



Land Allocations Consultation **Room to Live, Space to Breathe**


# Consultation Response Form

DISTRICT COUNCIL  
RECEIVED

09 SEP 2011

## 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: Mr John & Mrs Julia Sharpe	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.)

<b>Which site do you wish to comment on?</b>		
<b>Settlement</b> (e.g. Natland)	<b>Site reference number</b> (e.g. RN298#)	
Sedgwick	RN322#	
<b>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)</b>		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please explain your reasons/add your comments below</b> (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>We are not convinced that Sedgwick has the facilities or infrastructure for more houses. However if more houses are needed we feel these should be for local people only (local occupancy requirement), where possible be affordable and the number of houses should be very limited. We feel that SLDC have no real commitment to affordable housing in Sedgwick as they have recently lifted the planning restriction requiring local occupancy on probably the only affordable house in the village.</p> <p>However if it is deemed that Sedgwick requires more houses then we feel that this is a much more suitable site than the previous emerging sites RN18 &amp; RN175 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This site does not border any other housing.</li><li>• The site does not overlook any existing property &amp; is generally not overlooked. This makes this site less intrusive than the previous emerging options. If any new houses were set at lower levels (the site slopes down away from the village) it is likely that the properties at the end of Castle View would, at worst, see part of roofs areas only and most of Castle View &amp; Wakefield Meadows would see nothing at all. It is unlikely however that there would be invasion of privacy.</li><li>• The previous emerging sites (RN18 &amp; RN175) are adjacent to people's back gardens and would both overlook existing houses &amp; be overlooked themselves.</li><li>• With appropriate design light pollution to existing houses would not be a problem.</li><li>• RN322# (then RN19) was referred to at the public meeting organised by SLDC, held in the village hall and it was admitted that this site should not have been discounted.</li></ul>		

- It would be possible to locate access routes which would not directly impact existing housing.
- Further tree planting could take place.
- Traffic issues would be easier to deal with than the previously considered sites (not the problem of blind junctions & single track lanes) and certainly less dangerous. Both roads near the site are salted in winter.
- Construction work could be carried out with far less disruption and with increased safety.
- It would be easier to connect to local utilities.

We feel that consideration should be taken to the following points:

- There should be a local occupancy requirement.
- The number of houses should be limited.
- Building should be in keeping with the village.

## 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?

<b>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)</b>		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)</b>		
<p>As shortening the period the document should cover would mean a) The next consultation will just begin earlier, b) The building on allocated sites may occur earlier rather than later and c) any reduction in allocated housing now could reappear sooner as part of a future plan.</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 ☒

B ☐

**Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)**

We understand that in the absence of any allocated site/s, any land put forward by a landowner would be considered for housing, with the presumption in favour of development. This would be harder for residents to object to or have a say in where there is no other housing in an up to date plan. We feel a neighbourhood plan (for future housing) is not an option in Sedgwick as some of the councillors on our present Parish Council are land owners - one being the chairman.

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