

FCEM97

From: Hubbard, Alan [ak]  
Sent: 03- Sep- 11 13:35  
To: Development Plans  
Subject: South Lakeland LDF Land Allocations - Further Consultation - response from National Trust

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached a set of response forms setting out the views of the National Trust following careful consideration of the latest consultation documentation. It is requested that the views set out in the responses are fully considered by the Council prior to preparation of the publication document.

It is noted that several sites put forward at this late stage are owned by National Trust and it is not our intention to bring these forward for development given their importance to the special places that we are charged with protecting on behalf of the nation.

The Trust also wishes to draw attention to our previous comments relating to land to the north of Kendal (including in the context of the attached response to new site RN299#). In particular in respect of Site RN169 we commented as follows in April this year in response to the Preferred Options consultation:

It remains the case that, as previously advised, this site is subject to restrictive National Trust covenants. whilst that fact is recorded in the relevant documentation it is not addressed at all in any of the Council's commentary responding to this site.

It is particularly disappointing that the Council has not sought to respond to the invitation made by National Trust in its previous submissions, i.e.:

"Given the National Trust's role as a major stakeholder within the District it would welcome the opportunity to discuss the sites identified above, and their availability/appropriateness, with the Council should any of them make it beyond the initial sieving exercise."

The Council's current general consultation is the first time that it has been indicated to the Trust that it might pursue development of this site. At the same time its documentation is silent on the matter of the deliverability of this site, which is surprising given the issues flagged up by the Trust at the first opportunity.

As set out above National Trust has engaged with this DPD work at the earliest stage and despite that now being more than two years ago remains willing to meet with the Council regarding this matter.

Lastly, it is acknowledged that an approach has been received from the land owner's advisers regarding this site and its possible development. That is under consideration at the moment but it is too early to say what the outcome of discussions might be. At present the position remains as identified at the time of the initial consultation.

It is noted that this position was again drawn to the Council's attention in my conversation with Mr. Alistair MacNeil on 4th July 2011, but the Council has still not sought to enter into discussions with the Trust over this matter. This concern is of course reinforced by the inclusion of site RN299# in the current consultation - the Trust's response to this site is included in the attached set of response forms.

It is noted that current national advice in PPS12 on the preparation of Development Plan Documents (para 5.2) is that they need to comply with the same requirements as those set out for Core Strategies, of particular relevance in this regard are paras 4.20, 4.27 and 4.44.

Regards,

Alan Hubbard

Planning Adviser  
t National Trust

The National Trust is a registered charity no. 205846. Our registered office is Heelis, Kemble Drive, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 2NA.

The views expressed in this email are personal and may not necessarily reflect those of the National Trust unless explicitly stated otherwise.

FCEM97

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you should not copy it for any purpose, or disclose its contents to any other person. Senders and recipients of email should be aware that, under the Data Protection Act 1998, the contents may have to be disclosed.

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System. For more information please visit <<http://www.messagelabs.com/email>>. However the National Trust cannot accept liability for viruses that may be in this email and we recommend that you check all emails with an appropriate virus scanner.

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---



## Consultation Response Form

### How to make comments

You need fill out only one copy of your contact details. However, **please fill in a separate response form for each site or issue that you wish to comment on.** Please indicate in the box provided on the contact details form the total number of pages enclosed. Please complete the attached Equality Monitoring Form if you wish.

An electronic copy of this form is available at [www.southlakeland.gov.uk/landallocations](http://www.southlakeland.gov.uk/landallocations)

Electronic forms or responses by email can be sent to [developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk](mailto:developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk).

Responses on paper copies of this form should be posted or faxed to:

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

Fax: 01539 717355

You may also hand in your form to the council offices at:

- South Lakeland House, Lowther Street, Kendal; or
- Ulverston Local Link (Town Hall)

If you require additional copies of the form please call 01539 717490 or email [developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk](mailto:developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk).

Internet access is available at your local library and at South Lakeland House, Kendal.

**Please ensure that your comments reach the Council Offices at South Lakeland House, Kendal no later than Friday 9th September 2011.**

### Your contact details and privacy

Anonymous comments will not be accepted. Comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for public inspection. Your submitted comments will be used in the preparation of the LDF.

Contact details, signatures and private addresses will not be made public. Any data that you supply will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

### Viewing the relevant documents

The consultation document, which includes maps of the sites we would like comments on can be viewed at council offices and local libraries and downloaded from the Council website

### Any questions?

If you need help completing the comments sheet, require further information or are unsure about any aspect of the consultation, our Development Plans Team will be pleased to advise.

Contact details are:

Tel: **01539 717490**

Email: [developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk](mailto:developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk)



# 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: National Trust		Organisation: N/A	
Name: Alan Hubbard		Name:	
Address:		Address:	
Postcode:		Postcode:	
Tel:		Tel:	
*Email:		*Email:	

\*We aim to minimise the amount of paper printed and sent out. Therefore, where an email address is supplied, future contact will be made electronically.

This response contains  pages including this one.

Please tick the box if you would like us to notify you when the Land Allocations Development Plan Document is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and when it is adopted by the Council.

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
A590 Corridor and M6 Junction 36	E56#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>In principle the inclusion of all of the land on either side of the A590 from the M6 to the Brettargh Holt is impractical and has given no consideration to matters such as land ownership, landscape character, environmental assets, topography or geomorphology.</b></p> <p><b>The Trust is especially concerned about the impact of development on this scale and in this location upon the approach to Sizergh Castle and Estate, including Helsington Barrows, and their setting – including the views to and from these valued assets. The existing rural surroundings and the visitor approach would be very significantly and adversely affected.</b></p> <p><b>It is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p> <p><b>(This response is equally applicable to employment or mixed employment/housing use.)</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	E50#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>The National Trust objects to this site as it is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</b></p> <p><b>More particularly development of this land would adversely impact upon the rural setting of the Sizergh Estate, including views to and from it, as well as the important visitor approach to Sizergh.</b></p> <p><b>Development here would clearly also adversely impact upon other environmental assets, not least the heritage resources at Levens.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	E51#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>The National Trust objects to this site as it is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</b></p> <p><b>More particularly development of this land would adversely impact upon the rural setting of the Sizergh Estate, including views to and from it, as well as the important visitor approach to Sizergh.</b></p> <p><b>Development here would clearly also adversely impact upon other environmental assets, not least the heritage resources at Levens.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p>		



## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	E52#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>Approximately the middle third of this site (as defined by field boundaries) is owned by National Trust as part of the Sizergh Estate. Along with the remainder of site E52# it is an important element of the rural landscape around Sizergh Castle and the approach to it; the Trust does not intend to dispose of its land holding here or to promote mixed housing/employment development upon it.</p> <p>The site is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</p> <p>Development here would clearly also adversely impact upon other environmental assets, not least the heritage resources at Levens.</p> <p>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	E53#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>The whole of this site is owned by National Trust and is not available for mixed housing/employment development. It is an important element of the rural landscape around Sizergh Castle, its setting and the approach to it.</b></p> <p><b>The site is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	E54#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>The whole of this site is owned by National Trust and is not available for mixed housing/employment development. It is an important element of the rural landscape around Sizergh Castle, its setting and the approach to it.</b></p> <p><b>The site is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	E55#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>The whole of this site is owned by National Trust and is not available for mixed housing/employment development. It is an important element of the rural landscape around Sizergh Castle, its setting and the approach to it.</b></p> <p><b>The site is an area of open countryside poorly related to existing settlements and a range of local services.</b></p> <p><b>It is considered that an allocation of this scale in this location would not be in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	RN280#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>If there is a demonstrable need for a small amount of additional housing in Sedgwick then the National Trust does not oppose a suitable modest development on part of this site.</b></p> <p><b>However, it is considered that the site identified is excessive in size and that any new development should be closely associated with the existing village, i.e. utilising the eastern end of the identified site. It will also be necessary to demonstrate that this part of the site is suitable having regard to any particular site constraints.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick and Brettargh Holt	ON56	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>It is difficult to make a definitive response to this proposal as it relates to quite a large site and the level of information available is limited to a list of potential uses.</p> <p>There are potentially a number of issues regarding matters such as how suitable vehicular access to the site would be achieved (in part what is 'suitable' will depend upon the extent and nature of the uses), the scale and design of new development and the impacts upon environmental resources.</p> <p>However, in principle a leisure use here based around restoration of the canal could have a number of positive elements and could readily be linked to the existing and potential visitor attractions associated with the Sizergh Estate, including not only the Castle but also Low Sizergh Farm and Sedgwick gunpowder works. (There is an existing right of way to the north of Wilson Place and a related footbridge over the River Kent to the close by.)</p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Kendal SW	E5#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>This site is considered to be poorly related to the built up part of Kendal, being separated from it by both the A590 and also the existing open land to the east of the by-pass up to the outskirts of Kendal. As such it is not well related to existing services.</b></p> <p><b>Furthermore development in this location would adversely impact upon the open countryside and its landscape character.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Kendal SW	E8#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>This site is considered to be poorly related to the built up part of Kendal, being separated from it by both the A590 and also the existing open land to the east of the by-pass up to the outskirts of Kendal. As such it is not well related to existing services.</b></p> <p><b>Furthermore development in this location would adversely impact upon the open countryside and its landscape character.</b></p>		



## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Kendal NE	RN299#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>As with Site RN169 (as commented on previously) National Trust is the beneficiary of restrictive covenants that relate to this site.</b></p> <p><b>To date there have been no discussions between the Trust and either the Council or the land owner regarding this site and its deliverability.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Arnside	MN32#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>Attention is drawn to the National Trust's response earlier this year to the Site Allocations Preferred Options Consultation with specific reference to the approach generally to be taken to Arnside given its location within the nationally designated landscape of an AONB; including our submissions on the implications of the Adopted Core Strategy (e.g. Policies CS1.1 and 8.2).</b></p> <p><b>In effect this site is an extension of site MN20 previously put forward.</b></p> <p><b>The Trust is concerned about the overall scale of the site as now defined and the consequent impact of development not only on the designated landscape but also on the infrastructure available in Arnside. Whilst a case might be reasonably made for some modest employment development well related in siting and scale to the characteristics of the site, the Trust would, for example, be especially concerned about new housing development here on the far side of the railway line and in effect extending the village envelope.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Arnside	RN269#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>Whilst National Trust is not in a position to comment about the site-specific attributes and therefore the overall suitability of this site it does note that it is situated within the existing built up area of Arnside. As such well considered development on this site is unlikely to have adverse impacts upon landscape character or indeed the wider objectives for the AONB as set out in its Management Plan, or indeed to be in conflict with the relevant policies in the adopted Core Strategy.</b></p> <p><b>As such it is considered that this site is preferable to some of the sites proposed in the Preferred Options consultation earlier this year (in particular sites R81, RN225 and R693M).</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Arnside	RN267#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>Whilst National Trust is not in a position to comment about the site-specific attributes and therefore the overall suitability of this site it does note that it is situated within the existing built up area of Arnside. As such well considered development on this site is unlikely to have adverse impacts upon landscape character or indeed the wider objectives for the AONB as set out in its Management Plan, or indeed to be in conflict with the relevant policies in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>As such it is considered that this site is preferable to some of the sites proposed in the Preferred Options consultation earlier this year (in particular sites R81, RN225 and R693M).</p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Holme and Holme Mills	All sites	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>The National Trust does not wish to comment about the detailed characteristics of individual sites that have come forward at Holme and Holme Mills. However, it does wish to note that the potential scale of cumulative development is excessive, far exceeds the needs of these modest settlements and would fundamentally alter their character.</p> <p>The Trust's specific interest is the relative proximity of the settlements to its property at Holme Park Fell to the east which is a very popular viewpoint (along with Farleton Knott). Development of the extent proposed would have a considerable adverse impact upon the view from Holme Park Fell.</p> <p>Whilst a very modest amount of new development might reasonably be contemplated (for example sites such as RN30M#, RN283# and RN293# which are quite well related to the existing settlements) the same is not true of the significant number of very large sites (for example sites such as RN273#, RN274# and RN275#).</p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Levens	RN282#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p><b>It is considered that this site is of an excessive size to meet the reasonable needs of the settlement and that its development would considerably, and adversely, impact upon both the existing settlement pattern and the important open spaces between groups of buildings.</b></p> <p><b>Having regard to the topography of the site and its prominence, especially at the northern portion, in views towards Sizergh Fell from the south/south-west, it is considered that its development would also adversely impact upon the landscape character of this part of the District.</b></p> <p><b>The Trust is not aware of any detailed investigation into the suitability of this site but there is known to be ecologically sensitive land close by at Lane End corner.</b></p> <p><b>It is not considered that this site is preferable to those advanced in the Preferred Options consultation earlier in 2011.</b></p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Levens	RN295#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>It is considered the development of this site could adversely impact upon both the existing settlement pattern and the village envelope.</p> <p>Having regard to the topography of the site and its prominence, especially the un-built upon northern portion, in views towards Sizergh Fell from the south/south-west, it is considered that its development could also adversely impact upon landscape character.</p> <p>The Trust is not aware of any detailed investigation into the suitability of this site but there is known to be ecologically sensitive land close by at Lane End corner.</p> <p>Subject to ecological considerations a well-designed residential redevelopment of the existing buildings may be possible. Preferably this should firstly consider whether or not there is any potential to re-use existing buildings. In any event very careful control would need to be exercised over the height of new buildings and the extent and treatment of their curtilages.</p> <p>It is not considered that this site is necessarily preferable to those advanced in the Preferred Options consultation earlier in 2011.</p>		

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

### 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Levens	RN291#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>This site is considered to be quite poorly related to the existing settlement pattern at Levens and to be a comparatively prominent site.</p> <p>It is not considered that this site is necessarily preferable to those advanced in the Preferred Options consultation earlier in 2011.</p>		



## 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)

**There is clearly considerable uncertainty at the present time about the detail of future government policy, especially in terms of the final detail of the National Planning Policy Framework. At the same time the Localism Bill also remains under discussion as part of its passage through necessary parliamentary procedures.**

**Assuming the Council is intent on moving forward with its Site Allocations work and submitting a publication document in the autumn (whilst uncertainties will remain over both key planning documents) it would be sensible to adopt a shorter time span for the DPD and in due course proceed with an earlier review. Such a review will be able to be undertaken in the context of a clearer and established national perspective.**

### 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)

**The alternative approach set out in B is appropriate for small scale development having regard to a) the overall criteria that are set out in the recently adopted Core Strategy, and b) the intention to give local communities greater say in what happens, and where, in and around the places that are special to them.**

**This approach is not suitable for any large scale proposals – such development proposals should be absent or very unlikely given the overall spatial strategy set out in the Core Strategy. If the need for such development has not been identified in or around the ‘small villages, hamlets and open countryside’ at this stage in the preparation of the Site Allocations Document it would be reasonable to include a policy in the final DPD to the effect that major development will not be permitted in these locations.**

**Where small scale development proposals do come forward in these locations in the future it will be necessary to clear show that they are ‘needs based’, have the support of local communities, and would not adversely impact upon the significances of valued assets including landscape, nature conservation and heritage resources.**

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