

From: Allan Steward]

Sent: 25- May- 10 22:27

To: Programme Officer

Cc: DAVID BURROW

Subject: South Lakeland Core Strategy - Inspector's possible changes

Dear Ms. Rayner - Thank you for your letter of 12th May and attachments.

In view of the government's policy re. the Regional Spatial Strategy, see email from Tim Farron below, I'm wondering if you are still seeking comments regarding the possible changes to the SLDC Core Strategy DPD.

If you are, I wish to comment as follows :-

1. Specifically

IPC1 - I assume that this change is wanted because the Inspector considers the original target for housing development on PDL was unrealistic. If such a drastic reappraisal of one of the basics of the scheme is necessary, then the whole strategy is compromised.

IPC3 - Isn't that Barrow's problem? SLDC either has or hasn't got a housing need: Since when was this determined by the ambitions of an adjacent local authority? I just don't see how this relates to the 'soundness' of SLDC's plan. Does Barrow fear that it's people would prefer to live in Ulverston if they could? Are the Ulverston people now going to have to move eastwards to Kendal etc. to make the Barrow regeneration viable? It sounds to me as if there aren't enough people to populate the houses envisaged by the RSS. That is altogether unsound.

IPC4 - A sensible move from the planners' point of view as the "indicative numbers" allocated to each LSC in the SLDC "Submitted Core Strategy" (typically 132 per LSC) was very arbitrary and did not take into account what was environmentally practical and were in some cases contradictory: Arnside was allocated 132, but the first version of the Core Strategy did not identify any land that was suitable. Something more vague may make the document less misleading but the corollary is that the plan ends up so different from what the public was consulted about that the consultation process looks like a con.

IPC5 - The development industry doesn't want to do local/affordable in the attractive and saleable LSC sites, but is willing to accept a proportion of affordable in return for "sole or main occupancy" instead of a local occupancy restriction on some of the non-affordable. By responding with an amended "sole or main occupancy" proposal, SLDC has, in effect, abandoned the "local occupancy" objective. I'm not in a position to know how many houses in LSCs are holiday/second homes, but I doubt if Flookburgh or Holme or even Levens already have a lot of them. In a village with few holiday/second homes this would mean that none of a development would be local occupancy instead of 35% as SLDC proposed, substituting instead, speculative building aimed at incoming retirees etc. from outside SLDC area at the expense of local families of working age.

2. In general

All the IPCs quoted above have two major cumulative effects: Firstly they they require the permanent alienation of even more agricultural land at a time when world demand for food is likely to put pressure on our ability to produce it in Britain. Secondly when other initiatives e.g. the extension of the National Parks will reduce the area in which SLDC has planning jurisdiction, more houses will have to go into a more restricted area with the result that the scale of development will exceed even more the actual needs of the communities on which it is foisted.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Allan Steward

From: "Tim Farron" <tim@timfarron.co.uk>
Date: 24 May 2010 14:52:55 GMT+01:00
To: <
Subject: RE: the dreaded Regional Spatial Strategy

Mr. Allan C Steward

Our Ref: Stew013/3/sa

24 May 2010

Dear Allan

Thank you very much for your email about recent developments regarding the RSS.

I can confirm that the Coalition Agreement includes the abolition of the RSS, and that planning authorities will not be required to continue with the imposition of allocations of new housing. I hope this provides the reassurance you were seeking.

Many thanks for your good wishes and support over the election.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

TIM FARRON MP