

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: MR J D SMITH	Name:		
Address:	Address:		
Postcode:	Postcode:		
Tel: 0	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 **8** 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	R48/R455						
Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)								
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)								

- Access: Access is proposed via Dugg Hill. This road serves existing 47 properties and it proposed that it service a further development of 77 additional dwellings [R48 (+25) RN118 (+52)]. This increases the number of houses/units using the road from 47 to 124 which is clearly a massive expansion of use of the access. Dugg Hill has a sub-standard egress sight line on exit to the village road. There is poor vertical alignment and sight line due to the unsatisfactory vertical curve at the head of the initial steep gradient. There is then a junction at which the traffic generated by both sites will merge followed by a chicane of right hand and left hand bends on a rising gradient with limited sight lines which cause frequent near misses. Vehicles legitimately parked exacerbate these problems as they effectively reduce the carriageway to a single way traffic.
- **Yield**: The framework envisages a possible 'yield' of 77 properties in this one area of the village. These proposals at the density proposed will change the nature of the area and village and seem out of all proportion.
- **Drainage:** Any new development should presumably be sustainable requiring gravity rather than pumped foul sewerage system. Might this not necessitate laying a new sewer from the existing foul sewer immediately east of Heversham Hall to the west of houses on Princes Way? A shorter direct route to an existing sewer would appear to require deep excavation. Either route will encounter rock. Natural drainage of surface water would appear to be impeded by the A6. Disposal of surface water is an issue that would need to be addressed given increased intensity of run off from impervious surfaces.
- **Density**: The proposed density of 30 units to the hectare is in marked contrast with the existing development of 16 to the hectare. This seems to suggest two storey dwellings will be required resulting in an urban appearance to this rural settlement. Some recent developments in other villages reinforce this view and my objection.
- **Impact:** The development is bound to impact to the detriment of the adjoining properties however good the design and landscaping and on the entrance to the village which would be extended southwards.
- **Public Footpath**: A public footpath, not shown on the plan, crosses the site; no doubt an ancient right of way and short cut originally leading from Kirkgate Lane to Heversham Church still much used.

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).

Site R14 Leasgill might be considered by the Planning Authority as worthy of preservation for its potential to provide a future community facility lying as it does between the bowling green (site SF 60) to the west and the village hall, The Athenaeum and primary school to the east. The land could provide south facing allotments and/or could be of value for use by the school as a sports area, albeit sloping as the school presently has no such area immediately adjacent to the school. This is a suggestion expressed at two Parish meetings called by the Parish Council at which they sought views of parishioners but, it is noted, not represented in their submission(s) to the District Council. Such use would preserve the open view to the north west of the Lakeland hills which, I believe is valued by residents which, would likely be lost if the site is developed.

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		Sustainability	Scoping	Retail	Settlement Fact	Other (please specify)**	
Allocatio Docume		Appraisal	Report	Topic Paper	File (which?)		
What part of this document do you wish to comment on?							
Page:		Paragraph no:		Policy:			
				(where			
				applicat	ole)		
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