



# Consultation Response Form

## Your contact details

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

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: HOUSEHOLDER		Organisation:	
Name: Grahame Hall		Name:	
Address:		Address:	
Postcode:		Postcode:	
Tel:		Tel:	
*Email		*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.

If you have any questions, or no longer wish to be consulted on the South Lakeland Local Development Framework, please call the Development Plans Team on tel: 01539 717490.

Completed forms can be sent to:

**Development Strategy Manager  
 South Lakeland District Council  
 South Lakeland House  
 Lowther Street  
 Kendal  
 LA9 4DL**

# Comments about suggested site allocations (and other map designations)

Please use this form to comment on emerging options and other sites as they appear on the settlement maps. **Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Map Number (e.g. 11)	Site reference number (e.g. R62)	Other designation – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here
SEDGWICK	25	RN175M RN18M	
<b>Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation?</b> (delete as appropriate)			
I do not support <b>the suggested</b> site allocation for the use of <b>Housing</b>			
<b>Please explain your reasons</b> (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)			
<p><b>1. The proposal will expand the existing boundary of the village and is not the 'infilling' or 'rounding off' identified in the core strategy (7.14) for smaller settlements like Sedgwick.</b></p> <p><b>2. Access to local services from Sedgwick is difficult without a car. The proposed removal of the 550 bus service will make use of a car essential. Each new house will require at least one car. The developments will be accessed from Well heads lane which is a narrow single track road with no walkways or suitable 'passing places' and well used by cyclists. If these sites are developed the inevitable increased traffic on this road will raise the potential hazard for local and visiting people.</b></p> <p><b>Other dangers of increased traffic are:-</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i) the steep and blind entrance to Hill Close</b></li> <li><b>ii) school buses collect local pupils at the base of Well Heads lane</b></li> <li><b>iii) Well heads lane is heavily used in summer by agricultural vehicles. This is already a problem for local residents with 'near misses' for both vehicles and pedestrians.</b></li> <li><b>iv) Additional road junctions to new developments.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>3. Heavy construction vehicles required to develop the steeply sloped sites may cause damage to existing housing foundations.</b></p> <p><b>4. The development proposal for these sites suggests only 3 (out of 19) houses would be affordable. Given the acute shortage of affordable homes in the area (core stat. doc. (csd) 7.12) this allocation is shameful. Provision of affordable homes must be financially viable (csd7.13). However, this is a 'country wide' problem and it is highly likely that future government policy will address this problem and funded schemes may ultimately become available. SLDC should not use up valuable building land just to meet their overall house building target (csd 7.12). Development of these sites will only make Sedgwick a bigger village.</b></p>			

## How to suggest sites which do not appear on the maps

If you want to suggest a site that does not appear on the maps **please provide a map** with the site outlined in red. Please state the uses which you propose allocating the site for and explain your reasoning. Also, please include the name of the landowner if known.

## Comments about community facilities in your area

New development can provide benefits to communities through enabling the delivery of improved or new community facilities (for example, play areas, allotments, green space, car parks, traffic management, pedestrian and cycle links, health and education facilities and community centres etc).

Do you think that your area needs new or improved community facilities?

**If so, what sort of facilities and where?**

Please explain the types of improved and/or new community facilities you feel your community may need in the next 15 years (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary).

## Comments about the documents and approach

Please respond here if you have any comments to make about the documents and approach. Please indicate the name of the document, page number, paragraph number or policy reference (where applicable) by ticking the appropriate box.

**Please complete one of these sheets for each specific comment you want to make on each document.**

Which document do you wish to comment on? (tick one)					
Land Allocations Document* <input type="checkbox"/>	Sustainability Appraisal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Scoping Report <input type="checkbox"/>	Retail Topic Paper <input type="checkbox"/>	Settlement Fact File (which?) <input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please specify)** <input type="text"/>
What part of this document do you wish to comment on?					
Page:	<input type="text"/>	Paragraph no:	<input type="text"/>	Policy: (where applicable)	<input type="text"/>
Do you support or oppose this part of the document?					
I do not support this part of the document.					
Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)					
<p><b>The sustainability appraisal document identifies the suitability of each site regarding such things as access to facilities, flood risk, drainage etc. etc.....</b></p> <p><b>A significant part of this appraisal was based on distances to services such as schools and health centres. In the sustainability appraisal for Sedgwick these distances were measured 'as the crow flies' and not as 'normal' people would access by the rural road network. This problem was compounded by SLDC defining limits and allocating scores to these assessments. Indeed the documents were summarised by allocating colours to the various parameters used with green being favourable and red being unfavourable to each emerging option site.</b></p> <p><b>This provided an entirely misleading evaluation of the sites. I understand that sustainability appraisal is only one aspect of site assessment but planning decisions are often made on site detail and if SLDC are to put resources into producing these documents they should have a 'duty of care' to make them as accurate as possible. The use of modern technology (satellite navigation aids, multi-maps etc) makes this relatively easy.</b></p>					

\* Note the Land Allocations Document is the main document that includes the emerging site options and maps. It also includes proposals for open space and employment land designation, town centre and retail boundaries, green gaps and development boundaries.

\*\* Other documents include the Interim Consultation Statement, Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and the South Lakeland Gypsies, Travellers and Show People Accommodation Study (Final Draft).