

[REDACTED]

06 September 2011

[REDACTED]

Dear Mr Hudson

Your Ref: DH/60.12.43 - Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Thank you for your letter of 28 July, giving me the opportunity to comment on the 3 additional matters on which the District Council are seeking the views of interested parties.

I enclose my Consultation Response Form, giving my views on two of the alternative sites suggested for housing development in Levens and on the specific questions regarding (a) the time span of the land allocations document and (b) the policy for small villages. I continue to support the Council's proposals for development in Levens as described in their Emerging Options.

I have been interested to read the report which you presented to the Cabinet meeting on 13 July and I appreciate the concern which you expressed to the Members of the Council about the need to consolidate and expedite the current exercise to complete the formulation of the Land Allocations Development Plan.

Throughout the progress of work on the Local Development Framework your Council and their officers have displayed a positive and professional intention to produce a well researched and effective programme of land use policies for our district and the residents (though all of them may not realise it) are fortunate that this undertaking is so well advanced.

Hopefully, The Localism Bill will give the Council and local communities greater freedom to act jointly in the best interests of producing good planning policies and decisions which are supported at local level. However, I am very concerned, as are many other people, at the revolutionary idea in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework to propose the adoption of a new presumption in favour of development. I hope that this can be refined to a more reasonable approach but I am very thankful that the excellent work which the District Council and their officers have already done in producing the Core Strategy and their current work on the LADP will show that in this district we already have the means to control development in a sustainable way and to resist an otherwise possible "free for all" onslaught from major developers.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Donald Smalley



Dan Hudson BSc (Hons) MRTPI
Development Strategy Manager
South Lakeland District Council
South Lakeland House
Lowther Street
Kendal
Cumbria LA9 4DL

**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.

Your details	Your Agent's details (if you have one)
Organisation: PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL	Organisation:
Name: MR DONALD SMALLEY	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 **5** 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#)	
LEVENS	RN 291	
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>ALTHOUGH THE SOUTHERN PART OF THIS AREA (i.e. EMERGING OPTION R682LVM) COULD BE USED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AS REASONABLE "ROUNDING OFF" IN RELATION TO THE EXISTING BUILT-UP AREA OF THE VILLAGE, DEVELOPMENT OF SITE RN291 WOULD BE GREATLY EXCESSIVE, BEARING IN MIND VILLAGE NEEDS FOR A MORE LIMITED BALANCE OF AFFORDABLE & OPEN MARKET HOUSING AS PRESCRIBED BY THE CORE STRATEGY.</p>		



06 SEPTEMBER 2011

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	R105	
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>DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE (AND R680W IF IT WERE AVAILABLE) WOULD REPRESENT A SIGNIFICANT AND UNJUSTIFIED INCURSION INTO A LARGE OPEN AREA OF AGRICULTURAL LAND. THIS SOUTH-EAST ASPECT OF THE VILLAGE (AND THE SOUTH ASPECT IN R142). SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECTED TO FURTHER DEVELOPMENT, TO AVOID SEVERE DETRIMENT TO THE PRESENT ATTRACTIVE FACADE OF THE VILLAGE AND TO PRESERVE GOOD SPATIAL SEPARATION FROM THE HEAVY ROAD TRAFFIC USE OF THE A590 TRUNK ROAD</p>		



06 SEPTEMBER 2011

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 <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>AS FINAL ADOPTION OF THE PLAN WILL NOT OCCUR UNTIL AT LEAST NOVEMBER 2012, NINE YEARS WILL THEN HAVE ELAPSED OF THE PLAN PERIOD. BECAUSE OF THAT TIME LAPSE THE PLAN PERIOD SHOULD BE CONTINUED UNTIL 2025 TO ENSURE THAT:</p> <p>① THE PLAN OBJECTIVES REMAIN VALID FOR A SUBSTANTIAL LENGTH OF TIME, TO GIVE CERTAINTY TO DEVELOPERS AND TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES ABOUT POLICIES GOVERNING FUTURE LAND DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>② THIS PLAN REMAINS CONSISTENT WITH THE ADOPTED CORE STRATEGY, WHICH IS VALID UNTIL 2025.</p> <p>06 SEPTEMBER 2011</p> <p>SOUTH LAKELAND DISTRICT COUNCIL RECEIVED 07 SEP 2011 POST ROOM</p>		

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)	
<p>BECAUSE OF THE MUCH SMALLER SIZE OF THESE AREAS OPTION B IS A BETTER WAY TO PROMOTE ANY DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS, WHICH ARE BOUND TO AFFECT THE COMMUNITIES IN A MORE PERSONAL WAY. THE "LOCALISM" PRINCIPLE IS EVEN MORE IMPORTANT IN ASSESSING THE SITES BEING CONSIDERED BUT THE COUNCIL MUST BE ABLE TO ACT AS THE ULTIMATE INDEPENDENT ARBITER TO RESOLVE DIFFERENCES OF VIEW AND TO ENSURE THAT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS CONFORM TO RELEVANT CORE STRATEGY POLICIES.</p>	

Thank you for your views and suggestions.

