



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:	Organisation:
Name: Sylvia Horsfall	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#)	
Sedgwick	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 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>I oppose this site due to the fact that access would be from a single track road with no footpaths and poor visibility due to two bends in the road which is already dangerous without further traffic needing to use it. Housing would also be visible and intrusive.</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)

I feel the period to 2025 is too long. I cannot see how anyone or any organisation can identify the housing/development needs of this large area over such a long period. I would rather the Council look at a shorter period to 2020 and get it right and be able to plan financially for the future. Too much money is being spent on long term consultations which can end up wasted if mistakes are made.

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)

I think that sites should be identified so that long term financial planning by the Council can be done and smaller communities have security about long term plans for them. Smaller communities especially should be able to have reassurance about the future rather than the possibility of being continually presented with applications for development.

A small village/hamlet like Sedgwick needs to have sensitive development planned looking at the place as a whole and bearing in mind the lack of services (e.g. shop, pavements, street lighting), the width of roads, a single lane low canal bridge and the fact that we are a rat run for Kendal. It needs also to take account of the culture and tradition of rural communities, the wildlife and the agricultural aspect.

The Council should accept that, if development is necessary, this has to be done sympathetically in the case of smaller settlements to stop them being overrun and losing any appeal that they once had. There is also the worry that small settlements can become dormitories for Kendal leaving very little for the older residents as they become empty during the working week. This also has the effect of pushing up prices of housing further leaving local youngsters unable to afford to stay in the village.

If the Council identifies land for development local people could have reassurance that the village will not end up being over developed especially if the government's 'presumption for development' makes it through the current consultation.

Thank you for your views and suggestions.