



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:		Organisation:	
Name: J. Mohammed & B. Frank		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.**

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
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
Heversham & Leasgill	23	R48M, RN118M, R41, R445, RN221, RN222, R167	
Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate) Support in part			
I support / do not support / support in part the suggested site allocation/designation for the following use(s) Housing/employment/retail/community uses/open space/ other (specify).....			
Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)			

General points:

The number of new houses proposed for Heversham and Leasgill is excessive in the following respects:

- The proposed 99 new houses for Heversham is far too many for the village. This would represent an increase by one third of the current number of households, which would fundamentally change the nature and appearance of the village.
- There is not a high level of need for housing in Heversham. The 2008 Housing Needs Survey identified that up to 16 Heversham households could need to either move or find additional accommodation in Heversham over the following 5 years. Of these, 5 could need affordable accommodation. This is far short of the proposed 99 houses. There have recently been a number of properties offered for sale in the village which have remained unsold for over six months. These have presented a range of market values, which suggests that the need for housing in the villages is being met by available properties. The exception is obviously affordable homes.
- The village lacks real services; there is not a village shop or post-office, and the local bus fares are expensive. These considerations explain why people seeking affordable accommodation currently prefer to live in or near to the population centres, so as to be able to access services and employment more easily and more cheaply.

Site R48M (support in part)

It appears this would be a relatively accessible site for new build, as there are existing, wide roads and it would be possible to access Prince's Way safely. This section, close to the A6, might be a good location for affordable accommodation. The proposed numbers appear far too large; a much smaller number, and attention to location and design are essential, to ensure that any new build complements the existing properties, and does not detract from the appearance of this part of the village.

RN118M (support in part)

Again, the proposed number is far too large. It is essential to pay attention to how this site is used, and the visual appearance of any properties, to ensure that any build complements existing properties. To achieve this, far fewer properties would need to be built on this site. Again, this site benefits from links to good, existing roads, and access to the area can be made safely.

R41 (oppose)

Road access to this site via Moss Lane is not safe. This section of road is extremely narrow and approaches to both the old A6 and Princes Way are hazardous.

R445 (support)

Dallam School have offered land at R445, and to facilitate access via the boarding school, perhaps easing development of RN118. This site is supported.

RN221, RN222, R167 (all opposed)

Heversham Parish Council have made two submissions, one which reflects the public view, and a further submission which reflects their own. Their own submission has not been publicly discussed and it is important to point out, as they currently state on the Heversham Parish Council website (www.heversham.org.uk)

“...the Parish Council's view is a little at variance with that of the public who attended the last meeting and hence, a further submission was made to SLDC.” This further submission has not been publicly aired for discussion. Since this view has not been publically discussed the “little at variance with that of the public” is a matter of conjecture.

In addition to views on the sites proposed by SLDC, Heversham Parish Council's own submission also suggests the use of sites “RN22”, which from their reference to “Plumtree” appears to represent RN221 and RN222. Also use of R167.

RN221, RN222, R167 (all opposed)

These sites comprise two fields, which currently offer both grazing pastures and leisure access for the local community to Heversham Head and the Millennium Monument. RN222 sits behind St Peter's Church and abuts the Heversham conservation area. These sites have already been considered in the SLDC Land Allocation Development Plan Document, and rejected. We oppose Heversham Parish Council's proposal that these sites be considered and instead agree with the points made by SLDC. Namely:

SLDC makes similar statements for both RN221 and RN222:

“As the site is elevated it is likely to be prominent from more distant vantage points to the west. Development is also considered to be harmful to the wider landscape setting between the Parish Church and rising land in the direction of Humphrey Head. It is considered again that development here would set a precedent by extending Heversham eastwards on to higher land than previously developed. It is considered this would be harmful to the character and landscape setting of the village, which for the most part has not developed on to higher land, prominent to distant views.”

R167 was discounted in the SLDC Land Allocation Development Plan Document on “account of landscape impact and restricted access (and potential impact on the road and nearby primary school)”.

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).

Viable, and affordable public transport.

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 type="checkbox"/>	Scoping Report <input type="checkbox"/>	Retail Topic Paper <input type="checkbox"/>	Settlement Fact File (which?) <input type="text"/>	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 support /do not support/support in part this part of the document .					
Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)					

* 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).

Thank you for your views and suggestions. Electronic copies of the form can be downloaded from www.southlakeland.gov.uk/landallocations