance for best practice in rural development, was particularly critical of “doughnut development” where gap sites around the periphery of towns were developed on an ad-hoc basis. He was of the view that South Lakeland District Council’s Land Allocations DPD should try to adopt the more flexible approach identified in the Taylor report.
- 4.19 The member proposed that “Cabinet adopts and urges the District Council to adopt the principles and recommendations to fit the Taylor Report, and in particular to adopt a strategy which seeks land allocations not just contiguous to existing towns and villages but other land which may not be contiguous to but which would be capable of sharing infrastructure with those settlements”.
- 4.20 He also suggested substituting the words “small villages” with “all settlements” in the draft recommendation to Cabinet.
- 4.21 During discussion there was support by members to the proposal put forward. A member also referred to the time period of the Land Allocations DPD and was of the view that it should be stressed to South Lakeland District Council that it needed to be implemented regardless of decisions taken in the future by the National Park Authority.
- 4.22 South Lakeland Local Committee resolved “that the views expressed at the meeting be supported and forwarded onto Cabinet when consideration is given to the Council’s response on the Further Consultation at its meeting on 13 October”.
- 4.23 Whilst South Lakeland Local Committee are not suggesting for South Lakeland District Council to extend the development boundaries of settlements, it is suggested that appropriate development should be able to take place on land adjacent to and just outside the development boundaries where they may meet the sustainability criteria of the Core Strategy. In doing

so, there should be sufficient and robust justification which highlights the local need for the development and any proposed development site should be able to share the infrastructure within the defined settlement limits and therefore successfully connect to existing services and facilities.

Main Issues Raised

Consultation Issue 1: *Do you have any comments on any of the Alternative Sites that have been suggested by people responding to the recent consultation?*

- 4.24 There has been no change to the strategic comments provided in the previous consultation; a summary of the strategic comments provided to South Lakeland District Council for the Emerging Options consultation in April can be found in Appendix 1. The summary includes comments relating to: Highways and Transport; the Historic Environment; Biodiversity; Adult Social Care; School Organisation; and County Council owned sites.
- 4.25 There are two additional points to be made in addition to the strategic comments provided in the previous consultation response. In the previous consultation response, it was noted that the evidence base provided by South Lakeland District Council did not fully recognise biodiversity designation and issues. Since then, the County Council's Ecologist and a representative of the Cumbria Wildlife Trust met with officers from South Lakeland District Council in July 2011 to identify how the assessment of sites regarding biodiversity could be improved. Also, encouragement is given for the County Council land holdings to be brought forward as deliverable sites in order to support the County Council's strategic review of property to benefit the Council and the communities it serves.
- 4.26 Appendix 2 is a table which details the comments provided on a site specific basis. As with the previous consultation, these site specific comments have been provided in isolation and the potential cumulative development issues have not been considered.

Consultation Issue 2: *Should the Land Allocations document period remain as 2003-2025 or cover a shorter period, for example 2003-2020, to give greater flexibility to accommodate the impact of the Localism Bill?*

- 4.27 The South Lakeland Core Strategy established the plan period as 2003-2025. Prior to this consultation, South Lakeland District Council planned to use their Land Allocation document to allocate housing and employment sites in accordance with the full Core Strategy plan period.
- 4.28 The consultation paper highlights that there is the opportunity to reduce the timespan of the Land Allocations document to ten years rather than planning sites for the full 15 years. South Lakeland District Council is proposing to reduce the time period of their Land Allocations Document to ten years to focus on immediately deliverable sites and to allow a more flexible approach to long-term housing delivery. Table 2 provides an initial estimate of what

this time period reduction would mean in terms of actual housing target figures.

Settlement Tier (Core Strategy Policy CS1.2)	Dwelling Target at April 2011 (after account is taken of dwelling completions since 2003 and dwellings with planning permission at 2011)	
	2003-2025	2003-2020
Kendal (35%)	2,069	1,369 (*1)
Ulverston (25%)	1,219	751 (*2)
Key Service Centres (Grange, Milnthorpe and Kirkby Lonsdale) (13%)	808	548
Local Service Centres (21%)	1,287	867
Small Villages and Hamlets (11%)	528	308
(*1) – any firm commitment to the provision of dwellings in the Kendal Canal Head Area Action Plan area will also be taken off this target		
(*2) – this figure is adjusted downwards to reflect the phasing of housing in Core Strategy policy CS6.1		

Table 2: Effect of reduction of Land Allocations document timescale on dwelling targets

4.29 Appendix 3 sets out the full response however the main points raised are summarised as follows:-

- It is felt that the approach of shortening the time period of the Land Allocations document is not an appropriate decision – as it would create a lack of consistency between the Land Allocations document and the Core Strategy.
- The Core Strategy was only examined, found sound and adopted last year. The Inspector agreed that the district housing target (of 400 new dwellings per annum) was appropriate to 2025.
- The County Council's own POPGroup forecasting models seem to indicate that the annual dwelling target of 400 new homes is about right to promote strategic and economic growth and investment for South Lakeland in order to meet identified need and ensure delivery.
- The reduction of the Land Allocations document timespan would reduce the housing target creating added pressure on the district housing market. There is research to suggest that people are moving out of the district due to the lack of suitable homes.
- There is already a huge pressure on affordable housing provision in the district. If the Land Allocations document timespan was to be reduced, it would have an impact on the level of affordable housing in the district.
- There was a drop in the number of completions – it was suggested in the South Lakeland District Council Annual Monitoring Report that this was partly due to a lack of allocated sites – a lack of allocated sites would seem to indicate that completions are being stifled.

- Evidence supports the need for more employment land to be made available to meet demand in order to encourage economic development. Any reduction in the Land Allocations document timespan is likely to have a negative effect on the provision of employment land within South Lakeland.
- As an alternative to the proposed timespan reduction, it is suggested that South Lakeland District Council use the five year review periods to adjust targets if there is evidenced need.

Consultation Issue 3: *Do you think the future housing and employment needs of small villages, hamlets and open countryside is best met by:*

- a) allocating sites for housing 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?***

4.30 The third issue that South Lakeland is consulting on is the question over the most appropriate method of delivering development needs outside of the major settlements, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres. South Lakeland District Council states that the development needs for this area will be small scale, spread over a wide area and generally required to meet very specific local needs. South Lakeland is questioning whether such development in these areas should be brought forward through the Land Allocations document, or whether it should be brought forward through: the existing Core Strategy policy framework; neighbourhood plans; neighbourhood development orders; and the community right to develop land. Appendix 4 sets out the full response, the main points are summarised below:

- We would support a hybrid approach of the two options.
- Allocating sites strategically will provide an opportunity for the sites to be appropriately assessed and considered and the cumulative impacts assessed, together with infrastructure needs.
- Allocating sites across small villages and hamlets would also help to ensure a balanced housing market across the district. Scope should also be allowed for smaller windfall sites to meet local needs in existing settlements.
- Land allocations should be used to make provision for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites if there is an identified need – due to the sensitivity of this issue, it is felt this is the most appropriate approach.
- It is considered that adopted Core Strategy policies CS1.1 and CS1.2 provide clear guidance as to how Strategic Employment Sites should be considered.
- Whilst it is considered appropriate for the majority of housing and employment sites to be identified through the Land Allocations document, exception sites can also be used by Local Planning Authorities to provide additional sites. The value of local knowledge and unexpected development needs are recognised and it is acknowledged that this can be delivered through emerging community planning initiatives.
- South Lakeland should support any neighbourhood groups that are created so they understand the planning system and the planning process prior to creating Neighbourhood Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders.

5.0 OPTIONS

- 5.1 Members can raise additional comments on any aspect of the report and Appendices and make suggestions to amend. Alternatively, Members can endorse the report and response as it stands.
- 5.2 An option might be for the Cabinet not to respond to the Land Allocations 'Further Consultation'. In which case, as the strategic planning and local highways and transport authority, it would not be possible to influence the spatial development of South Lakeland. It is considered that this would not be a sustainable approach to take in this instance.

6.0 RESOURCE AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 There are four County Council owned sites included in the Emerging options document. Of these, two sites are currently bare agricultural land and one site is a former special school which has been closed for some time. All three of these sites have been put forward as an emerging option for residential use. The fourth site is a former highways depot which is partly occupied by a Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) and has been put forward as an emerging option for mixed residential and employment uses. If the consultation document is approved this may have financial implications for the Council with regards to these four sites (SM).

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The County Council is a statutory consultee and is not a 'decision taker' as such in the SLDC Local Development Framework process. Its views or comments in this process would not appear to hold any direct legal implications for the County Council as long as the views or comments have demonstrably been reasoned through as cogent land use considerations, and are not arrived at on an unreasonable basis or have not been properly considered.
- 7.2 There are no other legal considerations (BD).

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 Detailed comments are set out in Appendix 2, dealing with individual sites. Concern is raised regarding the approach of shortening the time period of the Land Allocations document as it would create a lack of consistency between the Land Allocations document and the Core Strategy. This could potentially reduce investor certainty in the longer term. The reduction of the Land Allocations document timespan would reduce the housing target creating added pressure on the district housing market, and it would be likely to have an adverse impact on the level of affordable housing in the district.
- 8.2 Whilst it is considered appropriate for the majority of housing and employment sites to be identified through the Land Allocations document, exception sites can also be used by Local Planning Authorities to provide additional sites. The value of local knowledge and unexpected development

needs are recognised, and it is acknowledged that this can also be delivered through emerging community planning initiatives

Marie Fallon
Corporate Director - Environment

13 October 2011

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Consultation Issue 1: Do you have any comments on any of the Alternative Sites that have been suggested by people responding to the recent consultation? – *Summary of strategic comments from 28 April 2011 Cabinet relating to the South Lakeland Land Allocations – Emerging Options consultation*

Appendix 2

Consultation Issue 1: Do you have any comments on any of the Alternative Sites that have been suggested by people responding to the recent consultation? – *Site Specific Comments*

Appendix 3

Consultation Issue 2: Should the Land Allocations document period remain as 2003-2025 or cover a shorter period, for example 2003-2020, to give greater flexibility to accommodate the impact of the Localism Bill?

Appendix 4

Full response to Consultation Issue 3: Do you think the future housing and employment needs of small villages, hamlets and open countryside is best met by:

- a) allocating sites for housing 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

Electoral Division(s): All of South Lakeland

**** Please remove whichever option is not applicable***

Executive Decision

Yes*	
------	--

Key Decision

	No*
--	-----

If a Key Decision, is the proposal published in the current Forward Plan?

		N/A*
--	--	------

Is the decision exempt from call-in on grounds of urgency?

Yes*	No*
------	-----

If exempt from call-in, has the agreement of the Chair of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee been sought or obtained?

Yes*	No*	N/A*
------	-----	------

Has this matter been considered by Overview and Scrutiny?

If so, give details below.

	No*
--	-----

Has an environmental or sustainability impact assessment been undertaken?

		N/A*
--	--	------

Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?

		N/A*
--	--	------

N.B. *If an executive decision is made, then a decision cannot be implemented until the expiry of the eighth working day after the date of the meeting – unless the decision is urgent and exempt from call-in and the Corporate Director has obtained the necessary approvals.*

PREVIOUS RELEVANT COUNCIL OR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Cabinet: 28 April 2011

South Lakeland Land Allocations Emerging Options – Supported Officers Recommendation with final detail delegated to the Corporate Director – Environment and the Cabinet Member for Transport and the Environment

South Lakeland Local Committee: 4 April 2011

South Lakeland Land Allocations Emerging Options – made comments on draft Cabinet report for consideration by Cabinet

Cabinet: 3 November 2009

South Lakeland Proposed Submission Core Strategy – Approved Officers Recommendation

South Lakeland Local Committee: 21 October 2009

South Lakeland Proposed Submission Core Strategy – Made comments on draft Cabinet report for consideration by Cabinet

CONSIDERATION BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Not considered by Overview and Scrutiny.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

South Lakeland Land Allocations Document – Further Consultation

<http://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/local-development-framework/allocations-of-land-dpd.aspx>

RESPONSIBLE CABINET MEMBER

Tim Knowles – Portfolio Member for Transport and Environment

REPORT AUTHOR

Contact:

Leanne Beverley – Senior Planning Officer
01228 226739
leanne.beverley@cumbria.gov.uk

Francesca McEnaney – Planning Officer
01228 221027
francesca.mcenaney@cumbria.gov.uk

E-Mail to: Democratic Services (Linda Graham –
linda.graham@cumbriacc.gov.uk)

DRAFT CABINET REPORT FOR MEETING ON: 18 October 2011

REPORT TITLE: South Lakeland Land Allocations – Further Consultation

AUTHOR: Leanne Beverley

PART 1 OR 2:

1. The above report has been agreed with the following corporate directors:

.....

.....

2. The Council's statutory officers below have also approved the report:

Name of approving officer

Assistant Director Finance (s151 officer) Yes/No*

Assistant Director Legal and

Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer) Yes/No*

3. The draft has also been discussed and agreed with the relevant Cabinet Member. Yes/No*

Signed:
[Corporate Director or Head of Service only]

Date:

PLEASE REFER TO THE INTRANET

(<http://www.intouch.ccc/eLibrary/Content/Intranet/536/653/39520101035.pdf>)

FOR TIMETABLE FOR REPORTS. ANY REPORTS WHICH DO NOT MEET THE DEADLINES ARE LIKELY TO BE DEFERRED TO THE FOLLOWING CABINET MEETING.

**Please delete as appropriate*

Appendix 1

Consultation Issue 1: Do you have any comments on any of the Alternative Sites that have been suggested by people responding to the recent consultation?

Summary of strategic comments from 28 April 2011 Cabinet relating to the South Lakeland Land Allocations – Emerging Options consultation

Employment

A1.1 It was noted that the Emerging Options would provide a small under supply of new employment land in the defined Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres. However, it was acknowledged that this under supply could be balanced out by the higher provision in the Principal Service Centres where the need may be greater. The allocation of employment sites in Kendal was welcomed, given the current deficit of supply and the need to support economic growth in Kendal and the wider area. It was considered important that a choice of sites was made available across Kendal, with the focus being land that is well related to the trunk road network.

Housing

A1.2 It was recognised that the overall amount of housing land proposed within the Emerging Options total was more than is required by the Core Strategy. In order to ensure that the supply of housing in the LDF area is managed to achieve sustainable growth, South Lakeland District Council should ensure that evidenced housing needs are met whilst taking account of the delivery of new employment sites and associated infrastructure which is also fundamental to meeting the economic objectives for the area. It was recommended that South Lakeland District Council should use their own impact assessments to judge which land allocations are most appropriate to be retained within the Land Allocations DPD.

Highways and Transport

A1.3 Technical site specific comments were provided. Whilst indicative responses were provided on the feasibility of individual development sites, the council did not wish these to pre-empt the outcomes of detailed highways assessments. As a general caveat it was noted that the comments were made on an individual site basis and did not take into account the cumulative effects on the highway network. County Council officers will work with South Lakeland District Council to identify more robustly the transport implications of development, so as to be able to provide developers and others with certainty in relation to requirements for enabling or mitigating highways and transport measures. There is ongoing work to assess the cumulative impact of development proposals in Kendal.

Historic Environment

A1.4 It was strongly recommended that early, pre-application consultation with the County Historic Environment service by any prospective developer is

needed. It was also considered that any development needs should be preceded by an assessment of the archaeological significance for each site.

Biodiversity

- A1.5 There was a general concern that the degree of infill which would take place if all of the sites were to be developed could lead to the potential significant loss of general biodiversity. It was therefore recommended that the DPD sought to incorporate significant enhancements. It was recommended that, along with Cumbria Wildlife Trust, County Council representatives should meet with South Lakeland District Council to discuss how the potential lack of evidence and consistency regarding biodiversity could be addressed. Concern was raised that the evidence base did not fully recognise the biodiversity designations and issues.

Adult Social Care

- A1.6 The independent needs analysis, provided by Planning4Care (2009), identified the need for 320 extra care housing units across the South Lakeland District Council area by 2019 (several schemes are already in operation which contribute to this target). It was noted that it was important for South Lakeland District Council to ensure identified needs are met through adequate provision of land through the housing land allocations document.

School Organisation

- A1.7 Many schools in South Lakeland, particularly primaries, were experiencing pressure on places. The areas with most concern are Kendal and Milnthorpe. The position of schools is continually monitored, but no schools have been identified for rationalisation as this will be discussed through BEST meetings with Headteachers, governors and stakeholders during the summer term.

County Council owned sites

- A1.8 Support was given to the inclusion of County Council owned sites in the Emerging Options document.

Appendix 2

Consultation Issue 1: Do you have any comments on any of the Alternative Sites that have been suggested by people responding to the recent consultation?

Site Specific Comments

Alternative Sites

	Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed Use	Net Area	Density	Yield	Consultation Response
Allithwaite	R339#	Land of Vicarage Lane / Green Lane	Housing	0.93	30	27.81	As with all sites around the village, because prehistoric remains have been found nearby, the site has potential for buried prehistoric remains
							Transport Statement required. Footway/width improvements required for both Green Lane and Vicarage Lane
	R347#	Settlement Limit	Housing	0.35	30	10.5	Access may be tricky due to road width
	RN195#	Site north of Barn Hey	Housing	0.18	30	5.4	Site covered in modern buildings and so archaeological potential is considered to be low
	RN224#	Land at New Hey Farm, Flookburgh Road	Housing	0.72	30	21.4812	As with all sites around the village, because prehistoric remains have been found nearby, the site has potential for buried prehistoric remains
							Transport Statement required. No direct access to the main road.
	RN73#	R339 along old cemetery and church side	Housing	0.26	30	7.8	As with all sites around the village, because prehistoric remains have been found nearby, the site has potential for buried prehistoric remains

							Transport Statement required. Footway/width improvements required for both Green Lane and Vicarage Lane (see Site R339#).
	RN86#	Land on N side of B5277 at West end of Allithwaite	Housing	0.09	30	2.7	As with all sites around the village, because prehistoric remains have been found nearby, the site has potential for buried prehistoric remains
							Transport Statement required. Can only be developed as part of RN224#
Arnside	RN337#	Land off Station Road	Housing	0.97	30	30	Impact on saltworks on site. Mitigation required to investigate and record remains affected
							Transport Statement required. Road requires widening, with a need to replace roadside parking. No direct access to dwellings
Burneside	E32#	Land to west of Hall Road	Employment	2.71		0	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Not suitable for development without improvement to infrastructure.

	RN304#	Land South of Hall Park	Housing	0.99	30	29.6325	Unsuitable – too intensive for estate roads.
Burton in Kendal	RN144#	Land adj. Bowling Green (emerging option RN144 for recreation)	Housing	0.61	30	18.36	
	EN14M#	Land southwest of Burton in Kendal	Housing	1.00	30	29.97	
	MN26#	Land at Green Dragon Farm	Housing and/or employment	6.30	30	100	Transport Statement required. Consider a new access from Tarn Lane Farm as the existing access is unsuitable.
	MN26#	Land at Green Dragon Farm	Housing	1.57	30	47.025	Transport Statement required. Consider a new access from Tarn Lane Farm as the existing access is unsuitable.
	RN327#	Creamery Garden and Orchard, to southwest of village (part of existing site EN14)	Housing	0.34	30	10.2	Not suitable as the site has an unsuitable access.

Cartmel	RN14#	Stables at Cartmel	Housing	0.43	35	15.12	Potential for remains related to priory to survive on site. Mitigation by record most likely to be the appropriate approach given that the stables will have disturbed some of the site
							Footway required.
Endmoor	M41M#	Field north of Sycamore Close	Housing and Open Space	3.63	30	108.9	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Changes to speed limit required for traffic calming.
	R83#	Land at Woodside Road	Housing	1.33	30	39.96	Transport Statement required. Access site from Birchfield.
Grange	R383#	Lido site	Protection for lido from redevelopment	0.35		0	No archaeological issues
	R204#	Carter House, Guide's Farm	Housing	0.31	25	7.75	No archaeological issues
							Site unsuitable. No footways and concern over the approach road's width and the fact that the approach is a cross roads.
Heve rsha	EN57#	Part of site E15, off Princes Way	Employment	0.17			Any development should make use of existing access. Sustainability may be an issue due to lack of connections with the village.

	R167#	Land to west of High Leasghyll, Leagill	Housing	0.93	30	27.81	Site is not suitable. There are issues with: the width of the access; pedestrian facilities; poor junction proximity to the school.
	R39#	Leasgill	Housing	0.59	30	17.82	Any development should provide a footway link to Heversham village. Sight lines will require the relocation of hedge.
	R445#	Dallam School car park	Housing	0.13	30	3.9	Due to the proximity of the school access, developers will need to seek to use the existing car park access – could lead to a loss of school parking. This will need to be considered as the school will need sufficient parking to serve the school. A Travel Plan for the school would be sought.
	RN310#	Land at Leasgill (south east part of site R75)	Housing	0.15	30	4.5	Not suitable – the gradient is too steep. There are access issues with the width of the lane – no passing places. Poor junction.
	RN316#	Land to East of Dallam School (west part of site R168E)	Housing	1.29	30	38.61	Transport Statement required.
	R14#	Land to east of Bowling Green, Low Lane, Leasgill	Housing	0.15	30	4.5	Development would be suitable at this site, but the inclusion of passing places should be considered.

	RN221#	Land North of Plumtree Bank, Leasgill	Housing	0.41	30	12.15	Site is not suitable. There are issues with: the width of the access; pedestrian facilities; poor junction proximity to the school.
	RN296#	East part of site R39, Leasgill (next to old A6)	Housing	0.16	30	4.653	Any development should provide a footway link to Heversham village. Sight lines will require relocation of hedges. Gradients should be considered.
High Carley	ON8#	Former Cricket field adj. Birkkrigg Park. Includes RN6M (& RN6, ON7 and ON8).	Community use	1.11		0	Transport Statement required. Any development should cater for pedestrians. Link use primarily to the estate.
							No Public Right of Way affected.
Hincaster	EN43#	Greenside Farm	Housing	0.77	30	22.95	Unsuitable – too remote from village
Holme	RN294#	Land off North Road (south part of site R674)	Housing	1.66	30	49.716	Transport Statement required.
	MN33#	Site north of Sheernest Lane (part of site	Mixed (housing and/or	2.87	30	86.01975	Unsuitable – unsustainable and too intensive for access.

		R675)	employment)				
Kendal	E23K#	Land North of Meadowbank	Employment	4.00		0	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Traffic model – northern relief road.
	E4M#	Land adjacent A6, South of Kendal	Housing	9	30	270	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Extend speed limit for traffic calming purposes.
	MN22#	Land beside Singleton Park Road from junction with Park Side Road	Housing or Employment	1.31	30	39.42	Not suitable – satisfactory access difficult to achieve.
	MN34#	Land at Natland Beck Farm - extension to R97M	Housing	0.9	30	27.0918	Not suitable – remote canal/cycleway.
	ON50#	Land north of Castle Green Hotel	Public Open Space	1.19		0	
	R124F#	Fields to the rear of Ullswater	Housing	2.71	30	81.225	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.

		Road					Access points need identifying.
	RN301#	Land behind WMG Hospital, adjoining Whinlatter Drive estate	Housing	0.99	35	34.74765	Transport Statement required. Any development should extend cycleway.
	RN302#	Fields East of Oak Tree Road	Housing	0.15	30	4.536	Access from the main road is unacceptable.
Kirkby in Furness	EN58#	Land behind Moorlands garage	Employment	1.20		0	Transport Statement required. Access site from Beckside Road. Any development should provide a footpath.
	R211#	Land behind Moorlands garage	Housing	1.20	30	35.91	Transport Statement required. Any development should provide a footpath. Use Burlington Close for Highway works.
	RN11#	Land North of Kirkby in Furness	Housing	1.36	30	40.77	Transport Statement required. Traffic calming on the main road required.
	RN63#	Land south of Laburnum Cottage	Housing	0.42	30	12.69	Transport Statement required. Site not suitable due to individual accesses.

Kirkby Lonsdale	R640#	Site at Dodgson Croft, adj to A65 roundabout	Employment/ Community use	0.37		0	Suitable for development.
	R640#	Site at Dodgson Croft, adj to A65 roundabout	Housing	0.37	30	11.07	Suitable for development.
	R640#	Site at Dodgson Croft, adj to A65 roundabout	Housing and/or car parking	0.37	30	11.07	Suitable for development.
Levens	R105#	Land at Greengate	Housing	1.53	30	45.9	Transport Statement required.
	RN127#	Land at south west of Levens Village	Housing	0.52	30	15.66	Site unsuitable – does not relate well.
	RN295#	Former Poultry Sheds and Stables, Scar Brae (part of site RN121).	Housing	0.87	30	26.0901	Site unsuitable – remote.
Milnthorpe	RN42#	Site adj Bindloss House, between Ackenthwaite & Milnthorpe	Proposed use as location for access road to Emerging Option site R462M	1.79		0	Site unsuitable – unsatisfactory access.

Penny Bridge	RN336#	Land in Penny Bridge	Housing	0.63	30	19	Transport Statement required. Any development would need to address road width and footways.
Sedgwick	RN322#	Land at north east Sedgwick, between Natland Road and Crosscrake Road (part of site RN19)	Housing	0.37	30	11.07	Not suitable – junction directly opposite the site.
Swarthmoor	R686SW#	Land to East of Park Road	Housing	3.87	30	116.1	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
	RN105#	Field south of Swarthmoor (middle part of R688)	Housing	2.53	30	75.825	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
	RN106#	Field south of Swarthmoor (part of W end of R688)	Housing	2.18	30	65.25	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Any development would need to assess the footway junction spacing
	RN315#	Field adjacent to RN109M	Housing	2.87	30	85.95	No evidence of pre-20th Century mining on historic maps. Prehistoric remains in close

							vicinity so site has potential for buried prehistoric remains
							Not suitable - junction is poor and no footway.
Ulverston	RN333#	Land at Canal Head	Housing	1.60	40	64.08	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. May be difficult to provide access.
	M14#	Site off Morecambe Road/ Sandside Road. Same site as existing site M14.	Mixed Housing / employment use or employment use	1.07	40	42.84	No particular archaeological issues
							Transport Statement required. Cumulative traffic on A590 junction – see Highways Agency
							No Public Right of Way affected.
	M26#	Rear of Booths/ Cumbria Glass Centre, near to Oubas Hill (off Next Ness Lane). Same site as M26.	Mixed - housing, employment, tourism & leisure	1.57	40	62.7	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
							Two public rights of way run through the site (578016 & 578017) but footpath 578017 that runs to the rear of the Booths development

							would benefit from up grading to make it suitable for the increased level of use such a development would create.
	M28#	Ulverston Canal Head, Canal Street/North Lonsdale Terrace/Road. Same site as M28.	Mixed use : Housing, leisure, heritage, tourism uses to include food retail	2.87	40	114.9	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Any development should provide the access only from Booths.
							Two public rights of way run through the site (578016 & 578017) but footpath 578017 that runs to the rear of the Booths development would benefit from up grading to make it suitable for the increased level of use such a development would create.
	SSOP10#	GSK's operational site, North Lonsdale Road.	Not limit employment safeguarding site SSOP10 to General Industrial Use - B2 but include other employment uses.	11.13		0	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Further improvement on A590 required – see Highways Agency
	RN141#	Land above Gasgow Farm	Housing	3.96	30	118.8	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.

	RN314#	Extensions of Lund farm development	Housing	1.50	30	45.09	
	RN321#	Extension to Gasgow farm remainder of original RN131 land immediately behind farm	Housing	2.30	30	69.075	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
	RN178#	SW corner of Ford Park	Housing	0.44	40	17.64	Transport Statement required. Any development should provide a footway.
	MN6#	West of Ulverston, off the A590. (part of emerging option site M11M)	Mixed - employment/housing	0.78	35	27.405	SLDC should consult the Highways Agency.
							No Public Right of Way affected.

New Sites

	Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed Use	Net Area	Density	Yield	Consultation Response
--	----------------	-----------	--------------	----------	---------	-------	-----------------------

Allithwaite	RN224#	Land at New Hey Farm, Flookburgh Road	Housing	0.72	30	21.4812	Main road is narrow
	RN265#	Land West of Brackenedge	Housing	0.34	30	10.263	No footways. Access road width needs to be addressed.
Arnside	MN32#	Station Yard and surrounding land to West and North	Mixed	1.38		0	No archaeological issues
	RN225#	Land at Hollins Lane	Housing	0.97	35	34.02	No archaeological issues
							Transport Statement required. Any development would need to address road width and footway.
Barbon	RN279#	Land south of Barnrigg	Housing	0.71	30	21.3111	Site not suitable for development – inadequate frontage.
Burnside	ON46#	Land north of Burnside Cricket Club	Other-2 tennis courts & clubhouse	0.34		0	Site suitable for development
	ON47#	Land adjoining	Other - tennis	1.92		0	Site suitable for development

		Burneside Football Ground	courts & football pitches				
Burton in Kendal	RN277#	Greenside (westward extension to site option RN226)	Housing	0.09	30	2.631	Site suitable for development
	RN319#	Land at East end of Thornleigh Drive	Housing	0.49	30	14.58	Site suitable for development
Flook/Cark	EN42#	Station yard	Employment	1.45		0	Retention of the historic railway building should be considered. Possible impact on the setting of SAM - English Heritage should advise
							Transport Statement required. Improvement to access from main road required.
Grange	RN332#	Honeypotts, off Allithwaite Rd.	Housing	1.05	30	31.59	Transport Statement required. Suitability of road junction to be assessed.

Grayrigg	RN257#	Land south of Chapel Houses	Housing	0.42	30	12.5658	Transport Statement required. Site not suitable – unsuitable road
Grizebeck	RN245#	Grizebeck Service Station Site	Housing	0.2	30	6.108	Site suitable for development
High Biggins	RN238#	Land north of Biggins Hall Farmhouse	Housing	0.12	30	3.51	Site suitable for development
Hincaster	RN232#	Fields to north of Hincaster inc. old village tip	Housing	0.55	30	16.605	Any development would need to look at widening the road and footway.
Kendal	MN27#	Eskdale House, Shap Road	Mixed	0.31	35	10.962	Site suitable for development
	RN228#	Acre Moss Garage Site	Housing	0.35	35	12.397	
	RN254#	Land at The Ghyll, Brigsteer	Housing	1.26	30	37.6866	Transport Statement required.

		Road					Any development would require a footway.
	RN297#	Land at Hylands and The Ghyll, Brigsteer Road	Housing	1.58	30	10	Transport Statement required. Any development would require a footway.
	RN299#	Land at Hallgarth	Housing	2.71	30	81.225	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
Kirkby Lonsdale	RN317#	Cedar House School	Housing	0.77	30	23.22	Footway will need to be widened on the main road.
Leece	RN266#	The Copper Dog	Housing	0.27	30	8.034	
Penny Bridge	RN312#	Land south of Church	Housing	1.19	30	35.64	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Road widening required. Footway road network is a limiting factor.

Slackhead	RN233#	Land at end of Highcoate Lane and Leighton Drive	Housing	0.37	30	11.1996	Site suitable for development.
Swarthmoor	RN328#	Fields west of Trinkeld Farm	Housing	3.22	30	96.525	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
Ulverston	MN30#	Land East of site M14, off Morecambe Road / Sandside Road	Employment	0.57		0	No archaeological issues
							Site suitable for development.
							No Public Right of Way affected.
	MN31#	New site includes & extends M28. Incorporates Booth's holding; Canal Head / rear of Booths, the petrol station & Lakes Glass	Mixed : employment/ retail/leisure & assembly/ tourism/heritage & housing	5.11	40	204.207	Retention of the more significant industrial buildings and structures on site needs to be considered. Mitigation by record any structures and below ground remains affected

		Centre.					
							Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
							Two public rights of way run through the site (578016 & 578017) but footpath 578017 that runs to the rear of the Booths development would benefit from up grading to make it suitable for the increased level of use such a development would create.
	MN29#	West End Nursery, West End Lane	Housing	3.07	40	122.757	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Any development will need to consider the footway.
	RN234#	Nook Farm	Housing	0.83	40	33.12	
	RN244#	Field behind Quaker Fold and Hall Field estates on Urswick Rd	Housing	1.94	40	77.46	Not suitable – junction unsuitable.
	RN250#	Stone Cross, Dalton Gate	Housing	5.71	40	228.519	Impact on parkland and how this would affect the conservation area needs to be considered. Mitigation by record required on site of mill
							Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.

	RN284	Gascow Farm, Ulverston land in front of and including farm	Housing	1.69	40	67.68	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.
	RN313#	Extensions of Lund farm development	Housing	0.03	30	0.84	
	RN311	Land north of Ulverston on B5281 Land north of Ulverston on B5281	Housing	6.60	40	264	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required.

Emerging Options

	Site Reference	Site Name	Proposed Use	Net Area	Density	Yield	Consultation Response
Arnside	R395M	Field behind Briery Bank House	Residential	0.33	30	9.9	No archaeological issues
							Transport Statement required.
	R88M	Land at Station Road	Residential	0.2584	30	7.752	Potential impact on saltworks on site. Mitigation required to investigate and record remains affected

Broughton	R163M		Residential	0.52	30	15.6	Transport Statement required. Footway highways improvements required.
Cark/Flookburgh	R321M	Land off Winder Lane, Flookburgh	Residential	0.50229	35	17.58015	Consideration should be given to respect existing historic property boundaries within any development. Potential for below ground remains of medieval village to be disturbed - mitigation by record required.
							Site suitable for development.
	R685	Land beside Bridge House and next to railway, Flookburgh	Residential	1.00305	30	30.0915	No archaeological issues
							Access acceptable via Manorside only
	R687	Former nursery beside railway, Flookburgh	Residential	0.72009	30	21.6027	Any development would need to look at the footways.
Cartmel	R112	OS Field 3249, South East of Cartmel	Residential	1.17	30	35.1	Potential for site to contain currently unknown remains given the known archaeology of the surrounding area

							Main road unsuitable – no footways.
Grange	R449		Residential	0.71154	30	21.3462	
	R672M	Land north of Allithwaite Road, West of West Winds, Kents Bank	Residential	0.9144	25	22.86	
	R74	Land at Low Fell Gate, Cartmel Road	Residential	1.12239	30	33.6717	Transport Statement required. Road widening improvements required.
Kendal	M4M	Land adjacent to Natland Mill Beck Lane	Residential	1.00476	35	35.1666	
	RN96M	Roundhill School	Residential	1.01412	30	6	Suitable for development. Transport Statement required.

Kirkby in Furness	R189M	Land west of Burlington Inn (3 fields)	Residential	1.57545	30	47.2635	Rights of Way borders site may benefit from 106 to improve surfacing to cope to increased use.
							Transport Statement required. Road widening footways required.
Little Urswick	M10M	Mid Town Farm	Residential	0.67581	30	20.2743	Consideration should be given for the retention of historic farm buildings. Potential for below ground remains of medieval village to be disturbed - mitigation by record required.
							Retention public rights of way. Footpath 580022 runs through the site, provision should be made to run this right through the green space of the site and avoid moving the path onto estate roads.
							Footway required on village green to bus stop.
	RN216M	Midtown Farm	Residential	0.80748	30	24.2244	Consideration should be given to respect existing historic pattern of the field boundaries within any development. Potential for site to contain currently unknown remains given the known archaeology of the surrounding area
							Footpath 580022 runs through the site, if this route is to be realigned then the green space of the site should be used and the estate roads should be avoided.

							Some public opposition re scale/development principle.
							Access will require further improvement - no footways to the village, visibility at the junction with the main road cuts across private gardens. Transport Statement required. New footway required on bus stop side. Gradient.
Milnthorpe	RN57M	Land at end of St Anthony's Close	Residential	0.89568	30	26.8704	Transport Statement required. Concerns are understood regarding the gradient issues outlined by SLDC regarding the narrow, steep winding access. Any development would need to overcome this.
Sandside/ Storth	M683sM	Land off Quarry Lane, Storth	Mixed	2.465775	30	43	Transport Assessment and Travel Plan required. Major improvements required to private road.
Swarthmoor	R684SWM	Land at N end of Kingsley Avenue	Residential	1.17279	30	35.1837	SLDC should consult Highways Agency.
	RN109M	Fields West of Swarthmoor	Residential	3.14175	30	94.2525	No evidence of pre-20th century mining on historic maps. Prehistoric remains in close vicinity so site has potential for

							buried prehistoric remains
							SLDC to consult Highways Agency regarding the junction.
Ulverston	RN131M	Gascow Farm, Priory Road	Residential	1.8579	30	55.737	Transport Statement required.

Settlements

Kendal	The ongoing traffic modelling work being undertaken by CCC will provide vital evidence to be used to inform assessment of traffic impact; transport infrastructure improvements required; and delivery option through LDF and LTP3
Ulverston	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network, but there will be a significant impact at connection points to the A590 trunk road and this would require assessment by Highways Agency.
Grange	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network. But there would be some concerns regarding the potential for any significant increases in development to exacerbate existing traffic and parking pressures in the town and neighbouring villages.
Milnthorpe	There are a number of wider traffic issues in Milnthorpe that would need to be considered in relation to new development proposals, including the capacity of the existing traffic signals; capacity of town roads which are subject to significant on-street parking; traffic volumes on Park Road and possible conflict with pedestrians given the limited pedestrian facilities.
Kirkby Lonsdale	There are localised on-street parking issues in Kirkby Lonsdale where there is high demand few public

	spaces available. This is especially the case near to the Rugby Club on Fairbank and around QES on Biggins Road.
Allithwaite	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network.
Arnside	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network. Increased development in Arnside will inevitably have some adverse impact on traffic conditions in Milnthorpe unless mitigated.
Broughton	There are strong local concerns regarding traffic concerns in Broughton and the local community have developed a traffic calming strategy for Broughton which should be considered for implementation as part of any significant development in Broughton.
Burneside	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network around Burneside, but the links to A6 Shap Road and Windermere Road, Kendal suffer from both capacity and safety concerns. Development in Burneside would need to be considered in conjunction with development proposals for Kendal and the required transport infrastructure requirements.
Burton in Kendal	Additional traffic from new developments would be acceptable subject to scheme specific transport assessments.
Cartmel	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network. However, there are significant local safety concerns in Cartmel in relation to traffic/pedestrian conflict around the schools and within the village centre. Any local increase in traffic could only exacerbate those concerns.
Endmoor	Additional traffic from new developments would be acceptable subject to scheme specific transport assessments.

Flookburgh/Cark	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network. However, there are significant local safety concerns in Cartmel in relation to traffic/pedestrian conflict around the schools and within the village centre. Any local increase in traffic in the Cartmel Peninsula could only exacerbate those concerns. The County Council has sought to address a number of local traffic concerns in Flookbrough and Cark via very minor highway improvement schemes, but these have only partially addressed those local concerns.
Great/Little Urswick	Some local concerns have been expressed regard traffic concerns in Great Urswick in the Church Road area, where traffic calming has been requested. Any local increase in traffic could only exacerbate those concerns.
Greenodd/Penny Bridge	
Holme	
Kirkby in Furness	The A595 in its current form is not suited to any significant increase in traffic.
Levens	
Natland	
Oxenholme	There are on-street parking issues brought about by locality to the station and this could have knock on effects for any new developments.
Sandside/Storth	Any larger developments could potentially have an impact on the traffic lights at Milnthorpe.
Swarthmoor	Without traffic modelling it is impossible to judge the cumulative traffic impact of the proposed site allocations on the wider county road network, but there will be a significant impact at connection points to the A590 trunk road and this would require assessment by Highways Agency.

Ackenthwaite	There are a number of wider traffic issues in Milnthorpe that would need to be considered in relation to new development proposals, including the capacity of the existing traffic signals; capacity of town roads which are subject to significant on-street parking; traffic volumes on Park Road and possible conflict with pedestrians given the limited pedestrian facilities.
Barbon	
Beetham	Strong local concerns have been expressed regarding traffic concerns in Beetham, where traffic calming has been requested. Any local increase in traffic could only exacerbate those concerns.
Bowston	
Brigsteer	
Carr Bank	
Casterton	
Clawthorpe	
Crooklands	Crooklands Canal Bridge could possibly result in constraints for access to developments.
Frostwaite	Poor road network with extremely narrow roads and few passing places could have an impact any access to developments.
Gatebeck	
Grayrigg	
Heversham	

High Biggins	
Hincaster	
Holme Mills	
Mealbank	
New Hutton	
Old Hutton	There are significant local concerns regarding vehicle/pedestrian conflict in the village, particularly in relation to schools traffic. There is a legitimate local aspiration for segregated pedestrian facilities and this would need to be considered for implementation as part of any new development proposals.
Sedgwick	
Stainton	
Headless Cross	
Ravenstown	See also Flookburgh/Cark
Aldingham	
Bardsea	
Baycliff	
Beanthwaite	
Broughton Beck	

Gleaston	
Grizebeck	The A595 in its current form is not suited to any significant increase in traffic.
High Carley	
Leece	
Lindal	Site of gas works and railway sidings. Mitigation required to investigate and record remains affected (archaeology).
Pennington	
Roosebeck	
Scales	
Stainton with Adgarley	

Appendix 3

Consultation Issue 2: Should the Land Allocations document period remain as 2003-2025 or cover a shorter period, for example 2003-2020, to give greater flexibility to accommodate the impact of the Localism Bill?

- A3.1 The South Lakeland Core Strategy outlines the housing target for the district for the plan period (2003-2025). Prior to this consultation, South Lakeland District Council planned to use their Land Allocation document to allocate housing and employment sites in accordance with the full Core Strategy plan period.
- A3.2 The consultation paper highlights that there is the opportunity to reduce the timespan of the Land Allocations document to ten years rather than planning sites for the full 15 years. The opportunity has arisen through the introduction of neighbourhood planning proposed by the Localism Bill and a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', in particular where plans are absent, silent or out-of-date, in addition to the further changes to the planning system anticipated in the new national planning framework.
- A3.3 South Lakeland District Council is proposing to reduce the period which their Land Allocations Document will cover from 15 years to ten years to focus on immediately deliverable sites and to allow a more flexible approach to long-term housing delivery.
- A3.4 It is considered that the suggested approach of shortening the time period of the Land Allocations document is not a suitable decision. By shortening the time period, South Lakeland District Council is at risk of creating a lack of consistency between the Land Allocations document and the Core Strategy. This is not a recommended approach given that the Land Allocations document should seek to assist with the delivery of the Core Strategy. As an alternative, it is suggested that South Lakeland District Council uses the five year review period as an opportunity for target adjustment if the evidence indicates a district need for under/over provision.
- A3.5 The South Lakeland Core Strategy includes the Regional Spatial Strategy housing targets which identified the need for 400 new dwellings per annum across the district between 2003 and 2021. The Core Strategy rolled this requirement forward to the end of the plan period, meaning that the district is seeking to create 8,800 new dwellings before the end of 2025. In submitting their Core Strategy for examination, South Lakeland District Council remained of the view that the targets were soundly based for the delivery of new housing. The Core Strategy was only examined, found sound and subsequently adopted in 2010; this indicates that the Inspector agreed that the district housing target was achievable and deliverable.

- A3.6 The County Council utilises the POPGroup model to help estimate the future number of dwellings that may be associated with a series of differing population, housing and economic scenarios. The POPGroup forecast figures suggest that the current housing target of 400 dwellings per annum is quite an accurate target. However, the 400 dwellings per annum should be seen as a minimum target provision in order to take account of the predicted economic growth scenario for the district to promote strategic and economic growth and investment within South Lakeland.
- A3.7 The proposed reduction of the Land Allocations document timespan would create additional pressures on the district housing market. Research suggests that a number of residents have moved out of the district due to the difficulty in finding a suitable home locally. In addition, there will need to be housing provision made to prepare for the predicted district-wide population increase; the Core Strategy states that the current district population is 105,000 and that it is expected to increase to around 117,000 by 2026.
- A3.8 Within the pressures of the wider housing market the proposed reduction in the Land Allocations document timespan, there will also be considerable pressures on the affordable housing market, an issue which impacts on the economic environment and community sustainability. Table 3 shows the increases in median house price rates between 2006 and 2009 and the annual affordable housing requirement per Housing Market Area in South Lakeland. If the Land Allocations document timespan was reduced, it would have an impact on the level of affordable housing provision in the district – something which is already an important issue.

	Median house price ratio in 2006	Median house price ratio in 2009	Annual affordable housing requirement (three year requirement in brackets)	Number of affordable homes provided (between 1/4/06 and 1/4/09)
Kendal	6.1 : 1	7.1 : 1 (2008 figure)	103 (309)	111
Rural Kendal	9.1 : 1	10.5 : 1	221 (663)	60
Ulverston and Furness	7.1 : 1	7.7 : 1	100 (300)	75
Cartmel Peninsula	8.1 : 1	8.9 : 1	75 (225)	18

Table 3: Median house price ratios and affordable housing requirements in South Lakeland

Source: South Lakeland Strategic Housing Market Assessment

A3.9 The provision of affordable houses underpins economic development by helping to reverse the trend of the working age population, especially young people, moving out of the district. The Housing Land Provision Statement (September 2010) stated the intention of South Lakeland District Council to give priority to improving the supply of housing land through the preparation of the Land Allocations document.

A3.10 Table 4 includes figures taken from the South Lakeland Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (December 2010), which shows the districts housing completion figures from 2003/2004 to 2009/2010. The data shows a drop in the number of completions, especially in the years 2007/2008 and 2008/2009. However, the AMR explains that the shortfall was a combination of reasons, including the effects of the recession and the fact that most of the allocated sites in the South Lakeland Local Plan (adopted 1997) had been developed, suggesting that a lack of sites stifled district completions. South Lakeland expects completion figures to increase once the Land Allocations document is adopted.

Monitoring year	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10
Number of completions	221	232	303	238	156	155	282

Table 4: Housing completions from monitoring year 03/04 to monitoring year 09/10

Source: South Lakeland Annual Monitoring Report (page 34)

A3.11 Evidence suggests that South Lakeland needs to make more employment land available to encourage economic development. The 2009 Employment Land Position Report states that the monitoring of employment land showed a shortage of available employment land. The report states the “current insufficient supply of quality, readily available employment land within the area is an important issue that the emerging LDF will need to identify and address”. This is supported by the South Lakeland Housing and Employment Land Search Study (March 2009) which states that there is a demand for employment sites and that there is a requirement for new sites to be allocated. Any reduction in the Land Allocations document timespan is likely to have a negative effect on the provision of employment land in South Lakeland.

A3.12 Overall, there is a clear district need for housing (especially affordable) and employment land through the whole plan period until 2025. South Lakeland District Council is considering reducing the timespan of their Land Allocations document based on the proposed publication of the Localism Bill and the new National Planning Policy Framework. However, it must be remembered that, although there are indications regarding the content, we still do not know exactly what the Localism Bill and the National Planning Policy Framework will contain, if and when they are adopted/enacted. It is recommended that South Lakeland District Council do not reduce their Land Allocations document based on national policy change suppositions but rather

seek to ensure that there is ongoing monitoring to guarantee there is a balance between land supply and evidenced need.

Appendix 4

Consultation Issue 3: Do you think the future housing and employment needs of small villages, hamlets and open countryside is best met by:

- a) allocating sites for housing 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?***

- A4.1 The third issue that South Lakeland is consulting on is the most appropriate method of delivering development needs outside of the major settlements, Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres. South Lakeland District Council states that the development needs for this area will be small scale, spread over a wide area and generally required to meet very specific local needs. South Lakeland is questioning whether such development in these areas should be brought forward through the Land Allocations document or whether it should be brought forward through: the existing Core Strategy policy framework; neighbourhood plans; neighbourhood development orders; and the community right to develop land.
- A4.2 As a County Council, we would support a hybrid approach of the two options. By bringing the sites forward through the Local Development Framework process, the allocations will provide a more strategic approach to identifying potential development sites. However, the value of local knowledge and unexpected development needs are recognised and it is acknowledged that this can be delivered through emerging community planning initiatives.
- A4.3 It is recognised that it is not necessarily always helpful to over forward plan. However, the allocation of sites in small villages, hamlets and the open countryside should not be ruled out where there is development certainty and the impact and scale of the development is deemed appropriate for the sites to be allocated. All allocations should meet local need.
- A4.4 Allocating sites for housing and employment purposes will allow the local authority to appropriately assess and consider the potential development sites. As part of this allocation approach, the potential cumulative development impacts can be assessed. This will allow both South Lakeland District Council and the County Council to pre-empt any potential cumulative impacts and adopt a joint working approach to identify the requirement for any necessary infrastructure.
- A4.5 Without a clear understanding of the spread of development across small villages and hamlets, development could become imbalanced, placing undue pressure on local services in some settlements, whilst local services in other areas suffer from a lack of usage. The act of

allocating sites for housing across the district will help to ensure a balanced housing market.

- A4.6 Whilst South Lakeland have not historically had a large Gypsy and Traveller community (except during the Appleby Fair), provision for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites should still be made if there is an identified need. It may be difficult to encourage community groups to suggest sites for this use and therefore it is felt that the Land Allocations document would be the most appropriate method of approaching this sensitive issue.
- A4.7 The consultation document highlights the fact that there could be circumstances where allocations in small villages, hamlets and the countryside would be required for: Strategic Employment Sites; Green Gaps; open spaces and playing pitches in villages; affordable housing; community uses; and environmental designations. Whilst some of these cannot be designated through the Land Allocations (e.g. Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings), the LDF process for other circumstances is considered to be the most appropriate method. For those allocations outside the Land Allocations document remit, community input should be sought and welcomed.
- A4.8 Cumbria County Council would seek for Strategic Employment Sites to be allocated if they cannot be accommodated in identified centres. However, the inability of identified centres to accommodate Strategic Employment Sites would be questioned and would need to be justified. It is considered that the South Lakeland adopted Core Strategy policies 1.1 ('Sustainable Development Policies') and 1.2 ('The Development Strategy') provide clear guidance as to how such sites should be considered.
- A4.9 Policy CS1.1 seeks to protect the countryside with most new development "directed to existing service centres where there is adequate service and infrastructure capacity to accommodate the required levels of development". Development proposals are required to follow the following sequential approach: firstly, development should use existing buildings within settlements and Previously Developed Land within settlements; secondly, developers should then look to use other suitable infill opportunities within settlements; and finally, the development of other land will only be considered where it is well located in relation to housing, jobs, other services and infrastructure.
- A4.10 Policy CS1.2 states that development will be focussed in areas according to the identified settlement hierarchy. It will initially be concentrated in the Principal Service Centres of Kendal and Ulverston (approximately 55% of development), then in the Key Service Centres of Grange-over-Sands, Kirkby Lonsdale and Milnthorpe (approximately 13% of development), then followed by a number of designated Local Service Centres throughout the district (approximately 21% of development). The remaining 11% (approximate) of development will

occur in small villages and hamlets, but any development proposals must strictly comply with Policy CS1.1.

A4.11 Whilst it is considered appropriate for the majority of housing and employment sites to be identified through the Land Allocations document, exception sites can also be used by Local Planning Authorities to provide additional sites. South Lakeland Core Strategy Policy CS6.4 provides the position of the district in relation to Rural Exception Sites. The County Council would support the use of this policy when required, where there is substantiated evidence to support local need.

A4.12 In order to ensure that members of the community are able to suggest sites through initiatives such as neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood development orders, South Lakeland District Council should ensure that any neighbourhood groups which are created should be given a solid understanding of the planning process. This will help to ensure that any plans brought forward through community groups comply with the South Lakeland Core Strategy and with wider strategic aims of both the district and the County Council.