DB ✓

SOUTH LAKELAND
DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECEIVED
23 AUG 2011
REVS & BENS

Mr. Dan Hudson,
Development Strategy Manager
South Lakeland District Council,
Lowther Street,
Kendal

Dear Sir,

Response to Land Allocations Document - Further Consultation, Summer 2011, Alternative Sites Put Forward by Respondents to Consultation

Map 23, Heversham and Leasgill
Site references RN 316, RN 326 (previously R 168E) & untitled, previously RN118M

As requested by SLDC, this response is primarily in relation to **Alternative sites** proposed by people responding to those put forward by the Council as Emerging Options but it is not concerned with matters contained within the Core Strategy, such as the suggested number of houses for any given settlement, policies or periodicity appertaining to the Land Allocations document. We consider that those matters have been adequately dealt with elsewhere.

In its **Response to the Consultation on the Local Development Framework, Heversham Parish Council** states that it can see the potential benefit of extending a single line of development on the eastern edge of **Site R168E** although it does have concerns about access, without specifying or elaborating on the reasons for those misgivings. By not doing so, the Parish Council gives the impression that it is promoting **Site R168E** (now **RN316** and **RN 326**) as suitable for nomination as Residential Land.
It is necessary, therefore, to draw attention to the inaccessibility to the two aforementioned sites, especially in comparison to the ease of access to **Site RN 118M**.

It has been suggested by the Trustees of Dallam School, the owners of the grazing land and greenfield, that it would be prepared to sell the land and facilitate access through the school campus to **Sites RN 316 and RN326** but any casual observer of their proposed route would immediately see that it is not only impracticable, it is highly likely that the Highways Authority would vigorously oppose it were any application be submitted to build on the proposed land. If it did not do so, its attention would be drawn to the fact that a night and day increase of vehicles due to new housing, over and above the present school traffic, would occur to the detriment of and pose danger to the children boarding close by. Indeed, it is shocking that the Trustees can even contemplate, let alone propose it.

The **Parish Council** ought to have highlighted the potential danger to schoolchildren if access were from and to the old A6, the main road through the village.

Access from Woodhouse Lane, by an increase of traffic into **RN316** is more than impracticable off such a narrow road, which hardly needs to be stated.

In comparison and in terms of safe access only, **Site RN118** is ideal. That same casual observer would immediately see that two points of **safe entrance** to the site, were left by the developers of the small estate and it would be a simple matter to extend them into the site. Not only that, a one-way system into and out of **Site RN118** could be implemented by utilising the two roads, thereby making it

even safer. It would be difficult, therefore, to argue against inclusion to the Local Development Framework of **Site RN118** on the grounds of access.

On those grounds alone, it was surprising to note that **Site R168E (RN316 & RN326)** hitherto excluded from Map 23 but outlined as a previously suggested site, should reappear, outlined in red as a potential for housing yet **Site RN118M** has neither outline in any colour nor a designated reference. Coincidentally and similarly, Site R455 and Site R48, to which a response was submitted by PFK Planning consultants on behalf of a residents' group, have neither outline nor designated reference. We have ascertained that these omissions are the result of nobody submitting them for consideration so we therefore **formally submit Site 455, Site 48M, Site R41, Site RN251 and Site 252** to be considered for inclusion in the LDF. The grounds for inclusion of Site 455 and Site 48M are enhanced by the Heversham and Leasgill Fact File, which indicates they are suitable for 25 dwellings and are suitable infill.

Further Responses to the Land Allocations Document - Further Consultation Summer 2011

Site RN316 and Site RN326

It is a widely accepted Government Policy that the countryside must be protected for its own sake.

Notwithstanding the forthcoming replacement of the Local Plan by a Local Development Framework, that policy still stands and we anticipate that it will be defined in that LDF, especially in South Lakeland and the various National Parks.

It cannot be disputed that the two sites heading this paragraph are the beginning of open and undeveloped countryside, which must be protected. It is an aphorism that the supply of land is limited. There is only so much. No new is being created and this truism must be recognised by government, planners and the public before it is too late. Every greenfield site, slice of countryside or open space lost will never be replaced.

It is therefore incumbent on us to cherish our countryside, no matter who owns or wishes to make monetary profit out of if. In that respect, the Trustees of Dallam School, as owners of the land, have a golden opportunity, not only to preserve it as open countyside but to enhance it by establishing a nature reserve, for which grants may be available. By doing so, not only would their schoolchildren benefit; wildlife would also be protected and we all would be richer in spirit.

The dismantled railway adjacent to the **Sites RN316, RN326** and **RN118M** is a green road from Hincaster to the edge of Milnthorpe and would be an addition to the reserve inasmuch as it already supports varied wildlife and is graced by magnificent bushes and deciduous trees. To develop the land would be vandalism and unforgiveable.

No Public Right of Way crosses the land but it is used as informal recreation and to gain access to the dismantled railway. The present usage is as grazing pastureland and meadow, which should be no hindrance to the proposal for a nature reserve.

SOUTH LAKELAND
DISTRICT COUNCIL
RECEIVED
3 AUG 2011
VS & BENS

Yours faithfully,

Name [redacted]

Address