



# HEVERSHAM AND HINCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS MADE IN THE  
CONSULTATION ON THE PRE-SUBMISSION DRAFT OF THE PLAN

In the Consultation period on the Pre-Submission Draft, 33 responses were submitted together with a response from South Lakeland District Council(SLDC). These were all published on the website and given individual consideration. The outcome is reflected in the revised Plan which will be submitted to SLDC.

The following table summarises comments made that potentially required amendment to the draft. In some cases, the related comments of several people have been combined in a single item. The table excludes those comments which expressed agreement or support and also those that were general statements of opinion not directly relating to the text. It also excludes simple corrections of fact or linguistic/presentational amendments; these have been picked up in the new draft.

The intention here is to convey the essence of the points made and the responses to them. The detail of the comments is available on the website. The revised draft Plan will be published by SLDC.

Overview	Reference should be made to Greenside House as building of note	Not considered sufficiently special
	Use of CRHT statistics is misleading	Noted and clarified
	Need for broadband should be referenced	Agreed and included
	Connectivity to rail stations not as good as inferred	Agreed and clarified
	Reference should be made to the AONB	Included
	Why should there be development in the buffer zone between national parks?	The statement is not promoting this but describing the fact that the area may be attractive
	Difficult to imagine employment (other than homeworking) without affecting character particularly of Hincaster	Noted - options may emerge and they would need to meet the requirements of the policies
	Promoting development of rural shops/post office etc not practical and, for some, not desirable	The plan does not actively seek to promote such developments. If they were to come forward, they would need to meet the requirements of the policies
	Map to show conservation area and a tree preservation map would be helpful	TPO map not practical. Possibility of including conservation area in map in final version to be explored
	Building houses to encourage commuting is not sound	The plan does not actively encourage it; it describes the reality
Focusing the plan	The communities are not particularly distinctive and the surroundings are not conserved.	“Conserved” was not meant to imply technical conservation status and it is clarified

	Debatable whether there is a strong sense of community in Heversham	Noted – there were also positive statements about the sense of community. The text is not changed
	Avoiding creeping urbansiation and sensitivity to scale of settlements should be emphasised	Text does make this point
	Assertion that “many” people believe that some development is both inevitable and desirable should be quantified	Wording clarified
	Many people may be residents of the parish but have moved in and are not “local” people	Local people was meant to refer simply to the people who live locally. Text clarified
	Without knowing what is to be built where, it is not possible to assess any impact of the vision	The reasons for opting for policies rather than sites are set out in the plan. The decision has been reviewed and confirmed
	The absence of specified sites makes it difficult to decide whether to support the Plan	In the absence of a plan developers would have more freedom about what to propose and where
	If sites are not specified will a developer not assume approval for any site	All developers will need to comply with the policies in relation to any and all sites they may propose
HH1	Requirement to integrate with what exists is a recipe for mundane development and will prevent a grand design like Eversley.	The existing settlements are eclectic and there is wide scope for architectural solutions that integrate. National planning law has specific provision for buildings of exceptional architectural merit.
	Need to emphasis the importance of integration within the existing communities	Agreed and included
	There is a bias towards development which should be removed	This is a requirement of a neighbourhood plan
	The policy says nothing of substance	Noted – others saw it as of value. Text not changed.
	The principles seem sensible but will be hard to adhere to and Hincaster in particular is ill-suited to development because	The principles will become part of the planning process

	of narrow lane and lack of mains services	
	How will a developer demonstrate compliance and to whom?	SLDC is the planning authority and will need to be satisfied about the meeting of the requirements of policies
HH2	Viver Green should result in no further development in Hincaster until after 2025 (at the earliest)	Noted - the main part of the development was approved prior to this plan. The split between Heversham and Hincaster has been removed
	There should be no new housing except possibly conversion of derelict buildings	The Plan has to be consistent with the SLDC Core Strategy and its assessed housing target
	What is the logic of the selected dates	There has to be a start date. The dates reflect the timescale of the development of the Plan and align with local government financial years
	Treatment of dwellings approved prior to Jan 2015 but not complete should be clarified	Noted and clarified
	All new housing should be small and affordable	Noted - the plan seeks a mix. The need for affordable is emphasised
	Local housing need difficult to define and the reference to "clear and quantified evidence... in the two parishes" should be deleted	Agreed and deleted
	Policy seeks to contain scale of housing development; there should be equivalent control on business properties.	Reviewed and its considered that HH4 is sufficient
	How does Viver Green development fit within these provisions	Text clarified to explain
	30 new properties unacceptable and the figure should be 1 per year in Heversham and 1 every other year in Hincaster (wherever possible by reusing existing non-residential buildings)	Noted - the Plan must align with the Core Strategy
	There should be a much larger number of new dwellings in	Noted - this is at odds with the overwhelming majority of those

	Heversham in order to attract young families	who have made their views known
	The split between Heversham and Hincaster seems disproportionate	Split removed
	The policy would appear to allow 6 new houses on a site in 2020 and then a further six in 2021	The Plan limits the scope for such contiguous development
HH3	To meet the demographic time-bomb there should be a retirement complex of say 30 units – meeting the need for older people to downsize and freeing larger family houses	If such a proposal were to come forward and if it met the other relevant policy requirements, it could be considered under HH7
	Integration into existing communities should be a specific policy	Reviewed and the text is felt adequately to make the point
	Need to press for broadband	Noted. Reference made and community objective inserted
	Housing developments should be considered in light of traffic they generate on road network	This point is made in the Plan and reflected in the community objectives
	Employment developments should be subject to the same provisions as housing	It is considered HH4 is adequate
	Up to 6 is too large and imposing. Should be max of 3	Noted - 6 is seen as an appropriate balance between competing views
	Maximum should be 4	Noted - 6 is seen as an appropriate balance between competing views
	Viver Green is a large cluster; how does this fit?	Its approval predates the Plan and this will be clarified
	Would the plan allow two clusters of 5 (for example)	The Plan precludes contiguous developments
	Small developments unlikely to include the essential affordable housing	Noted – hence a new Community Objective 2
	Who judges the extent to which a scheme meets the criteria?	SLDC – text clarified
	Self-build may be a way of promoting a housing mix	Noted and incorporated
	Only developments that are in-fill and rounding off should be considered	The Plan allows for slightly greater flexibility but still limits free standing developments

HH 4	Impose a levy on business to cover reinstatement costs if vacated	Outside the scope of a neighbourhood plan
	Impose cap on number of developments similar to that for housing	Policies seen as providing sufficient safeguard against inappropriate scale of development
HH5	What are the implications of “there is potential for developments.”	This is a statement of the fact that a developer may see opportunities
	Tourism brings no parish benefit and not particularly desirable	The policies in the plan adequately manage development of an appropriate scale
	Farmland should not be allowed to be used for tourism unless evidence that there is not an agricultural use	Outside the scope of a neighbourhood plan
	References to the marsh infer a pre-bias for development and are site specific	Not intended; wording reviewed
HH6	Renewable energy may be acceptable but not fracking	Fracking excluded from text
	This says nothing of significance	Reviewed and felt to be worth leaving in
	Solar farms on ground (as opposed to roofs) should not be allowed	Noted but provisions of policies felt to be sufficient safeguard
HH7	This policy undermines the others. It is not rational or sensible	The policy has been redrafted but the principle is one that is maintained in order to ensure that the Plan enables the vision to be realized in the light of changing circumstances
	Any deviation from the policy should involve the whole community	The Parish Council is the elected body and in practical terms the most appropriate location for any such consideration, providing it meets in public. In Hincaster it would be the Parish Meeting
Community objective 1	Once SLDC have the money they will use it as they wish	It is important that the objective is stated and dialogue maintained
Community objective 2	There are already paths in the churchyard	There is no path connecting the Heversham House gate with the paths to Heversham Head

	Could old railway from Sandside to Hincaster be developed as walking/cycling route	Reflected in text
	The role of Cumbria County Council/SLDC should be made explicit	The wording of the objectives amended to clarify this
Community objective 3	St Peter's is a church, not a venue	The Parochial Church Council have an agreed lettings policy for the Church and it is used for non-religious events
Community objective 4	Specific improvements to parking were suggested	It was decided to keep the objective in general terms
	Roads should not be widened for caravans but caravans should be required to accommodate to existing roads	Noted but it was felt not appropriate to amend text
Community objective 5	755 either through Heversham or proper stops on Prince's Way	Agreed and incorporated in text
	A number of specific improvements to bus services were suggested	It was decided to keep the objective in general terms
General comment on Community Objectives	Not clear what the point of the objectives is, in the sense of who is to do anything about them	Text amended to clarify purpose of the objectives and the focus for action
	Ambiguity about whether Community Objectives are policies.	Wording amended to clarify distinction

### Key Comments made by SLDC

Again, the Key Comments made by SLDC are summarized in the table below. A separate list of some Minor Comments was also received. These minor comments are largely linguistic/typographical/presentational points and have been picked up in the amended draft.

General	Plan must meet basic conditions and provide a Basic conditions statement	Noted and actioned
	Ensure wording is appropriately future proofed	Amendments made
	Consultation statement required	Noted and actioned
3.6	Consider being more explicit about option selection	Amendments made
3.7	Re detail of historic environment could be included	Some additional references inserted

3.9	Need to be clear that community objectives do not compromise planning policies	Amendments made to achieve clarification
HH1A	Consider amending words better to relate to the statutory duty of the relevant legislation	Amended
HH1B	Consider clarifying wording better to convey intention	Amended
HH1C	Consider re-wording not all developments could be expected to do all	Amended
4.5	Consider amending the word “ceiling”	Amended
4.5/HH2	Identifying housing need at very local level is not easy; consider reference to Local Plan targets pro-rata. Justification for phasing needed	Amendments made and additional detail inserted
HH2	Clarify how numbers are arrived at and remove “maximum”	Amendments made and additional detail inserted
	Review separate figures for Heversham and Hincaster	Revised in light of other comments
	Consider flexibility for later phases to pick up initial under delivery	There is provision for this
	Consider greater flexibility if clear evidence of additional need -possibly cross referencing HH7	HH7 could apply if these circumstances were to arise. Specific cross reference to HH7 not required as it applies to all the policies
4.6	Clarify “integrate into footprint”	Amended
4.7	Consider referring to homes generally being unaffordable to local people, especially younger/lower income (not specifically couples)	Amended
HH3	Consider reference to Starter Homes/self-build	Done
HH3A	Consider framing the policy more positively and flexibly – possibly cross referencing HH7	Amended but Specific cross reference to HH7 not required as it applies to all the policies
	Consider clearer phrasing of “cumulative developments’	Amended



HH3B	Consider ref to GPA Note 3 when assessing impact on heritage assets. LVIA is a technical term that cannot be amended to be proportionate	GPA note is a level of detail not required but LVIA reference amended
HH3C	Expecting affordable housing from small developments may not be viable	Noted and hence new community objective
HH3D	Consider focus on mix of housing types to enable local mobility rather than encouraging small(cheaper) homes to become larger (more expensive)	Amendments made
HH3F	Consider more explanation/justification for the approach	Amendments made
	Consider identifying settlements	Not felt appropriate
	Consider how policy avoids coalescence or isolated developments in open countryside	Point is adequately addressed in the text
HH4	Consider clarification that this does not seek to prevent conversions which are within local Plan and national policy (permitted development rights)	Amendments made
HH4 1B	Consider whether size threshold is too restrictive and need to clarify what is “commercial development” or “employment development”	Size threshold retained. References to commercial development removed, the policy relates to any activity which generates employment
HH4 2 & 3	Many of these types of development no longer require planning permission.	Clarified in text
HH4 3	Consider alternative to “Not at odds with”, which is hard to define	Amendments made
	How would agricultural building conversion to residential be dealt with and/or demolition/redevelopment	Already covered by housing development policies
HH5	Consider clarification of wording better to convey intention	Amendments made
HH6	How does this fit with HH1 B?	Clarified by amendment

HH7	This provides welcome flexibility but it may be useful to rephrase it to avoid giving weight of policy to future comments by Parish Council	Amendment to wording
5.1	Important to clarify status (and therefore expression) of Community objectives	Clarified and changes to presentation
5.2/5.3/ Objective 1B	Consider referring to CIL supporting infrastructure including community facilities and adding reference to vision and policies of Plan	Amended
Objective 1C	Hincaster could nominate a larger parish to administer CIL funds or it could be retained by SLDC who would be required to engage with Hincaster on how best to use it	Noted but reference not required in the context of this objective
Appendix 4	Consider listing permissions/completions	Actioned