ALLOCATIONS OF LAND - EMERGING OPTIONS.

HELSINGTON PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE.

1. The Parish Council has prepared this response based on the deliberations of the Parish Council, the results of the Housing needs survey commissioned by the Parish Council (2008) and the sentiment of the Parish meeting held on Wednesday 2nd March to discuss the issue. The results of the opinion survey (attached) done by Brigsteer residents have also been used to inform this response.

2. Site RN 214. Peat Houses

The site is on the perimeter of the village and can therefore only be considered in the context of an 'exceptions' site i.e. 100% affordable. The land belongs to the parish council and it has <u>not</u> been 'made available' (contrary to the impression given in the fact file relating to this site). As the owner of the site has not agreed for it to be designated we request that this site should be removed from consideration. It was awarded to the parish by the Enclosure Commissioners in 1855 and was designated as '...for recreational purposes'. We suggest that Helsington Community Trust should withdraw sponsorship for this site. A development of 11 affordable houses on this site would have a major impact on this part of the village in visual and environmental terms and such development is opposed.

3. Site RN 213. Wheatsheaf

3a. Development of this site would entail removal of a significant number of trees and the opening of a new vehicular access onto the main road in a place where traffic is quite fast and visibility poor. The plan proposes development of 13 houses of which 35% would be 'affordable' (i.e. 4 out of twelve). This is a large development in a small community and would have major impact on the residents of the village; especially on those in the immediate vicinity. There is no shop or school in the village and residents require at least one car per family and if the breadwinner is commuting to work the family carer might also require the use of a vehicle. This suggests the need for up to 26 cars. The bus runs only once a week at present. The scale of this development is thought to be too ambitious.

The site is thought to support a population of red squirrels and deer and this is considered important.

A mixed development of seven properties with single highway access, sympathetic to the local vernacular, with tree cover retained where possible is supported. We would like to see a parking provision of at least an average of 2.5 cars per property.

4. RN227 Levens Moss.

4a. Proposals for this site were received too late for inclusion of an assessment in the fact file. However, the site is well known to local residents. It is visible from a very wide area and incapable of screening by trees and development here would therefore have a major detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the village and potentially damage locally important tourist business. Road access is presently very poor. The land is extremely wet and immediately adjacent to the flood plain; indeed it is likely that the outfall of conventional sewage and drainage systems might be below flood level. The inclusion of this site is opposed.

On the 21st June 2010 Councillor Bulman issued a letter to Mr Higgins (freeholder) in support of development of the site signed as Chairman to Helsington PC. At the PC meeting on the 7th July 2010 Councillors discussed the letter and agreed to ask the clerk to write to Mr Higgins saying we do not support the development. In the event that Mr Higgins uses the letter of 21st June to indicate support by the PC, this Council wishes it to be known, particularly to SLDC planning, that the letter was issued without authority of this Council and was the personal opinion of Councillor Bulman.

5. EN38 and E4M Land south of Scroggs Wood for employment.

We have mixed feelings regarding development of this land but if the site were used we are conscious that the A6 entrance to Kendal would change considerably from the present appearance of Scroggs Wood and as such would like to see a substantial belt of deciduous tree screening around the development, particularly to the West and South.

6. **Conclusion.**

6a. The Parish Council supports the provision of affordable housing for local people and if the CLT is prepared to undertake the task of finding suitable sites and bringing them forward for discussion with the Parish Council and all other interested parties the council would receive such representations positively. It is understood that proposals received subsequent to the completion of the present consultation could still be included in the SLDC land allocation programme. It has been suggested by the Helsington Community Trust that the Wheatsheaf site might be suitable for a development of three open market dwellings and four affordable homes and this would be supported, although it is suggested that it would be appropriate to defer such a development to phase 2 (2015 -2020) 6b. The Parish Council supports the provision of affordable housing and did commission a Housing Needs Survey which identified 17 cases of need in the parish. This Council is of the view that the section 106 agreement housing allocation policy rarely addresses the parish housing need as the highest priority. We therefore would like the parish housing need to take the highest priority when developments are being considered for consent.

6c. The Parish council would prefer small scale own developments of 1 or 2 dwellings, by landowners wishing to provide affordable housing for their families or dependents through schemes such as 'Home on the Farm'. The council would also prefer an extended time scale so that changes can be absorbed gradually.

Questions asked	Number of people who			% of people who	
	Agree	Disagr	ee	Agree	Disagree
Affordable housing is a good thing in principle		71	11	87	13
Up to 13 houses, at least 35% affordable, should be built on RN213 (opposite Wheatsheaf)		19	66	22	78
Up to 11 houses, 100% affordable, should be built on RN214 ('Peat Houses')		19	61	24	76
Up to 18 houses, 100% affordable, should be built on R227 (by Levens Moss)		11	69	14	86
All additional affordable housing in the Parish should be for local people only		76	7	92	8
All housing in the Parish designated as affordable should be so in perpetuity		78	7	92	8
Use of smaller sites and existing buildings for affordable housing is better than new buildings		70	9	89	11
Additional affordable housing should be spread across the Parish and should not be just in Brigsteer		82	3	96	4
Affordable housing should be on small sites and integrated into the community not separated		80	4	95	5
Additional affordable housing should be developed gradually not all in Phase 1		83	3	97	3
A local community-led organisation, e.g. CLT, should manage our affordable housing		73	5	94	6

Results of Brigsteer Affordable Housing Opinion Survey

86 people in Brigsteer completed the survey (not all answered every question). 9 forms were received after the closing date and are not included but they do not change the result.