



South Lakeland Local Development Framework

Submission **Core Strategy** REPRESENTATIONS STATEMENT (REG. 30)



NOVEMBER 2009

Lawrence Conway, Corporate Director (Community), South Lakeland District Council
www.southlakeland.gov.uk/ldf



**Alternative formats of this
document are available by
calling 01539 733333 ext.7102**

Submission Core Strategy Representations Statement

Regulation 30 1 (e)

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This document contains details of the representations received following publication of the South Lakeland Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD). It explains how the Council has responded to the particular requirements of Regulation 30 (1) (e) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

1.2 The Core Strategy was published in August 2009 to enable representations to be made prior to its submission to the Secretary of State. This helps to ensure that there will not be any issues that would cause the Council to re-consider its submission and enables minor changes to be made to the document. The representations will be taken into account at the Core Strategy examination.

1.3 In accordance with Regulation 30 (1) (e) the purpose of this document is to set out:

- How many representations were made on the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) in accordance with Regulation 28 (2) and
- A summary of the main issues raised in those representations.

1.4 The Regulation 30 (d) Statement of Consultation published by the Council alongside the Core Strategy in August 2009 provides details of the consultation carried out during preparation of the Core Strategy DPD, including who was consulted; how they were consulted; a summary of the main issues raised; and how those issues have been addressed.

2.0 The Representation Period

2.1 The Core Strategy, associated main proposed submission documents and other relevant documents were published on Thursday 27th August 2009. Representations were invited over an eight-week period, closing on Friday 23rd October 2009, in accordance with Regulations 27 and 28.

3.0 How many representations were received?

3.1 A total of 473 duly made representations were received from 126 respondents. Of these, 269 were objections, 119 were in support and 85 expressed no preference or were general comments.

3.2 Appendix 1 is a breakdown of duly made representations received in plan order. Representer references (for example rep 1.1) quoted in this report relate to the main issue as summarised and should be cross-referenced with the Appendix in order to identify the relevant representors and issues they may have made with respect to tests of soundness.

4.0 Summary of the Main Issues Raised in the Representations

4.1 Set out below is a summary of the main issues raised. It starts with comments received from 4NW (the regional leaders' forum with responsibility for planning for the North West of England) and Government Office for the North West (GONW), followed by general comments applicable to the whole document. It then provides a summary of the comments received in respect of each policy chapter of the Core Strategy and finally other supporting main submission documents.

Conformity with Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Response from GONW

4.2 The designated regional planning body for the North West of England (4NW) assesses consultations on DPDs to confirm whether or not they are in 'general conformity' with the adopted RSS. The current statutory RSS for the North West is the North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021. 4NW (rep 23) is of the view that the South Lakeland Core Strategy is in general conformity with RSS. However, they have commented on areas where consistency with RSS or clarity could be improved.

4.3 The Government Office for the North West (GONW) (rep 33) supports the Core Strategy as a whole, believing it to be an appropriate response to the district's needs, which does not raise any significant concerns as regards regional or national planning policy. However, they have made some representations relating to matters that would benefit from clarification or explanation. Whilst they impinge on soundness (in relation to policies CS6.3, CS7.2 and CS8.7) they consider that they can be dealt with by minor amendments and overall do not undermine the soundness of the document.

General Comments

4.4 A number of general representations were received. The following main issues from these are outlined below:

- Clarity over how Parish Plans would be taken into account (rep 39.1).
- Lack of reference to potential Lake District National Park boundary changes (reps 43 and 48.1).
- Suggestions about how the Council should be engaging with its partners in terms of decision-making and determining aims and objectives (reps 69.1-4).
- Lack of belief from some house builders that the Council has effectively engaged with private-sector house builders in the development of housing policy (rep 123.1).
- Concern that the views of residents and, in some cases, Parish Councils have not been taken into account (e.g. reps 16, 44.1, 49.1 and 130.1) and that information relating to population and housing stock is inaccurate.
- Criticism was made with regard to the over-complexity of the document in terms of methods of written communication and also the lack of evidence of engagement with hard to reach groups (rep 75).

Section 1 Introduction/ Key Issues, Strategic Objectives and Vision

4.5 Only a small number of representations received related to Section 1 of the document. The following main issues were raised in relation to Section 1:

- A separate key issue is required relating to improving existing tourism facilities and accommodation, encouraging new tourism facilities and accommodation and economic objectives should also cover the importance of tourism (reps 76.2 and 76.3).
- General support from Cumbria Wildlife Trust to the protection and enhancement of the quality environment and especially ecosystem services and green infrastructure (reps 25.1 and 25.2).
- Challenges to whether the strategic objectives will be met, particularly in the case of Kendal, and whether they are sensitive to the unique selling points of the district and are responsive to its key issues (rep 92.1).
- A view that the spatial portrait does not go far enough in emphasising the strong socio-economic linkages with Barrow and Lancaster (rep 113.3).
- Concerns regarding the vision for improvements to the A590 in view of the need to encourage more sustainable transport modes (The National Trust rep 106.1).
- A challenge relating to the robustness of some of the strategic objectives, believing them to be aspirational and, in some instances, undeliverable (Kendal Town Council rep 99.2).
- Support from The North West Development Agency (NWDA) to the vision and strategic objectives, although there is need for greater emphasis on developing Ulverston and Furness tourism appeal and also a rewording of economic objectives towards strengthening and diversifying the local economy (reps 61.2 and 61.3).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.1) suggest a number of minor amendments in respect of park-and-ride and coach parking to reflect the findings of the Kendal Transport Assessment and, more generally, with regard to accessibility to reflect wording in Cumbria local transport plan policy LD5.

Section 2 – The Development Strategy for South Lakeland

Policy CS1.1 Sustainable Development Principles

4.6 Few representations were received in respect to this policy; of those received the following main issues were raised:

- Support from Cumbria Wildlife Trust (rep 25.3), Environment Agency (rep 52.1) and others such as Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.1) and The National Trust (rep 106.2).
- Concerns that the sustainable development principles, particularly in relation to enhancing and safeguarding the natural and built environment, do not harmonise with the level of development proposed (rep 39.5).
- Suggestions made by Kendal Town Council that the principles could be more specific (rep 99.3).
- Questions were raised regarding the purpose of the policy and how much weight it adds to the strategic objectives (NWDA rep 61.4).
- A view that closer linkage with CS1.2 is required (Cumbria County Council rep 129.2).

Policy CS1.2 The Development Strategy

4.7 A significant proportion of all representations received related to policy CS1.2. The following is a summary of the main issues raised in relation to this policy:

- General support from the Highways Agency (rep 77.3), Environment Agency (rep 52.2), The Lake District National Park (rep 74.2) and The National Trust (rep 106.3).
- Support for directing the majority of new development to Ulverston and Kendal, although the policy should include a further circumstance in which new development will be allowed in the open countryside, i.e., when it provides significant new tourism assets (NWDA rep 61.5).
- A belief that rural infrastructure is inadequate to meet current needs and this must be addressed before allowing any large-scale new development (reps 13 and 14).
- Concerns that the policy is not going far enough to reduce CO₂ emissions, and that development should be restricted to Key Service Centres (rep 55, this also relates to policy CS1.1).
- Questions were raised regarding the evidence to support the overall district housing requirements and advising that this should be monitored continuously (rep 83.2).
- Greater flexibility is required in the apportionment of new development between settlements to ensure that there is no shortfall in the district-wide housing requirements if development constraints hinder deliverability in some areas (rep 107.1).
- Some house builders (rep 53.2) do not believe that the distribution of the housing is properly justified either by reference to land availability to the function of settlements or by comparison of existing population to target population.
- Some house builders (reps 123.2-123.6) advocate a different approach to how the spatial development strategy should be devised, suggesting a revised settlement hierarchy and the idea of functional areas. Housing development should be redistributed across this revised settlement hierarchy based on the concept of functional areas. These representations also relate to CS2 and CS3.1, CS4 and CS5.
- Some house builders (rep 123.2) believe that Milnthorpe/Ackenthaite should be identified as a Key Service Centre and Heversham/Leasgill should be classed as a Local Service Centre and a consistent list of rural settlements is required.
- A belief that the policy needs to reflect more closely the wording of RSS policy with respect to meeting previously developed land targets (NWDA rep 61.5).
- Explicit reference is required relating to how likely the 50% previously developed land target over the plan period will be achieved. If unlikely, as could be implied by current predictions of potential supply, then consideration may need to be given to the release of more greenfield land (4NW rep 23.4 and Cumbria County Council rep 129.3). These representations also relate to policy CS2, CS3.1, CS3.2, CS4, CS5, CS6.1 and CS6.6.
- In context of the above, 4NW (rep 23.8) suggests that it would be useful to show the broad locations where the release of greenfield land will be necessary to deliver the level of housing and employment development required over the plan period. Cumbria County Council (rep 129.3) believes that an indication of the broad locations of growth to support the delivery of the level of housing and employment development required over the plan period is necessary and that without this the policy is ineffective. These representations also relate to policy CS2, CS3.1, CS3.2, CS4 and CS5.
- General concerns were raised regarding the negative impacts of developing green field land and some respondents questioned the evidence base showing why such land is required (reps 5, 10.3, 20.1, 20.2 and 60.1).
- Many concerns were raised relating to the scale of growth proposed in different service centres, taking the growth figures contained in the table on page 75 as matter of fact.

Most of these were made by members of the public in relation to Storth/Sandside believing the settlement is inappropriate for the expansion implied in the table on page 75, largely due to infrastructure constraints, lack of facilities, the impact on AONB and that it should not be classified as a local service centre (reps 7, 27, 44.1-44.3, 46, 47.2, 50.1-50.3, 59.1 and 59.2 amongst others). These representations should also be reflected against policy CS5 and CS6.1.

- A belief that the definition of Local Service Centre classification relating to access to public transport does not reflect that contained in the RSS (rep 85.1).
- Concerns that the housing allocation is too high for Cartmel (rep 83.4) and Holme (Holme Parish Council rep 116.1 and 116.2).
- Concerns were raised regarding the levels of development in Arnside (The National Trust rep 106.7).
- A belief that the employment land allocation for the Key Service Centres cannot be achieved within the actual centres, particularly in and around Kendal, without needing to use a freestanding site some distance from the centre and its immediate surrounding area (Cumbria Vision rep 95.1 and Eden and South Lakeland Delivery Board rep 96.1).
- General support from many respondents to the strategy for promoting the rural economy (for example rep 91).
- Concerns raised by Friends of the Lake District that, without a robust district-wide landscape character assessment, the policy couldn't be delivered or monitored (rep 101.2).
- Some support for a lowering of the scale of development proposed for Kendal in view of the existing inadequate highways infrastructure (rep 11, 18.4, 60.1, 60.2 and rep 94). These representations should also be reflected against policy CS2.

Section 3 – Area Strategies

4.8 Below is a summary of the main issues raised in relation to the area strategy policies (CS2, CS3.1, CS3.2, CS4 and CS5). Many of the representations made against policy CS1.2 also relate to the area strategy policies and, where this is the case, they have not been repeated below.

- In overview, GONW accepts the logic of the spatial strategies for each part of the district (rep 33.5).

Policy CS2 Kendal Area Strategy

4.9 A fairly high proportion of respondents made representations to this policy. The main issues raised were:

- The area strategy should support the provision of a strategic network of recycling centres around Kendal to reduce the need to travel through Kendal (rep 1.1-1.4). This representation also relates to policy CS5, CS8.9 and CS10.1.
- A belief that the area strategy does not go far enough with respect to minimising air pollution (rep 18.2).
- 4NW (rep 23.11) considered that it would be useful if the Core Strategy or Implementation Plan provided more detail on delivery of the development and mitigation strategy regarding transport improvements in Kendal.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.4) provided some detailed comments regarding the implementation of travel plans, endorsement of a number of recommendations made in the Kendal Transport Assessment and how these will need to be considered in

determining where new development should be located. Reference is made to the need for an amendment to reflect the fact that the County Council will not be funding the optimisation of traffic lights in order to allow development to occur.

- Cumbria Wildlife Trust (rep 25.5) supports the statement that alternatives to canal restoration in Kendal will be considered should the potential negative impact on the River Kent Special Area for Conservation not be mitigated against.
- Environment Agency (rep 52.3) is supportive of the policy alongside NWDA (rep 61.6).
- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.3) believe that the employment allocation for Kendal should be reduced to protect settlement character and landscape quality.
- Many respondents were supportive of the policy for Kendal Canal Head, but questions were raised regarding whether the vision for the area is likely to be fully realised (rep 10.8).
- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.4 and 99.5) raised a number of issues regarding the potential negative impacts of the scale of development proposed for the town and does not believe safeguards against harm to the setting and landscape qualities as outlined in the policy will be fully realised. It also questioned the extent to which the policy relating to developer contributions toward sustainable transport modes will be delivered.
- A view that the policy could be strengthened to ensure that areas of high landscape value and high ecological value are protected (rep 71).
- A belief that the Strategy needs to stress the importance of working with the Lake District National Park Authority (LDNPA) to bring forward potential sites for employment within Kendal as there are a number which fall just outside the South Lakeland LDF area, within the National Park (rep 120.2).
- Further explanation of how the Kendal Sports Village will be realised is required (NWDA rep 61.6).
- Reference is required to support the relocation of the existing Household Waste Recycling Centre from Kendal Canal Head to the site next to Kendal Fell Quarry (LDNPA rep 74.4 and Cumbria County Council rep 129.4).
- Some respondents believe that the proposed transport policy for Kendal is ineffective (reps 18.1, 10.9 and 54), some suggest greater support for park and ride schemes (reps 38.2 and 39.4) and others support the need for a northern bypass (rep 54).
- The Highways Agency (rep 77.1) would like the policy reworded to reflect the existing guidance for transport assessments more closely.

Section 4 – Spatial Strategy for Ulverston

Policy CS3.1 Ulverston and Furness Area

4.10 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS3.1:

- General support from the Environment Agency (rep 52.4) and others (e.g. reps 24 and 102.2).
- A view that Ulverston Canal Head should be the preferred location for new development, and not the use of greenfield land in Ulverston (rep 15.1).
- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.4) believe that the employment allocation for Ulverston and Furness should be reduced to protect settlement character and landscape quality.
- Concerns were raised by Barrow Borough Council (rep 100) with regard to how the scale and type of housing proposed for the Ulverston and Furness area will support the realisation of a wider strategic objective for regeneration in Barrow-in-Furness.

- A belief that the policy should state that the future development of the Canal Head and Corridor area is for a mix of uses and not an employment area, in order for consistency with CS3.2 (GSK Ulverston rep 97.2).
- A view that the closure of GSK needs to be stressed more in the policy (rep 126), whilst GSK themselves would like any reference to GSK withdrawing from Ulverston deleted from the policy and supporting text (rep 97.1).
- A view that not enough focus is placed on developing new tourism opportunities or support for the rural economy in accordance with policy CS7.4 (NWDA rep 61.7).
- A feeling that there is not a clear strategy in relation to transport improvements and how flood risk will be mitigated (rep 126).
- Concerns regarding the lack of statutory weight attached to the Canal Head masterplan (rep 126).

Policy CS3.2 Ulverston Canal Head and Corridor

4.11 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS3.2:

- Some consider that this area is more suitable for development than using greenfield land in Ulverston (rep 15.2).
- Pennington Parish Council (rep 58) feels that the area is more suitable for leisure facilities and housing should be avoided on account of flood risk.
- Support from Cumbria Wildlife Trust (rep 25.8) regarding the enhancement of biodiversity at Ulverston canal head/corridor site.
- Environment Agency supports the policy (rep 52.5).
- A view that leisure opportunity should be seen as key to delivering regeneration to the area (The National Trust rep 106.4).
- That partnership working should be used to provide advice and guidance to steer delivery of development and not necessarily to fund and deliver directly as is implied in the policy (NWDA rep 61.8).

Section 5 Spatial Strategy for Cartmel Peninsula

Policy CS4 – Cartmel Peninsula

4.12 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS4:

- Priority in Grange over Sands should be given to the provision of a new bridge over the promenade and demolition of Berners swimming pool (rep 19.3).
- Some house builders (rep 53.5) state that the absence of a specific housing target figure for Grange over Sands, as a Key Service Centre, is unacceptable.
- A belief that further research is necessary to ascertain the likely affects of new development on congestion in Grange over Sands' town centre and to prove that there is clear evidence of local housing need, alongside more evidence of how local bus provision will be improved and how infrastructure improvements will be funded and delivered (reps 73 and 89.3-89.6 and Grange Town Council 108.3-108.8).
- A suggestion that greater reference to the distinctiveness of Cartmel is needed in the vision and supporting text (The National Trust rep 106.5).
- The area strategy should reflect emerging Shoreline Management Plan 2 with regard to future planning of coastal defence lines (rep 76.5).
- A belief that the policy should be expanded to include reference to enhancing existing tourism accommodation and facilities (rep 76.4).

- Some said that new housing is not required in Grange over Sands (reps 19.1, 62 and 89.1) and others questioned why more is needed considering the number of empty properties (rep 19.3).
- A lack of evidence of any infrastructure plan to meet the needs associated with Grange over Sands (Grange Town Council reps 108.1 and 108.2 and others such as rep 89.1).

Section 6 – Spatial Strategy for the East (including Milnthorpe and Kirkby Lonsdale)

Policy CS5 The East (including Milnthorpe and Kirkby Lonsdale)

4.13 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS5:

- Some house builders (rep 53.6) suggest that the definition of the East Area Strategy should be redrawn in order to allow locations close to Kendal (the majority of the area covered in the north western part of the East Area) to be included in the definition of the Kendal area strategy. This representation also relates to policy CS2.
- Some house builders would like a clear commitment in the policy to the need to use land on the edge of Milnthorpe and Kirkby Lonsdale for economic development (rep 53.6).
- Stronger acknowledgement of the existing AONB Management Plan and that it will be used to assess individual planning applications in the AONB is required (The National Trust rep 106.6).
- A view that the strategy does not reflect the evidence of the Levens Parish Plan particularly regarding housing need (rep 16).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.7) requires clarity with respect to what threshold/size of development will trigger the need for developer contributions to improve accessibility as stated in paragraph 6.30.

Core Policies

Section 7 – Housing

Policy CS6.1 Meeting the Housing Requirement

4.14 A large proportion of representations received related to the distribution of housing development at the settlement level. Some of these representations are reflected against policy CS1.2 and are not repeated below. A summary of the main issues relating to this policy is given below:

- Challenges to the district-wide housing requirements have been made. Some respondents believe that it should reflect previous RSS target of 265 dwellings per annum, reasoning that this reflects viability factors (rep 18.5), whereas others feel the requirement is based on guesswork (rep 43, 83.2 and 84.1) or does not factor into account the amount of empty homes and second homes (rep 39.10).
- A number of house builders (rep 123.7) believe that the existing housing shortfall against RSS requirements should only be made up over the period up to 2021 and consequently changes need to be made to how housing will be phased.
- 4NW (reps 23.12 and 23.13) has made reference to improving consistency with RSS policy L4. The supporting text or implementation plan should refer to how the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be used to develop land supply management.

- A number of respondents made representations relating to the table on page 75. Some questioned the accuracy of the calculations relating to housing stock (rep 85.1-85.2). Many of these representations relate to those made against policy CS1.2 regarding Sandside/Storth. Others believe the figures relating to a number of LSCs in the East area are arbitrary and unsupported by evidence (rep 130.1 and 130.2).
- A suggestion was made for the table to include only the overall Key Service Centre and Local Service Centre grouped targets, adding that more debate is required before targets can be set for each KSC and LSC (The National Trust rep 106.7).
- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.20) stressed that a district-wide landscape character assessment is needed to inform such figures, together with greater evidence regarding the amount of available Category 1 SHLAA sites in each settlement.
- A belief that reference to deliverable and developable sites is premature in advance of a full site assessment and consequently this distinction should be removed (rep 107.4).
- Greater clarity is sought regarding the provision made in relation to sporadic developments outside Key Service Centres (rep 124.1).
- Kendal Town Council is supportive of monitoring rates of growth in tandem with delivery of infrastructure (rep 99.6).
- NWDA (rep 61.11) said that there was a lack of consideration of housing clearance, adding that even if this is not an issue, how it had been taken into account needed to be explained.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.8) feels that the policy needs to link more closely with the findings of SHMA and the impact of development on services, especially schools, needs to be appropriately considered.

Policy CS6.2 Dwelling Mix and Type

4.15 Few representations were received on this policy; the following main issues were raised:

- A need for the policy to be more specific about the type of houses that will be required (rep 53.7).
- Some house builders said that reference to lifetime homes should be deleted as the Code for Sustainable Homes requirements is a national matter rather than for the Core Strategy to consider (reps 53.7, and 125.1). These issues also relate to policy CS7.7.
- Concerns and issues from some house builders regarding the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and its robustness (125.1).

Policy CS6.3 Provision of Affordable Housing/Local Occupancy Housing

4.16 A large number of representations were received on this policy. Overall, there were mixed levels of support for the proposed affordable and local occupancy housing requirements. The following main issues were raised:

- Cumbria Rural Housing Trust gave general support for the prioritisation of meeting affordable housing need (rep 110.2 and rep 83.6).
- Some respondents believe the level of affordable housing should not be reduced on the basis of viability and that local occupancy housing should be provided where it is required (rep 39.9).
- Grange Town Council believes that the 35% requirement for affordable housing on large sites in Grange over Sands is too low (rep 108.9 and rep 89.8).

- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.7) supports the 35% affordable housing requirement,; but raised concerns about the looseness of the policy as worded and its repercussions for delivering what should be seen as priority, i.e. local needs housing.
- Some house builders (reps 53.3, 53.4, 125) and others have challenged the deliverability of the policy relating to affordable housing considering it to be unviable and unjustified. They stressed that the viability evidence used to inform the policy is not robust and credible due to it relating only to the release of green field sites. One house builder (rep 125.2) would like the policy to be reworded to state that where there are financial viability issues there will be allowance for percentage requirements for affordable housing to be adjusted downwards.
- Some house builders believe that affordable housing requirements should be restricted to schemes of 15 dwellings or more (rep 125.2).
- A number of house builders (reps 53.3-53.6,123.3-123.7), believe that the proposed social rented target requirements will not be delivered and cannot be justified. This view is echoed in rep 107.2 with respect to Ulverston and Furness.
- One view is that affordability needs to be judged in terms of site specifics and therefore a policy that sets specific percentages is inappropriate (rep 124.2).
- One suggestion is that all new housing in a Local Service Centre should be restricted to local occupancy and that the main proportion of new housing in a Key Service Centre and Principal Service Centre should be local occupancy in order to ensure that local need is met (Friends of the Lake District rep 101.6).
- Some house builders said local occupancy should relate only to affordable housing and reference to tenure should be removed (rep 123.3-123.6), whilst other house builders questioned the need for any local occupancy housing in the Furness area (rep 53.4).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.9) would like to see greater justification in the exploratory text regarding the reasoning for the local occupancy requirements outside Key Service Centres and greater clarity over what types of 1-2 bedroom schemes will be subject to such requirements.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.9) stressed it would be useful for the policy to cross-reference the Appendix regarding the operation of the affordable housing mechanism.
- GONW (rep 33.1) believes that the policy needs to be backed up by an evidence-based justification to show why it is needed with respect to a local occupancy requirement and, if possible, that experience has demonstrated that it can work beneficially.

Policy CS6.4 Rural Exception Policy

4.17 Very few representations were received on this policy. The following main issues were raised:

- Some house builders believe that the requirement to obtain support from local people or parish councils would hinder the delivery of rural exception schemes (rep 53.9).
- A need for the inclusion of criteria which would prevent identifying land adjacent to any rural exception site as appropriate for infill or rounding off and also criteria for limiting the size of exception sites (rep 81.3).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.10) would like the policy (second bullet point) to make direct reference to the findings of the SHMA as a source of evidence of housing need.

Policy CS6.5 – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

4.18 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS6.5:

- Criteria could be more positive in addressing the needs of the users of the site, as well as reducing negative impacts (4NW reps 23.15 and 23.16).
- Questions were raised regarding the evidence in the assessment and whether this has underestimated the level of need (rep 121.2).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.11) stressed that the policy needs to be split in two, distinguishing between the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and those of Travelling Showpeople and that specific reference to the Cumbria Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment is required, along with further criteria that require developments to be located where services are accessible by sustainable modes of transport.

Policy CS6.6 Making Effective and Efficient Use of Land and Buildings

4.19 Very few representations were made regarding this policy. The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS6.6:

- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.8) and others (e.g. Friends of the Lake District rep 101.7) support the policy.
- NWDA (rep 61.12) would like the policy to reflect the exact wording of RSS policy.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.12) is supportive of the variations of densities for different locations.

Section 8 – Jobs, Skills and Regeneration

Policy CS7.1 Meeting the Employment Requirement

4.20 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS7.1:

- Advice is required in the supporting text on the amount of greenfield land required for development and the mechanisms for a phased release (4NW reps 23.1-23.19 and Cumbria County Council rep 129.13).
- The policy should make reference to office development needing to be focused in accord with RSS policy W3 and national guidance (4NW reps 23.17-19 and Cumbria County Council rep 129.13).
- Some suggestions were made regarding the need to improve the clarity of the policy in respect to provision of a 5-year supply of employment land (rep 35).
- A clearer deliverable strategy is needed to enable the step change to the local economy as envisaged (rep 90.1). These representations also relate to policy CS7.2.
- Friends of the Lake District (rep101.8) believe that the employment allocation for the district should be reduced to protect settlement character and landscape quality.
- Some concerns were raised that the policy may result in only small-scale development that may not satisfy the needs of all employers particularly in areas that are sequentially less preferable (rep 107.9).
- NWDA is supportive of the policy (rep 61.13).

Policy CS7.2 Type of Employment Land Required and Sectoral Split

4.21 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS7.2:

- 4NW (reps 23.18 and 23.20-23.22) suggested a need for further clarity with respect to where the strategic employment sites in Kendal and Ulverston are. If these are Kendal

AAP and Ulverston Canal Head and Corridor these should be cross referenced, if not, ideally the Core Strategy should show broad locations or at least provide a robust set of criteria by which the sites will be identified in future Development Plan Documents. This would also apply to the proposed science and business parks if they are likely to be strategic in nature.

- GONW (rep 33.2) questioned whether the Core Strategy is delegating too much to the Allocations of Land DPD with respect to identification of employment land across the district. It suggested that further evidential justification might be necessary. It is hoped that pointing to site availability in the appropriate settlements would be sufficient.
- Questions were raised regarding the lack of empirical evidence to justify the overall sectoral split as proposed (Cumbria Vision rep 95.2 and Eden and South Lakeland Delivery Board rep 96.2).
- Cumbria Vision (rep 95.2) raised concerns about the implementation of this policy, particularly with regard to identifying the required unconstrained developable land in Kendal.
- NWDA (rep 61.14) suggested that, in view of the Employment Land Premises Study being updated, it might be more appropriate for the table to be put in the supporting text rather than the policy.

Policy CS7.3 Education and Skills

4.22 Very few representations were received on this policy. Kendal Town Council (rep 99.11) believes that the focus of the policy should be on protecting/maintaining and, where necessary, restoring existing services.

Policy CS7.4 Rural Economy

4.23 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS7.4:

- General support is given to this policy (Friends of the Lake District rep 101.9, The National Trust rep 106.8 and NWDA rep 61.15). However, some concern was raised regarding how effective the policy will be in protecting the countryside against inappropriate business-led development (rep 114.1).
- A belief that priority should not necessarily be given to the use of existing sites, which have on-site mains service facilities (rep 124.3).

Policy CS7.5 – Town Centre and Retail Strategy

4.24 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS7.5:

- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.9) suggest the policy should restrict new out-of-centre development to two storeys only, with underground parking.
- One respondent (reps 8 and 29) believes the retail strategy to be flawed in that it is seeking to support a lower order shopping provision in the district to meet a higher order shopping need and they believe this is unlikely to succeed, consequently the strategy should be aiming to support further retail development in Kendal as opposed to Grange over Sands and Milnthorpe.

Policy CS7.6 – Tourism Development

4.25 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS7.6:

- Support has been given to this policy by The National Trust (rep 106.9), NWDA (rep 61.16) and others (e.g. rep 104.2).
- 4NW (rep 23.23) believes that consistency with RSS policy W7 is required to recognise the need to promote eco-tourism in areas of high natural value.
- Reference to working with neighbouring authorities through the Morecambe Bay Regional Park or Bay Programme to promote the Bay area is needed (rep 113.4).
- Lack of reference in the policy for explicit support for proposals that aim to improve existing holiday parks (rep 76.6).

Policy CS7.7 Opportunities Provided by Energy and the Low Carbon Economy

4.26 The following main issues were raised in relation to CS7.7:

- A number of representations raised issue with how the policy should be supporting the use of wind energy. Some give no support (rep 39.8), others believe that the policy for renewable energy should, as priority, support the use of wind energy both on-shore and off-shore, however, this is not implicit in the policy as there is no reference to on-shore wind energy (reps 92.2 and 80.1), whereas others believe that the policy should refer to offshore wind energy only (rep 83.5).
- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.10) believes the policy is undeliverable in the absence of a district-wide landscape character assessment and higher priority must be given to the need to protect landscape character. It suggested that a separate on-shore wind energy policy is developed.
- 4NW (rep 23.24) welcomed reference to contributing to the renewable energy targets in RSS policy EM17 and the Environment Agency supports the policy (rep 52.6).
- GONW (rep 33.3) stated that the policy should make clear the status of the existing joint Wind Energy Supplementary Planning Document, i.e. that it will be used in the determination of planning applications.
- A view is that the policy does not sufficiently support the development of a low carbon economy in its entirety (rep 111).
- NWDA (rep 61.17) believes that, as worded, the policy is not fully consistent with Planning Policy Statement 22. It suggested that the penultimate paragraph in CS8.7 is incorporated into the policy and that the final paragraph in policy CS7.7 is more suited to inclusion in supporting policy text.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.16) would like to see a more balanced policy on how it deals with the harmful effects on environment features.

Section 9 – Quality Environment

Policy CS8.1 Green Infrastructure

4.27 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.1:

- There was general support for the policy from, for example, Cumbria Wildlife Trust (rep 25.11), Environment Agency (rep 52.7), Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.11) and The National Trust (rep 106.11).
- Reference is needed to the Morecambe Bay Regional Park or Bay Programme (Morecambe Bay Partnership rep 113.2).

- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.17) would like the policy to make specific reference to the protection of the historic environment and have links to the policy for the coast and the development of a regional park for Morecambe Bay.

Policy CS8.2 Protection and Enhancement of Landscape and Settlement Character

4.28 A few representations were received on this policy. The following main issues were raised:

- General support for the policy from, for example, The National Trust (rep 106.12) and Kendal Town Council (rep 99.15).
- One view is that the policy regarding green gaps should reflect exactly the current wording contained in South Lakeland local plan policy C2 (rep 18.3).
- Green Gaps should also allow for deployment of renewable energy (rep 80.2).
- A belief that support should not be given to the policy until a district-wide landscape character assessment has been undertaken (Friends of the Lake District rep 101.12).
- The current clear presumption against development in green gaps should remain and existing green gap boundaries should be maintained (Friends of the Lake District rep 101.12).
- Concerns were raised about the effectiveness of this policy (Kendal Civic Society rep 10.6).
- A belief that the policy needs to make clear that greenfield development should be accommodated in a manner sensitive to the landscape setting of settlements and their relationship with the surrounding countryside (rep 81.4).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.18) views the policy as ineffective, saying that it needs to refer to Cumbria Landscape Character Assessments which define landscape types, not landscape areas and should also refer to the emerging Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit.

Policy CS8.3a Accessing Open Space, Sport and Recreation

4.29 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.3a:

- Some house builders state that the policy is undeliverable as it is not clear how it will be implemented particularly with respect to improvements (rep 53.11).
- Support from Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.13).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.19) believe that Natural England standards should be reflected in the policy and further clarity is needed with respect to how natural/semi natural greenspace is defined in terms of area and quality.

Policy CS8.3b Quantity of Open Space, Sport and Recreation

4.30 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.3b:

- Some house builders stated that the policy is undeliverable as it is not clear how it will be implemented; it is considered aspirational in nature and needs a clearer delivery mechanism (rep 53.12).
- Cumbria Wildlife Trust has raised issues with regard to the lack of reference in the policy to the district's biodiversity resource and the Cumbria Biodiversity Evidence Base (rep 25.12).
- Some house builders believe that the types of open space requirements should refer to playing pitches, children's play areas and amenity space only and that minimum

thresholds should be set, depending on the type of open space requirement and the size and nature of scheme (rep 125.3).

Policy CS8.4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

4.31 A number of representations were made regarding this policy. The following main issues were raised:

- General support is given to this policy from, for example, the Environment Agency (rep 52.8), Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.14) and The National Trust (rep 106.13).
- Cumbria Wildlife Trust (rep 25.6) supports the statement that biodiversity must be safeguarded both within and outside protected sites.
- Reference to local biodiversity evidence is required in order to reflect provisions of RSS policy EM1 (B) (4NW rep 23.25).
- Cumbria Wildlife Trust raised many issues, believing that protection for international biodiversity designations should not be included in the Core Strategy as they have their own legislation. Rather, this policy should be an opportunity to offer support for those areas of biodiversity importance that do not enjoy such a high level of protection, such as County Wildlife Sites. This representation also relates to the area strategy policies CS2, CS3.1, CS3.2, CS4 and CS5 (see reps 25.6-25.10).
- Cumbria County Council (129.20) raised many detailed issues regarding how the effectiveness of the policy could be improved. These included the need for the policy to make explicit the need to restore and enhance biodiversity and identify those biodiversity and geodiversity resources it seeks to protect. Concerns have been raised that the policy goes against Habitats Regulations Assessments: as written, the policy would allow harm to designated sites. Cross-reference is needed to the Cumbria Biodiversity Evidence Base and the role of UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and the Cumbria Biodiversity Action Plan.

Policy CS8.5 Coast

4.32 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.5:

- General support is given to this policy from, for example, the Environment Agency (rep 52.9), Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.15) and The National Trust (rep 106.14).
- GONW (rep 33.6) stressed the need to include reference to the Shoreline Management Plan as a material consideration to which the Core Strategy will seek to align planning policy. It is not clear whether the policy is making reference to this document in the last 'bullet point'.
- One view is that the policy needs to include greater reference to the role of the Morecambe Bay partnership, the European Marine Site and the Marine Bill (rep 113.1). Cumbria County Council (rep 129.21) believes that reference should also be made to the need to link with the Marine Management Organisation in due course and to any Marine Management Plan that may emerge covering the SLDC administrative area.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.21) stressed that it should not be seen as the sole body responsible for coastal management; others, such as the Environment Agency, play a similar role.
- The policy should make explicit that it aims to hold and maintain the existing coastal defence line (rep 76.7).

Policy CS8.6 Historic Environment

4.33 Few representations were received on this policy:

- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.16) and The National Trust (rep 106.15) support the policy.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.22) made issue with the lack of reference to archaeology and therefore considered the policy not to be in accord with draft Planning Policy Statement 15.
- One respondent believes that the policy is too restrictive (rep 124.5).

Policy CS8.7 Sustainable Construction, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

4.34 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.7:

- The Environment Agency is supportive of this policy (rep 52.10) as is The National Trust (rep 106.16) amongst others (rep 119.3).
- Some respondents believe the policy is rather aspirational, (e.g. Kendal Town Council rep 99.17).
- 4NW (rep 23.26) considers that the policy needs to go further to reflect provisions of RSS policy EM18. It is not clear whether the policy as currently worded is meant to reflect EM18. There should be a commitment in the Core Strategy to setting South Lakeland specific targets in a future DPD.
- The policy needs to be more proactive to delivering renewable energy (rep 31.2).
- Some house builders (rep 53.13) raised issue over the implications of costs associated with requirement for the use of materials from a sustainable local source in new development; the policy should be modified to say 'where reasonably possible'. Also the Core Strategy should reflect national standards in respect of code for sustainable homes.
- A view is that the policy should be deleted as it replicates national planning policy (rep 125.4).

Policy CS8.8 Development and Flood Risk

4.35 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.8:

- The Environment Agency expressed support for this policy (rep 52.11), as did The National Trust (rep 106.17).
- It is suggested that: more evidence is needed with regard to the likely scale of flood risk in the Cartmel Peninsula and Ulverston areas; and the policy is not effective enough in terms of promoting essential flood mitigation measures (rep 92.3).
- A belief that additional policy text is required to ensure that, in the case of existing holiday parks that require a waterside setting, only the extent of the new development site and not the whole site, will be sequentially and otherwise considered (rep 76.8).
- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.18) raised concerns regarding potential implications that the policy may have on the health and wellbeing of residents where flood risk occurs.

Policy CS8.9 Minerals and Waste

4.36 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS8.9:

- The Environment Agency (rep 52.12) and the Coal Authority (rep 3) support this policy.

- Reference should be made in the policy to the appropriate relocation of the existing Kendal Household Waste Recycling Centre at Kendal Canal Head (LDNPA rep 74.4 and Cumbria County Council rep 129.24).
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.24) felt that more explanation is needed with regard to how minerals will be safeguarded and that reference should be made to the mineral safeguarding areas on the County Council's minerals and waste adopted proposals map and how this is represented at a district level.
- The Coal Authority (rep 3) suggest that future changes to the Proposals map relating to the need to show identified minerals safeguarding areas that may arise out of Cumbria County Council's Minerals and Waste Development Framework will be required.

Policy CS8.10 Design

4.36 Very few representations were received on this policy. The following main issues were raised:

- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.17) and The National Trust (rep 106.18) support this policy.
- A feeling was expressed that the policy will not deliver what it is set out to do, particularly with regard to protection of the historic environment (rep 10.10)
- Cumbria Constabulary (rep 68.1) stressed the importance of the need for a policy that will help to 'Design out Crime' and reduce antisocial activity.

Section 10 – Health and Wellbeing

Policy CS9.1 Social and Community Infrastructure

4.37 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS9.1:

- The Theatres Trust (rep 64.2) and Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.18) have given support to this policy.
- Concerns were raised over how the proposed social and community infrastructure improvements will be achieved (rep 45.2 amongst others).
- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.19) raised concern regarding the effectiveness of SLDC's partnership working with the Primary Care Trust and Social Services, in preventing loss of community facilities, and feel that developer contributions may not be substantial.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.25) believes that this policy needs to make reference to the building of residential care homes and extra care housing.

Policy CS9.2 Developer Contributions

4.38 A number of representations were received on this policy. The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS9.2:

- The Environment Agency is supportive (rep 52.13) and The Theatres Trust (rep 64.3) and Cumbria Wildlife Trust (rep 25.14) specifically support the inclusion of biodiversity in the list of developer contributions.
- Many respondents (for example rep 45.3) expressed concern over how the proposed infrastructure improvements set out in this policy will be achieved and whether they will meet the needs of local people, in particular Storth and Sandside but this also relates to

Grange over Sands (rep 89.9) and Kendal (Kendal Town Council rep 99.5). These representations relate to policy CS5, CS4 and CS2 respectively.

- There is belief amongst house builders and others that the policy does not have a clear delivery mechanism, i.e. it is not clear what contributions are expected and therefore it is undeliverable. Its implications in terms of potential costs to developers will only hinder further the delivery of required housing needs (reps 53.14 and 95.3, 96.3 and 125.5).
- Grange Town Council (rep 108.10) suggests that an alternative policy is needed to address infrastructure delivery requirements.
- It is necessary to commit to the production of supplementary planning guidance in order to help deliver and implement the policy effectively (rep 120.3 and Cumbria County Council rep 129.26).
- Cumbria Constabulary (rep 68.2) would like to see a more pronounced use of section 106 in respect to addressing Community Safety and Crime Prevention issues.
- Cumbria County Council (rep 129.26) suggest that the policy should consider the need for developer contributions to prepare and oversee the implementation of Travel Plans.

Section 11 Accessing Services

Policy CS10.1 Accessing services

4.39 The following main issues were raised in relation to CS10.1:

- Many respondents expressed concern about how the proposed service and infrastructure improvements will be achieved and whether they will meet the needs of different communities in South Lakeland, in particular Sandside and Storth (for example rep 45.2, 48.3, Grange Town Council rep 108, Kendal Town Council rep 99.20). These representations also relate to policy CS10.2.
- The Highways Agency (rep 77.4) stressed that it will need to be involved in any evidence base for improvements to the A590.
- The National Trust (rep 106.19) would like to see the policy regarding improvements to A590 restricted to allowing only those that result in improving highway safety and journey reliability.
- The policy should recognise the need for car-based accessibility for tourism uses, particularly for those located in remote areas (rep 76.9)
- There is a lack of emphasis on the use of rail travel as a primary means of public transport. A joined up strategy that includes exploring options for the re-opening of rail stations should be included in the policy and those areas with rail links should be the main targets for development (rep 84.4).

Policy CS10.2 Transport Impact of New Development

4.40 The following main issues were raised in relation to policy CS10.2:

- Friends of the Lake District (rep 101.19) and The National Trust (rep 106.20) support the policy.
- 4NW (rep 23.27) stressed that, in order to improve consistency with RSS, reference should be made to adopted/emerging RSS policy car parking standards.
- The Highways Agency (rep 77.2) and Cumbria County Council (rep 129.28) would like the policy amended with respect to where travel plans are required to reflect more closely existing national planning guidance.

- Kendal Town Council (rep 99.21) believes that much work needs to be done to ensure that development can be accommodated using the existing road network and that it will not cause adverse impact to air quality.

4.41 The remaining part of this document relates to representations made against either the Core Strategy appendices, policy omissions or supporting documents/evidence base.

Appendices

Monitoring and Implementation Framework

4.42 4NW (rep 23.11) considered that it would be useful if the Core Strategy or Implementation Plan provided more detail on delivery of the development and mitigation strategy regarding transport improvements in Kendal. It also (reps 23.12 and 23.13) made reference to improving consistency with RSS policy L4. The supporting text or implementation plan should refer to how the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will be used to develop land supply management.

Appendix C

4.43 One respondent said that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should have considered all those sites that may have been suggested through the Allocations of Land DPD consultation (rep 109).

Appendix D

4.44 Suggestions have been made for amendments to definitions and implementation of local occupancy clauses (rep 83.8).

Omissions (policies not included/topics that are not included)

4.45 A request for inclusion of a criteria-based policy to deal with a firm prison proposal, should it arise during the plan period (rep 22).

Supporting Documents

Infrastructure Report

4.46 The Environment Agency (rep 52.14) supports the approach taken by SLDC in the preparation of this report. Early engagement was initiated by SLDC and overall the Environment Agency is satisfied that its input has been incorporated into the report.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment

4.47 Some house builders raised concern regarding the robustness and methodology used to prepare the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (rep 123.1).

APPENDIX 1

Breakdown of Representations in Plan Order

APPENDIX 1

Guide to abbreviations

GENERAL General Comments	CS6.5 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	CS8.5 Coast
WHOLE Whole document	CS6.6 Making effective and efficient use of land and buildings	CS8.6 Historic Environment
INTRO Section 1 Introduction (where a representation relates only to a specific paragraph number/chapter heading this is included)	CS7.1 Meeting the employment requirement	CS8.7 Sustainable construction, energy efficiency and renewable energy
CS1.1 Sustainable Development Principles	CS7.2 Type of employment land required and sectoral split	CS8.8 Development and flood risk
CS1.2 The Development Strategy	CS7.3 Education and skills	CS8.9 Minerals and waste
CS2 Kendal area Strategy	CS7.4 Rural economy	CS8.10 Design
CS3.1 Ulverston and Furness area Strategy	CS7.5 Town Centre and Retail Strategy	CS9.1 Social and community infrastructure
CS3.2 Ulverston Canal Head and Corridor	CS7.6 Tourism Development	CS9.2 Developer contributions
CS4 Cartmel Peninsula area Strategy	CS7.7 Opportunities provided by energy and the low carbon economy	CS10.1 Accessing Services
CS5 The East area Strategy	CS8.1 Green Infrastructure	CS10.2 Transport impact of new development
CS6.1 Meeting the housing requirement	CS8.2 Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character	APP C Appendix C Evidence Base
CS6.2 Dwelling mix and type	CS8.3a Accessing open space, sport and recreation	APP D Appendix D Monitoring and Implementation Framework
CS6.3 Provision of affordable housing/local occupancy housing	CS8.3b Quantity of open space, sport and recreation	OMI Omissions – reference to representations requesting new policy
CS6.4 Rural exception policy	CS8.4 Biodiversity and geodiversity	

Section: Part of Core Strategy to which the representation relates.

Representor Ref: Database representor reference/index reference.

Name: Name of the person who made representation including those acting on behalf of a representor.

Test of Soundness: Test of soundness to which representation relates.

LC = Legally compliant

NLC = Not legally compliant

S = Sound

US = Unsound but no test given

US1 = Unsound = Not justified

US2 = Unsound = Not effective

US3 = Unsound = Not consistent with national policy

NA = Not relevant / Not answered

Comment Type: **OBJ** = Objection

SUP = Support

GEN = General comments neither support or object

Comment Number: Unique PINS reference number: In the format A/B/C/D. A and B are taken from the database

A = Consultee/Representor ID

B = Representation number/ID

C = Part of Core Strategy to which representation relates

D = Test of Soundness – reason for being unsound where applicable

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
General		5 Jennifer Cramer	NA	OBJ	2321/2695/General/-
General		41 Beetham Parish Council, Jessica Harvey	NA	SUP	1209/2809/General/-
General		42 Yorkshire Forward, John Pilgrim	NA	GEN	474/2806/General/-
General		43 Diane Meakin	NA	GEN	1868/3111/General/-
General		48.1 Martin Purdy	LC, US2	OBJ	1863/3026/General/U2
General		52.15 EnvironmentAgency	LC, S	SUP	551/2833/General/S
General		53.1 Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	US2	OBJ	3930/2834/General/U2
General		56 Thelma Aldridge	LC, S	SUP	2276/3033/General/S
General		57 Lancaster City Council	NA	GEN	1290/3021/General/-
General		61.1 NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3139/General/-
General		65.3 Network Rail	NA	GEN	3955/3040/General/-
General		74.1 Lake District National Park Authority	NA	GEN	2639/3157/General/-
General		75 Joanna Greenway	NA	GEN	2356/2964/General/-
General		76.1 Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	NA	GEN	587/3044/General/-
General		77.3 Highways Agency	NA	GEN	469/3036/General/-
General		92.1 Mr D Aikman	US1, US2	OBJ	3787/2942/General/U1-U2
General		99.1 Kendal Town Council	NA	GEN	1109/3118/General/-
General		99.10 Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3127/General/-
General		103 Mono Consultants Ltd	NA	GEN	463/2982/General/-
General		119.1 National Farmers Union, Helen Little	NA	GEN	1725/2975/General/-
General		120.1 Kendal Futures Board, Peter Hensman	NA	GEN	1187/3115/General/-
General		121.1 South Lakeland District Council LSP, Judith Quigley	NA	GEN	635/2996/General/-
Whole		6 Donald Smalley	LC, S	SUP	2346/2701/Whole/S

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
Whole		9 New Hutton Parish Council	LC, S	SUP	3905/2706/Whole/S
Whole		12 Paul Beavan	LC, S	SUP	2853/2713/Whole/S
Whole		16 Peter Jackson	NLC, US1, US2	OBJ	3911/2719/Whole/LC-U1-U2
Whole		21 Gary Stone	LC, S	SUP	3200/2720/Whole/S
Whole		23.14 NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2737/Whole/S
Whole		26 Mr R Johnston	LC, S	SUP	824/2734/Whole/S
Whole		28 Geoffrey Allsebrook	LC, S	SUP	3799/2766/Whole/S
Whole		33.4 Government Office for the North West	S	SUP	193/2896/Whole/-
Whole		39.1 Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2815/Whole/U
Whole		47.1 Michael and Ann Simpson	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	2477/2810/Whole/LC-U1-U2-U3
Whole		88 Lucy MacDonald	NA	SUP	617/2951/Whole/-
Whole		98 United Utilities	LC, S	GEN	502/2950/Whole/S
Whole		112 Preston Patrick Parish Council, Lesley Winter	S	SUP	123/2993/Whole/-
Whole		123.1 Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	US	OBJ	3960/3163/Whole/U
Intro		4.1 RSPB	NA	GEN	1201/2691/Intro/-
Intro		4.2 RSPB	LC, S	SUP	1201/2692/Intro/S
Intro		25.1 Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2767/Intro/S
Intro		25.2 Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/5768/Intro/S
Intro		38.1 Richard Sheriff Jones	US2	OBJ	990/2796/Intro/U2
Intro		39.3 Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2818/Intro/U
Intro		48.2 Martin Purdy	LC, US2	OBJ	1863/3027/Intro/U2
Intro		61.2 NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3140/Intro/-

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
Intro	61.3	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3141/Intro/-
Intro	76.2	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	587/3045/Intro/U1-U2
Intro	76.3	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	587/3046/Intro/U1-U2-U3
Intro	83.2	John Evans	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	1099/2916/Intro/U1-U2
Intro	84.1	Phillip Hine	US1, US2	OBJ	1680/2914/Intro/U1-U2
Intro	99.2	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3119/Intro/-
Intro	106.1	The National Trust	LC, US1	OBJ	578/3091/Intro/U1
Intro	113.4	Morecambe Bay Partnership, Sussanah Bleakley	NA	GEN	311/2992/Intro/-
Intro	129.1	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3178/Intro/S
CS1.1	23.2	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2738/CS1.1/S
CS1.1	23.8	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2744/CS1.1/-
CS1.1	25.3	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2769/CS1.1/S
CS1.1	39.5	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2821/CS1.1/U
CS1.1	52.1	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2733/CS1.1/S
CS1.1	55.1	Ralph Sutton	US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1619/2839/CS1.1/U1-U2-U3
CS1.1	61.4	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3142/CS1.1/-
CS1.1	62	David Strawbridge	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	2730/2868/CS1.1/U1-U2
CS1.1	89.2	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2869/CS1.1/U1-U2
CS1.1	99.3	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3120/CS1.1/-
CS1.1	101.1	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3071/CS1.1/S
CS1.1	106.2	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3092/CS1.1/S
CS1.1	108.1	Grange Town Council Robert Cass	US1, US2	OBJ	3935/2884/CS1.1/U1-U2
CS1.1	129.2	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3179/CS1.1/S
CS1.2	7	Stanley & Catherine Matthews	NLC, US1,US2, US3	OBJ	3889/2703/CS1.2/LC-1-2-3

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS1.2	10.1	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2850/CS1.2/U1-U2
CS1.2	10.3	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2852/CS1.2/U1-U2
CS1.2	11.1	Kevin Lasbury	US	OBJ	1191/2707/CS1.2/U
CS1.2	13	Kathleen Procter	NLC,US2	OBJ	3210/2714/CS1.2/LC-U2
CS1.2	14	Brian Bond	NLC,US2	OBJ	3909/2715/CS1.2/LC-U2
CS1.2	19.1	Valerie Jones	US1	OBJ	3499/2728/CS1.2/U1
CS1.2	20.1	John and June Wilkinson	US1, US2	OBJ	1653/2727/CS1.2/U1-U2
CS1.2	23.3	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2739/CS1.2/S
CS1.2	23.4	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2740/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	27	Robert and Andrea Harvey	LC, US1, US2, US3	SUP	1341/2735/CS1.2/U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	33.5	Government Office for the North West	S	SUP	193/2897/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	36	Michael & Marie Judith Booth	NLC	OBJ	3927/2801/CS1.2/LC
CS1.2	37	M Wilson	NA	OBJ	2887/2802/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	39.2	Dianne Dey	NA	GEN	1774/2816/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	39.6	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2822/CS1.2/U
CS1.2	44.1	Irene Parsons	NLC, US	OBJ	2772/2935/CS1.2/LC-U
CS1.2	45.1	Margaret Nicholson	US1	OBJ	2215/2900/CS1.2/U1
CS1.2	46.1	Richard Bamber	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3937/2905/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	47.2	Michael and Ann Simpson	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	2477/2894/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	49.1	Gordon Henry Maddicks	US2	OBJ	3939/2909/CS1.2/U1
CS1.2	50.1	Raymond Newton	NLC, US1, US3	OBJ	2483/2911/CS1.2/LC-U1-U3
CS1.2	51	Jean Oliver	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3943/2938/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	52.2	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2805/CS1.2/S
CS1.2	53.2	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1	OBJ	3930/2835/CS1.2/U1
CS1.2	55.2	Ralph Sutton	US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1619/2979/CS1.2/U1-U2-U3

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS1.2	59.1	Jennifer Moreton	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	2585/2994/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	60.1	Stephen and Gill Longhurst	US1	OBJ	2007/2862/CS1.2/U1
CS1.2	61.5	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3143/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	66.1	Phillipa Stafford	NLC, US1	OBJ	3956/3059/CS1.2/LC-U1
CS1.2	67.1	Stephen and Helen Wray	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3957/3061/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	70.2	Jane Tagney	NLC, US1, US2	OBJ	3919/3113/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2
CS1.2	74.2	Lake District National Park Authority	NA	GEN	2639/3158/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	78.1	Mr and Mrs C Matthews	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3889/3065/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	78.3	Mr and Mrs C Matthews	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3889/3067/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	78.5	Mr and Mrs C Matthews	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3889/3069/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	79	Barbra Street	US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3953/3030/CS1.2/U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	81.1	Christopher Patching	LC, US3	OBJ	2045/3022/CS1.2/U3
CS1.2	81.2	Christopher Patching	LC, US3	OBJ	2045/3023/CS1.2/U3
CS1.2	85.2	Gregory Tagney	NLC, US1, US3	OBJ	3933/2932/CS6.1/LC-U1-U3
CS1.2	87.1	Chris and Lorraine Bell	US1	OBJ	3945/2952/CS1.2/U1
CS1.2	89.1	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2764/CS1.2/U1-U2
CS1.2	91	Cumbria Rural Enterprise Agency	LC, S	SUP	8/2940/CS1.2/S
CS1.2	93.1	Roger Pickup	NLC, US	OBJ	2501/3041/CS1.2/LC-U
CS1.2	95.1	Cumbria Vision	LC, US	OBJ	1017/2958/CS1.2/U
CS1.2	96.1	Eden & South Lakeland Delivery Board	LC, US	OBJ	3947/2961/CS1.2/U
CS1.2	101.2	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3072/CS1.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	102.1	Higham & Co on behalf of Mr F Philipson	NA	SUP	71/3003/CS1.2/-

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS1.2	105	Higham&Co on behalf of Midtown Farm, Little Urswick	NA	SUP	3951/3005/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	106.3	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3093/CS1.2/S
CS1.2	107.1	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	NA	GEN	3952/3007/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	108.2	Grange Town Council Robert Cass	US1, US2	OBJ	3935/2885/CS1.2/U1-U2
CS1.2	110.1	Cumbria Rural Housing Trust, Judith Derbyshire	LC,S	SUP	245/2984/CS1.2/S
CS1.2	114.1	South Lakelanders Opposed to Gateway (SLOG), Drusilla Gabbot Pickthall	NA	OBJ	3944/2985/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	115.1	Mr Gorton	NA	OBJ	3950/3001/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	116.1	Holme Parish Council, C.Hayton	NA	OBJ	104/2990/CS1.2/-
CS1.2	117	Brenda Tidmarsh, Stephen	NLC, US3	OBJ	2424/3063/CS1.2/LC-U3
CS1.2	118.1	Allan Pentecost	NLC,US1	OBJ	3925/3057/CS1.2/LC-U1
CS1.2	123.2	Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3960/3164/CS1.2/U1-U2-U3
CS1.2	129.3	Cumbria County Council	LC, US2	OBJ	3569/3180/CS1.2/U2
CS1.2	130.1	Allan Steward	US	OBJ	2558/3176/CS1.2/U
CS2	1.1	David DeRycke	US2	OBJ	2755/2686/CS2/U2
CS2	10.11	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2860/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	10.2	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2851/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	10.4	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2853/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	10.7	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2856/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	10.8	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2857/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	10.9	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2858/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	11.2	Kevin Lasbury	US	OBJ	1191/2708/CS2/U

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS2	18.1	Kentrigg West Action Group - Derek Whitmore	LC, US1	OBJ	3913/2721/CS2/U1
CS2	18.2	Kentrigg West Action Group - Derek Whitmore	LC, US1	OBJ	3913/2722/CS2/U1
CS2	18.4	Kentrigg West Action Group - Derek Whitmore	LC, US1	OBJ	3913/2724/CS2/U1
CS2	23.11	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2747/CS2/-
CS2	23.5	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2741/CS2/-
CS2	23.9	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2745/CS2/-
CS2	25.4	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, US3	OBJ	545/2770/CS2/U3
CS2	25.5	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2771/CS2/S
CS2	25.6	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2772/CS2/S
CS2	38.2	Richard Sheriff Jones	US2	OBJ	990/2797/CS2/U2
CS2	39.4	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2819/CS2/U
CS2	52.3	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2807/CS2/S
CS2	53.3	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2836/CS2/U1-U2
CS2	54	Kenneth Gibson	US2	OBJ	1322/2861/CS2/U2
CS2	60.2	Stephen and Gill Longhurst	US1	OBJ	2007/2971/CS2/U1
CS2	61.6	NWDA	NA	SUP	1024/3144/CS2/-
CS2	69.1	Cyril Henderson	NA	GEN	1133/3053/CS2/-
CS2	71	Geoff Thompson	US2	OBJ	1015/3062/CS2/U2
CS2	72	British Waterways	LC, S	SUP	3948/2978/CS2/S
CS2	77.1	Highways Agency	US3	OBJ	469/3034/CS2/U3
CS2	94	John Lowther	NA	OBJ	1458/3018/CS2/-
CS2	99.4	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3121/CS2/-
CS2	99.5	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3122/CS2/-
CS2	101.3	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3073/CS2/LC-U1-U2-U3

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS2	120.2	Kendal Futures Board, Peter Hensman	NA	GEN	1187/3116/CS2/-
CS2	122	Signet Planning on behalf of Gilbert Gilkes and Gordon Ltd	NA	GEN	3607/2968/CS2/-
CS2	123.3	Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3960/3165/CS2/U1-U2-U3
CS2	129.4	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3181/CS2/S
CS3.1	15.1	Avril Viney	NA	GEN	1891/2716/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	23.6	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2742/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	23.10	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2746/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	24	HOW Planning LLP	NA	SUP	3809/2765/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	25.7	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, US3	OBJ	545/2773/CS3.1/U3
CS3.1	52.4	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2808/CS3.1/S
CS3.1	53.4	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2837/CS3.1/U1-U2
CS3.1	61.7	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3145/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	69.2	Cyril Henderson	NA	GEN	1133/3054/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	97.1	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of GSK (at Ulverston)	LC, US1	OBJ	2577/2969/CS3.1/U1
CS3.1	100	Barrow Borough Council	US	OBJ	3949/3000/CS3.1/U
CS3.1	101.4	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3074/CS3.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS3.1	102.2	Higham & Co on behalf of Mr F Philipson	NA	SUP	71/3004/CS3.1/-
CS3.1	107.2	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US	OBJ	3952/3008/CS3.1/U

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS3.1	123.4	Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3960/3166/CS3.1/U1-U2-U3
CS3.1	126	Councillor Mark Wilson (Ulverston East)	US1	OBJ	2677/3162/CS3.1/U1
CS3.1	129.5	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3182/CS3.1/S
CS3.2	15.2	Avril Viney	NA	GEN	1891/2717/CS3.2/-
CS3.2	25.8	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2774/CS3.2/S
CS3.2	52.5	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2812/CS3.2/S
CS3.2	58	Pennington Parish Council	LC, US2	OBJ	122/3006/CS3.2/U2
CS3.2	61.8	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3146/CS3.2/-
CS3.2	97.2	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of GSK (at Ulverston)	LC, US1	OBJ	2577/2970/CS3.2/U1
CS3.2	106.4	The National Trust	LC, US	OBJ	578/3094/CS3.2/U
CS4	19.2	Valerie Jones	US1	OBJ	3499/2736/CS4/-
CS4	25.9	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, US3	OBJ	545/2775/CS4/U3
CS4	30	Hugh & Brenda Edwards	LC, S	SUP	2910/2789/CS4/S
CS4	32	Thomas and Doreen Rhodes	LC, S	SUP	2994/2795/CS4/S
CS4	53.5	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2838/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	61.9	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3147/CS4/-
CS4	65.1	Network Rail	NA	GEN	3955/3038/CS4/-
CS4	69.3	Cyril Henderson	NA	GEN	1133/3055/CS4/-
CS4	73	Grange Civic Society	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3936/2899/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	76.4	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	587/3047/CS4/U1-U2

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS4	76.5	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US2	OBJ	587/3048/CS4/U2
CS4	83.1	John Evans	LC, S	SUP	1099/2915/CS4/S
CS4	83.3	John Evans	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	1099/2917/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	89.3	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2870/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	89.4	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2871/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	89.5	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2873/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	89.6	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2874/CS4/U1-U2
CS4	106.5	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3095/CS4/S
CS4	107.3	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US	OBJ	3952/3010/CS4/U1
CS4	108.3	Grange Town Council, Robert Cass	US2	OBJ	3935/2886/CS4/U2
CS4	108.4	Grange Town Council, Robert Cass	US1	OBJ	3935/2887/CS4/U1
CS4	108.5	Grange Town Council, Robert Cass	US2	OBJ	3935/2888/CS4/U2
CS4	108.6	Grange Town Council, Robert Cass	US2	OBJ	3935/2889/CS4/U2
CS4	108.7	Grange Town Council, Robert Cass	US2	OBJ	3935/2890/CS4/U2
CS4	123.5	Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3960/3168/CS4/U1-U2-U3
CS4	129.6	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3183/CS4/S
CS5	1.2	David DeRycke	US2	OBJ	2755/2687/CS5/U2
CS5	4.3	RSPB	NA	GEN	1201/2693/CS5/-

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS5	25.1	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, US3	OBJ	545/2776/CS5/U3
CS5	34.2	Kenneth & Ann Johnson	US1, US3	OBJ	3926/2799/CS5/U1-U3
CS5	40	Heversham Parish Council, Jacqueline Davidson	LC, US1	OBJ	3920/2793/CS5/U1
CS5	53.6	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2841/CS5/U1-U2
CS5	61.10	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3148/CS5/-
CS5	69.4	Cyril Henderson	NA	GEN	1133/3056/CS5/-
CS5	70.1	Jane Tagney	NLC, US1, US3	OBJ	3919/2908/CS5/LC-U1-U3
CS5	84.2	Phillip Hine	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1680/2925/CS5/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS5	84.3	Phillip Hine	US2, US3	OBJ	1680/2926/CS5/U2-U3
CS5	86.1	Peter Standing	NLC, US2	OBJ	3940/2934/CS5/LC-U2
CS5	106.6	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3096/CS5/S
CS5	116.2	Holme Parish Council, C.Hayton	NA	OBJ	104/2991/CS5/-
CS5	123.6	Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3960/3169/CS5/U1-U2-U3
CS5	129.7	Cumbria County Council	LC,S	SUP	3569/3184/CS5/S
CS5.1	104.1	Lake District Estates Co Ltd, Peter Hensman	NA	SUP	588/2980/CS5/-
CS6.1	18.5	Kentrigg West Action Group, Derek Whitmore	LC, US1	OBJ	3913/2725/CS6.1/U1
CS6.1	19.2	Valerie Jones	US1	OBJ	3499/2729/CS6.1/U1
CS6.1	20.2	John and June Wilkinson	US1, US2	OBJ	1653/2730/CS6.1/U1-U2
CS6.1	23.12	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2748/CS6.1/S
CS6.1	23.13	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2749/CS6.1/-
CS6.1	34.1	Kenneth & Ann Johnson	US1, US3	OBJ	3926/2798/CS6.1/U1-U3

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS6.1	39.10	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2827/CS6.1/U
CS6.1	44.2	Irene Parsons	NLC, US	OBJ	2772/2936/CS6.1/LC-U
CS6.1	46.2	Richard Bamber	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3937/2906/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	47.3	Michael and Ann Simpson	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	2477/2895/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	49.2	Gordon Henry Maddicks	US2	OBJ	3939/2910/CS6.1/U1
CS6.1	50.2	Raymond Newton	NLC, US1, US3	OBJ	2483/2912/CS6.1/LC-U1-U3
CS6.1	59.2	Jennifer Moreton	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	2585/2995/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	61.11	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3150/CS6.1/-
CS6.1	66.2	Phillipa Stafford	NLC, US1	OBJ	3956/3060/CS6.1/LC-U1
CS6.1	67.2	Stephen and Helen Wray	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3957/3112/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	70.3	Jane Tagney	NLC, US1, US2	OBJ	3919/3114/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2
CS6.1	78.2	Mr S and Mrs C Matthews	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3889/3066/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	78.4	Mr S and Mrs C Matthews	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3889/3068/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	78.6	Mr S and Mrs C Matthews	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3889/3070/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	83.4	John Evans	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	1099/2918/CS6.1/U1-U2
CS6.1	85.1	Gregory Tagney	NLC, US1, US3	OBJ	3933/2932/CS6.1/LC-U1-U3
CS6.1	87.2	Chris and Lorraine Bell	US1	OBJ	3945/2953/CS6.1/U1
CS6.1	89.7	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2875/CS6.1/U1-U2
CS6.1	93.2	Roger Pickup	NLC, US	OBJ	2501/3042/CS6.1/LC-U
CS6.1	99.6	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3123/CS6.1/-
CS6.1	101.20	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3090/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	106.7	The National Trust	LC, US1, US3	OBJ	578/3097/CS6.1/U1-U3
CS6.1	107.4	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US	OBJ	3952/3011/CS6.1/U

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS6.1	108.8	Grange Town Council Robert Cass	US2	OBJ	3935/2891/CS6.1/U2
CS6.1	115.2	Mr Gorton	NA	OBJ	3950/3002/CS6.1/-
CS6.1	118.2	Allan Pentecost	NLC, US1	OBJ	3925/3058/CS6.1/LC-U1
CS6.1	123.7	Garner Planning on behalf of Story Group, Russell Armer Ltd, Applethwaite Ltd, Robert Hughes and Briery Homes Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3960/3170/CS6.1/U1-U2-U3
CS6.1	124.1	Country Land and Business Association - Helen Lancaster	US3	OBJ	229/2872/CS6.1/U3
CS6.1	129.8	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3186/CS6.1/S
CS6.1	130.2	Allan Steward	US	OBJ	2558/3177/CS6.1/U
CS6.2	53.7	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3930/2842/CS6.2/U1-U2-U3
CS6.2	83.6	John Evans	LC, S	SUP	1099/2921/CS6.2/S
CS6.2	89.8	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2876/CS6.2/U1-U2
CS6.2	101.5	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3075/CS6.2/S
CS6.2	107.5	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US	OBJ	3952/3012/CS6.2/U
CS6.2	108.9	Grange Town Council, Robert Cass	US1, US2	OBJ	3935/2892/CS6.2/U1-U2
CS6.2	125.1	Garner Planning Associates on behalf of Story Group	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3895/3171/CS6.2/U1-U2-U3
CS6.3	23.14	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2750/CS6.3/-
CS6.3	33.1	Government Office for the North West	LC, US1	OBJ	193/2790/CS6.3/U1
CS6.3	39.9	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2826/CS6.3/U
CS6.3	53.8	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3930/2843/CS6.3/U1-U2-U3

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS6.3	99.7	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3124/CS6.3/-
CS6.3	101.6	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3076/CS6.3/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.3	107.6	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US1	OBJ	3952/3013/CS6.3/U1
CS6.3	107.7	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US1	OBJ	3952/3014/CS6.3/U
CS6.3	110.2	Cumbria Rural Housing Trust, Judith Derbyshire	LC,S	SUP	245/3009/CS6.3/S
CS6.3	125.2	Garner Planning Associates on behalf of Story Group	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3895/3172/CS6.3/U1-U2-U3
CS6.3	129.9	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3187/CS6.3/S
CS6.4	53.9	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US2	OBJ	3930/2844/CS6.4/U2
CS6.4	74.3	Lake District National Park Authority	NA	GEN	2639/3159/CS6.4/-
CS6.4	81.3	Christopher Patching	LC, US3	OBJ	2045/3024/CS6.4/U3
CS6.4	121.3	South Lakeland District Council LSP, Judith Quigley	NA	GEN	635/2998/CS6.4/-
CS6.4	124.2	Country Land and Business Association, Helen Lancaster	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	229/2878/CS6.4/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS6.4	129.10	Cumbria County Council	LC,S	SUP	3569/3188/CS6.4/S
CS6.5	23.15	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2751/CS6.5/S
CS6.5	23.16	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2752/CS6.5/-
CS6.5	121.2	South Lakeland District Council LSP, Judith Quigley	NA	GEN	635/2997/CS6.5/-
CS6.5	129.11	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3189/CS6.6/S
CS6.6	23.7	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2743/CS6.6/-
CS6.6	53.10	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2845/CS6.6/U1-U2
CS6.6	61.12	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3151/CS6.6/-

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS6.6	99.8	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3125/CS6.6/-
CS6.6	101.7	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3077/CS6.6/S
CS6.6	107.8	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	NA	GEN	3952/3015/CS6.6/-
CS6.6	129.12	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3190/CS6.6/S
CS7.1	23.17	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2753/CS7.1/S
CS7.1	23.19	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2755/CS7.1/-
CS7.1	35	Brian Barden, Barden Planning Consultants	LC, US2	OBJ	2840/2840/CS7.1/U2
CS7.1	61.13	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3152/CS7.1/-
CS7.1	90.1	Indigo Planning on behalf of Store Street Properties Ltd	US2	OBJ	3946/2956/CS7.1/U2
CS7.1	101.8	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3078/CS7.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS7.1	107.9	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	US	OBJ	3952/3016/CS7.1/U
CS7.1	129.13	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3191/CS7.1/S
CS7.2	23.18	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2754/CS7.2/S
CS7.2	23.2	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2756/CS7.2/-
CS7.2	23.21	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2757/CS7.2/S
CS7.2	23.22	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2758/CS7.2/-
CS7.2	33.2	Government Office for the North West	LC, US1	OBJ	193/2791/CS7.2/U1
CS7.2	61.14	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3153/CS7.2/-
CS7.2	90.2	Indigo Planning on behalf of Store Street Properties Ltd	US2	OBJ	3946/2957/CS7.2/U2
CS7.2	95.2	Cumbria Vision	LC, US	OBJ	1017/2959/CS7.2/U
CS7.2	96.2	Eden & South Lakeland Delivery Board	LC, US	OBJ	3947/2962/CS7.2/U
CS7.2	129.14	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3192/CS7.2/S
CS7.3	99.11	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3128/CS7.3/-
CS7.4	61.15	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3154/CS7.4/-

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS7.4	101.9	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3079/CS7.4/S
CS7.4	106.8	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3098/CS7.4/S
CS7.4	114.2	South Lakelanders Opposed to Gateway (SLOG), Drusilla Gabbot Pickthall	NA	OBJ	3944/2986/CS7.4/-
CS7.4	119.2	National Farmers Union, Helen Little	NA	GEN	1725/2976/CS7.4/-
CS7.4	121.4	South Lakeland District Council LSP, Judith Quigley	NA	GEN	635/2999/CS7.4/-
CS7.4	124.3	Country Land and Business Association, Helen Lancaster	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	229/2879/CS7.4/U1-U2
CS7.4	124.4	Country Land and Business Association, Helen Lancaster	LC, S	SUP	229/2880/CS7.4/S
CS7.4	129.15	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3193/CS7.4/S
CS7.5	8	Turley Associates on behalf of Median Developments Ltd	US2	OBJ	3904/2704/CS7.5/U1
CS7.5	29	Turley Associates on behalf of Median Developments Ltd	US1	OBJ	3904/2788/CS7.5/U1
CS7.5	44.3	Irene Parsons	NLC, US	OBJ	2772/2937/CS7.5/LC-U
CS7.5	46.3	Richard Bamber	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3937/2906/CS6.1/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS7.5	50.3	Raymond Newton	NLC, US1,US3	OBJ	2483/2913/CS7.5/LC-U1-U3
CS7.5	64.1	The Theatres Trust	S	SUP	486/2987/CS7.5/-
CS7.5	93.3	Roger Pickup	NLC, US	OBJ	2501/3043/CS7.5/LC-U
CS7.5	99.9	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3126/CS7.5/-
CS7.5	99.12	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3129/CS7.5/-
CS7.6	23.23	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2759/CS7.6/-
CS7.6	39.7	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2823/CS7.6/U
CS7.6	61.16	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3155/CS7.6/-
CS7.6	76.6	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	587/3049/CS7.6/U1-U2-U3

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS7.6	99.13	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3130/CS7.6/-
CS7.6	104.2	Lake District Estates Co Ltd, Peter Hensman	NA	SUP	588/2981/CS7.6/-
CS7.6	106.9	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3099/CS7.6/S
CS7.6	113.2	Morecambe Bay Partnership, Sussanah Bleakley	NA	GEN	311/2973/CS7.6/-
CS7.7	23.24	4NW	LC, S	SUP	3586/2760/CS7.7/S
CS7.7	31.1	EnvirolinkNW	LC, US3	OBJ	3903/2783/CS7.7/U3
CS7.7	39.8	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2825/CS7.7/U
CS7.7	52.6	EnvironmentAgency	LC, S	SUP	551/2813/CS7.7/S
CS7.7	61.17	NWDA	NA	GEN	1024/3156/CS7.7/-
CS7.7	80.1	WhirlwindRenewablesLtd	LC,US3	OBJ	3954/3031/CS7.7/U3
CS7.7	83.5	John Evans	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	1099/2919/CS7.7/U2
CS7.7	92.2	Mr D Aikman	US3	OBJ	3787/2945/CS7.7/U3
CS7.7	101.10	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3080/CS7.7/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS7.7	106.10	The National Trust	LC, US1, US3	OBJ	578/3100/CS7.7/U1-U3
CS7.7	111	Ashford Associates Properties Ltd, John Ashford	US2	OBJ	930/2983/CS7.7/U2
CS7.7	129.16	Cumbria County Council	LC,S	SUP	3569/3194/CS7.7/S
CS8.1	4.4	RSPB	LC, S	SUP	1201/2694/CS8.1/S
CS8.1	10.5	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2854/CS8.1/U1-U2
CS8.1	25.11	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2777/CS8.1/S
CS8.1	52.7	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2814/CS8.1/S
CS8.1	99.14	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3131/CS8.1/-
CS8.1	101.11	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3081/CS8.1/S
CS8.1	106.11	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3101/CS8.1/S
CS8.1	113.3	Morecambe Bay Partnership, Sussanah Bleakley	NA	GEN	311/2974/CS8.1/-

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS8.1	129.17	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3195/CS8.1/S
CS8.2	10.6	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2855/CS8.2/U1-U2
CS8.2	18.3	Kentrigg West Action Group, Derek Whitmore	LC, US1	OBJ	3913/2723/CS8.2/U1
CS8.2	80.2	Whirlwind Renewables Ltd	LC,US3	OBJ	3954/3032/CS8.2/U3
CS8.2	81.4	Christopher Patching	LC, US3	OBJ	2045/3025/CS8.2/U3
CS8.2	82.1	Lancaster City Council	NA	GEN	3570/2965/CS8.2/-
CS8.2	83.7	John Evans	LC, US2	OBJ	1099/2922/CS8.2/U2
CS8.2	99.15	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3132/CS8.2/-
CS8.2	101.12	Friends of the Lake District	NLC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	1974/3082/CS8.2/LC-U1-U2-U3
CS8.2	106.12	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3102/CS8.2/S
CS8.2	129.18	Cumbria County Council	LC,S	SUP	
CS8.3a	53.11	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US2	OBJ	3930/2846/CS8.3a/U2
CS8.3a	101.13	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3083/CS8.3a/S
CS8.3a	129.19	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3196/CS8.3a/S
CS8.3b	53.12	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2847/CS8.3b/U1-U2
CS8.3b	63	Paula Hill	NLC, US3	OBJ	3932/2882/CS8.3b/LC-U3
CS8.3b	125.3	Garner Planning Associates on behalf of Story Group	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3895/3173/CS8.3b/U1-U2-U3
CS8.4	23.25	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2761/CS8.4/-
CS8.4	25.12	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, US3	OBJ	545/2778/CS8.4/U3
CS8.4	25.13	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, US3	OBJ	545/2779/CS8.4/U3
CS8.4	52.8	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2817/CS8.4/S

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS8.4	82.2	Lancaster City Council	NA	GEN	3570/2966/CS8.4/-
CS8.4	99.16	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3133/CS8.4/-
CS8.4	101.14	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3084/CS8.4/S
CS8.4	106.13	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3103/CS8.4/S
CS8.4	129.20	Cumbria County Council	LC, US2	OBJ	3569/3198/CS8.4/U2
CS8.5	33.6	Government Office for the North West	NA	GEN	193/2898/CS8.5/-
CS8.5	39.11	Dianne Dey	US	OBJ	1774/2828/CS8.5/U
CS8.5	52.9	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2820/CS8.5/S
CS8.5	76.7	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	587/3050/CS8.5/U1-U2
CS8.5	101.15	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3085/CS8.5/S
CS8.5	106.14	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3104/CS8.5/S
CS8.5	113.1	Morecambe Bay Partnership, Sussanah Bleakley	NA	GEN	311/2972/CS8.5/-
CS8.5	129.21	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3199/CS8.5/S
CS8.6	82.3	Lancaster City Council	NA	GEN	3570/2967/CS8.6/-
CS8.6	101.16	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3086/CS8.6/S
CS8.6	106.15	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3105/CS8.6/S
CS8.6	124.5	Country Land and Business Association, Helen Lancaster	NLC, US1, US2	OBJ	229/2881/CS8.6/U1-U2
CS8.6	129.22	Cumbria County Council	LC, US3	OBJ	3569/3200/CS8.6/U3
CS8.7	23.26	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2762/CS8.7/-
CS8.7	31.2	Envirolink NW	LC, US2, US3	OBJ	3903/2787/CS8.7/U2-U3
CS8.7	33.3	Government Office for the North West	LC, US2	OBJ	193/2792/CS8.7/U2
CS8.7	52.10	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2824/CS8.7/S

SECTION	RERESNTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS8.7	53.13	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2848/CS8.7/U1-U2
CS8.7	99.17	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3134/CS8.7/-
CS8.7	106.16	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3106/CS8.7/S
CS8.7	119.3	National Farmers Union, Helen Little	NA	GEN	1725/2977/CS8.7/-
CS8.7	125.4	Garner Planning Associates on behalf of Story Group	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3895/3174/CS8.7/U1-U2-U3
CS8.7	129.23	Cumbria County Council	LC,S	SUP	3569/3201/CS8.7/S
CS8.8	52.11	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2829/CS8.8/S
CS8.8	76.8	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US2	OBJ	587/3051/CS8.8/U2
CS8.8	92.3	Mr D Aikman	US2	OBJ	3787/2949/CS8.8/U2
CS8.8	99.18	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3135/CS8.8/-
CS8.8	106.17	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3107/CS8.8/S
CS8.9	1.3	David DeRycke	LC, US2	OBJ	2755/2688/CS8.9/2
CS8.9	3	Coal Authority	LC, S	SUP	3898/2690/CS8.9/S
CS8.9	52.12	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2830/CS8.9/S
CS8.9	65.2	Network Rail	NA	GEN	3955/3039/CS8.9/-
CS8.9	74.4	Lake District National Park Authority	NA	GEN	2639/3160/CS8.9/-
CS8.9	129.24	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3202/CS8.9/S
CS8.10	10.1	Kendal Civic Society	US1, US2	OBJ	290/2859/CS8.10/U1-U2
CS8.10	68.1	Cumbria Constabulary	NA	GEN	235/3019/CS8.10/-
CS8.10	101.17	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3087/CS8.10/S
CS8.10	106.18	The National Trust	LC, S	SUP	578/3108/CS8.10/S
CS9	125.5	Garner Planning Associates on behalf of Story Group	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3895/3175/CS9.2/U1-U2-U3

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS9.1	45.2	Margaret Nicholson	US1	OBJ	2215/2901/CS9.1/U1
CS9.1	64.2	The Theatres Trust	S	SUP	486/2988/CS9.1/-
CS9.1	99.19	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3136/CS9.1/-
CS9.1	101.18	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3088/CS9.1/S
CS9.1	107.10	Coates Associates on behalf of Holker Estates	NA	GEN	3952/3017/CS9.1/-
CS9.1	129.25	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3203/CS9.1/S
CS9.2	25.14	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	LC, S	SUP	545/2780/CS9.2/S
CS9.2	45.3	Margaret Nicholson	US1	OBJ	2215/2902/CS9.2/U1
CS9.2	52.13	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2831/CS9.2/S
CS9.2	53.14	Barden Planning Consultants on behalf of Applethwaite Ltd, Briery Homes Ltd & Russell Armer Ltd	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	3930/2849/CS9.2/U1-U2
CS9.2	64.3	The Theatres Trust	S	SUP	486/2989/CS9.2/-
CS9.2	68.2	Cumbria Constabulary	NA	GEN	235/3020/CS9.2/-
CS9.2	89.9	Grange Fell Action Group, Sarah Wiseman	US1, US2	OBJ	3916/2877/CS9.2/U1-U2
CS9.2	95.3	Cumbria Vision	LC, US	OBJ	1017/2960/CS9.2/U
CS9.2	96.3	Eden&South Lakeland Delivery Board	LC, US	OBJ	3947/2963/CS9.2/U
CS9.2	108.10	Grange Town Council Robert Cass	US2	OBJ	3935/2893/CS9.2/U2
CS9.2	120.3	Kendal Futures Board, Peter Hensman	NA	GEN	1187/3117/CS9.2/-
CS9.2	125.5	Garner Planning Associates on behalf of Story Group	LC, US1, US2, US3	OBJ	3895/3175/CS9.2/U1-U2-U3
CS9.2	129.26	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3204/CS9.2/S
CS10.1	1.4	David DeRycke	LC, US2	OBJ	2755/2689/CS10.1/2
CS10.1	45.4	Margaret Nicholson	US1	OBJ	2215/2903/CS10.1/U1

SECTION	RERESENTOR REFERENCE	NAME	TEST OF SOUNDNESS	COMMENT TYPE	UNIQUE PINS REFERENCE NUMBER - COMMENT NUMBER
CS10.1	48.3	Martin Purdy	LC, US2	OBJ	1863/3028/CS10.1/U2
CS10.1	76.9	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd	LC, US2, US3	OBJ	587/3052/CS10.1/U1-U2
CS10.1	77.4	Highways Agency	NA	GEN	469/3037/CS10.1/-
CS10.1	84.4	Phillip Hine	US1, US2	OBJ	1680/2928/CS10.1/U1-U2
CS10.1	99.2	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3137/CS10.1/-
CS10.1	106.19	The National Trust	LC, US	OBJ	578/3109/CS10.1/U
CS10.1	129.27	Cumbria County Council	LC, S	SUP	3569/3205/CS10.1/S
CS10.2	23.27	4NW	NA	GEN	3586/2763/CS10.2/-
CS10.2	45.5	Margaret Nicholson	US1	OBJ	2215/2904/CS10.2/U1
CS10.2	48.4	Martin Purdy	LC, US2	OBJ	1863/3029/CS10.2/U2
CS10.2	77.2	Highways Agency	US3	OBJ	469/3035/CS10.2/U3
CS10.2	99.21	Kendal Town Council	NA	OBJ	1109/3138/CS10.2/-
CS10.2	101.19	Friends of the Lake District	LC, S	SUP	1974/3089/CS10.2/S
CS10.2	106.20	The National Trust	LC,S	SUP	578/3110/CS10.2/S
CS10.2	129.28	Cumbria County Council	LC,S	SUP	3569/3206/CS10.2/S
APP C	52.14	Environment Agency	LC, S	SUP	551/2832/Appendix C/S
APP C	109	David Clarke	US2	OBJ	3426/3064/Appendix C/U2
APP D	83.8	John Evans	LC, US1, US2	OBJ	1099/2923/Appendix D/U1-U2
OMI	22	Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of National Offender Management Service	NA	GEN	570/2731/General/-