



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: N/A		Organisation:	
Name: Peter and Jill Shaw		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	23	RN118M	
Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)			
I do not support the suggested site allocation/designation for the following use(s) Housing other (specify).....			
Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)			
<p><u>Development on this site would be contrary to several of the Core Strategy Policies.</u></p> <p><u>Size.</u> Making provision for 56 houses on one site is contrary to Policy CS1.2 (“small scale infilling and rounding off development would be permitted”), and Policy CS5 (“Make provision for small scale housing developments in the Local Service Centres and to a lesser extent in the smaller rural settlements”).</p> <p><u>Is it Infill?</u> It is not “on a vacant plot on an otherwise built up street frontage”.</p> <p><u>Is it Rounding Off?</u> An inspector’s report on a previous application for only part of the site (5/90/0467) concluded (Paragraph 7) that “...it is a large scheme which could not reasonably be regarded as infilling or rounding off.”</p> <p>Perceptions have no doubt changed since 1990, but RN118M does not complete an incomplete group of buildings on land which is partially developed in such a way that will complete the road pattern or finally define and complete the boundaries of the group. (See Core Strategy paragraph 2.25)</p> <p>The size of the development on RN118M would distort the character of the settlement in an undesirable way – see also below.</p> <p>If RN118M were developed there would be pressure to develop R168E and vice-versa.</p> <p>There is also a condition in the definition of rounding off that public services must be in place before a site which is rounding off can be considered.</p>			

The Effect on the Landscape.

In section 2.15 On page 13 of the Emerging Options Consultation Edition the criteria include :-
“**Landscape and Settlement** considerations including the potential impact of development on landscape and views, the scale of development relative to the settlement size.....”

The same 1990 inspector’s report (Paragraph 5) concluded that “.... the erection of 40 houses at this substantial site would be unduly conspicuous and would constitute an unacceptable extension of the built up part of the settlement out into the surrounding countryside, causing a substantial and adverse change to the character and appearance of the area.”

A development on RN118M would be in the public view looking towards Morecambe Bay and Arnside Knott from Heversham Head. A panoramic indicator was built as a Millennium project on the Head in 2000, and as a result it is a more popular walking area than it was in 1990. RN118M would also be in view looking from Heversham Head towards St Anthony’s tower (Core Strategy Policy CS 8.2).

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 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: var ious	Paragraph no:		Policy: (where applicable)		
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)					

1. The Emerging Options Consultation Edition does not make clear that the extent of new housing in the smaller villages is not limited to the sites put forward.

There would also be infill and rounding off, and any other sites which emerge during consultation. In Kendal Rural the report expects these to provide half of the dwellings.

For Heversham and Leasgill this would mean, if all sites put forward in the report remain after consultation, that the village would grow by well over 100 dwellings. The 2001 census recorded only 310 households in the whole parish – many of them outside the village hub.

There is general agreement in the parish that this is too much, and there is nothing in the Emerging Options Report or the Heversham and Leasgill Housing Needs survey in 2007 which justifies a need for so many. The fact that “a lot of land was offered” is not sufficient justification.

2. Why do emerging sites (unless for 100% affordable housing) need to be identified for smaller villages? Core Strategy Policy CS1.2 abolishes development boundaries and allows “new small scale infill and rounding off” in the smaller villages.

Without abolition of the development boundaries the number of dwellings built in the smaller villages since 2003 (plus 80% of permitted, plus SHLAA) in the SLDC area has been at a rate of approximately 50 per annum against a target of 44 per annum. In Kendal Rural the required rate is 34 per annum, and again the built plus 80% of permitted plus SHLAA is close to target. These figures are taken from “Table 1 : Overall Housing Requirement and Balance Between Settlements” on page 11 of the Consultation Edition.

We believe that some other authorities (Copeland?) are taking the view that it is not necessary to nominate sites in smaller villages. Any planning application made between now and 2025 would simply be tested against Core Strategy Policies and planning rules.

3. If sites are needed in the smaller villages the method of choosing the most appropriate is not transparent and not always based on correct facts. In Heversham and Leasgill it has produced :- one site (R41) which would only be developable at one end and would require a road across the other end for access, and another site (RN118M) which is not “small scale”, and which in 1990 an inspector stated “could not reasonably be regarded as infilling or rounding-off”.

It is very difficult to see how these could be the best sites if a proper comparison of all sites across SLDC had been carried out. Miraculously, of the three sites suggested in Heversham one belongs to each of the large landowners in the parish!

* 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

