



Land Allocations Consultation Room to Live, Space to Breathe

Consultation Response Form

Your contact details

If you are completing a paper copy of this form please use CAPITALS and BLACK INK.

SOUTH LAKELAND
DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECEIVED

31 AUG 2011

POST ROOM

Your details	Your Agent's details (if you have one)
Organisation:	Organisation:
Name: Ian & Dagmar Johnson	Name:
	Address:
	Postcode:
	Tel:
	*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#)	
Grayrigg	RN257#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Under the consultation document for Grayrigg published in July 2011 for neighbouring site RN68# it was intimated that the existing sewage farm is already close to its working capacity. 2) Site RN257# has only one access to public road which in fact is a narrow lane with tight bends. If RN68# at 0.33ha is considered for 10 dwellings, this site at 0.47ha presumably would be for even more. Therefore access is totally unsuitable. 3) From the environmental point of view there is an underground stream which runs alongside the northern boundary of the RN257# site. This emerges within the grounds of the property called The Cockpit and from there runs above ground across the fields. This stream is the home of native freshwater crayfish. 4) It has been also suggested whether the parish should consider any development with the implication that no development could lead to stagnation. In our opinion any development in Grayrigg could only be along the lines of bits & pieces of expensive housing of an exclusive nature. This may or may not be desirable, but will not contribute to the reinforcement of the fabric of the community and will not provide the type of housing that is considered necessary. 		



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 <input type="checkbox"/>	B <input type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)	
<p>Neither.</p> <p>Unless there is legislation in place that can ensure that new development is for local people with the need for suitable housing, these small developments are pointless.</p> <p>The choice of small villages, hamlets and open countryside already precludes achieving this goal as such places by and large lack services (intermittent and/or restricted public transport, shops and schools, amenities and employment opportunities) which are exactly the things people in need would have to have access to.</p> <div data-bbox="1070 960 1453 1292" style="text-align: right;"><p>SOUTH LAKE DISTRICT COUNCIL RECEIVED 31 AUG 2011 POST ROOM</p></div>	

Thank you for your views and suggestions.