

## Supplementary Comments 16 July 2017

### Objection to the Allocation for Housing Development and Public Open Space on Site A8/A9, Hollins Lane, Arnside

We note that a submission dated the 14 July 2017 has been made on behalf of the owner of site A8/A9 to amend the proposals and allocations for this site. Most respondents will not be aware of the proposal now put forward, and all residents originally consulted should have the opportunity to assess and comment on the revisions. Would the Development Plans Manager at SLDC please check the correct procedures that the local planning authority should follow in dealing with this late amendment. In light of the change to the proposals our supplementary comments are listed below.

The revised proposal is for an increase in the area proposed for residential development. In the original consultation document sent to some residents there is no reference to housing types or numbers. On the basis of the current revised proposal, the outcome, if supported by the local planning authority, would be additional development, with no guarantee that it would meet the needs of those retiring in the local community. When permission is granted for development, and land sold to a developer, there is often pressure applied to build a different and more profitable scheme.

The sale of Ashmeadow would offer an opportunity to consider using the building and the site to meet the perceived demand for a range of housing needs; possibly something more modest than upmarket accommodation in the building, and some limited development within the site. The building is listed and its significance will need to be protected, but a sensitive development is worthy of investigation. The site is most appropriate for meeting housing needs in a safe, convenient and central village location.

The revised proposal outlined 4 additional points of justification. Our comments respond to each in turn.

1. **Indicative layout.** If the layout should be indicative, why submit a revised layout with more land proposed for development? To be accurate (and to allow the public to fully understand what is proposed), the revised layout should also show the relocation of the cul-de-sac and the resulting loss of open space/greenspace.
2. **Depth of the site.** If the intention is to build bungalows for the retired of the community, surely manageable rear gardens would be preferred and larger rear gardens would not be required.
3. **99 and 101 Silverdale Road.** Yes, there is an unsatisfactory relationship between the depth of the proposed housing development site and the amenities of numbers 99 and 101 Silverdale Road. The answer to this is to delete the development from this area and not to increase the area proposed for development.
4. **Public Open Space v Greenspace.** This proposal appears to be contradictory. If the majority of the open space is to be for the use of the wider community, and assuming active use, there is no room for any meaningful greenspace, as the landowner is now proposing to increase the size of the housing development. Will the newly retired residents of the new development really be responsible for the management of the public open space?

Our previous comments on the principle and detail of the proposals for this site still apply.

M and F Nightingale