



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to South Lakeland District Council

by **Simon Berkeley BA MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date 14 November 2013

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED)

SECTION 20

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE SOUTH LAKELAND LOCAL PLAN: LAND ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Document submitted for examination on 31 May 2012

Examination hearings held between 23 and 25 October 2012, 6 and 8 November 2012, 11 and 14 June 2013 and on 18 and 21 June 2013

File Ref: PINS/M0933/429/7

Abbreviations Used in this Report

AA	Appropriate Assessment
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CS	Core Strategy
DPD	Development Plan Document
IDP	Infrastructure Delivery Plan
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LEA	Local Education Authority
MM	Main Modification
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
RS	Regional Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the South Lakeland Local Plan: Land Allocations Development Plan Document provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the District over the next 12 years providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan. The Council has specifically requested that I recommend any modifications necessary to enable them to adopt the Plan.

The modifications, which have all been put forward by the Council, can be generally summarised as follows.

- Ensuring the Special Area of Conservation is properly safeguarded;
- Ensuring that flood risk is properly managed in line with national policy;
- Introducing a local presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- Giving support to self build housing;
- Clarifying the approach to extra care housing;
- Securing a commitment to produce a Local Plan document to properly deal with the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers;
- Deleting allocations where the landowner has not made the land available;
- Clarifying the scope and timescales for Development Briefs;
- Ensuring that sites can and will be accessed safely and deleting those sites that cannot be;
- Ensuring that housing on the village recreation (Willink) field and tennis courts site does not lead to a reduction in the scale or quality of recreational facilities in Burneside;
- Avoiding unjustifiable delay to development that does not cause unacceptable impacts on the waste water network;
- Securing the mitigation of impacts by requiring 'buffer zones', landscaping and other measures;
- Requiring that a land contamination assessment of the land south of Underbarrow Road is undertaken and that any necessary measures are implemented;
- Clarifying the requirements of the Appleby Road and Burton Road Broad Locations;
- Ensuring that the Milnthorpe/Ackenthwaite Green Gap is not undermined by deleting the land at Owlet Ash Fields;
- Allocating additional land for housing in Milnthorpe;
- Preventing adverse impacts on the water quality and flow of Peasey Beck;
- Securing a commitment to produce a Local Plan document to deliver land allocations across the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and
- Modifying the allocation and identification of land for employment around Ulverston canal head to properly reflect the present circumstances and development plan intentions.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the South Lakeland Local Plan: Land Allocations Development Plan Document (hereafter referred to as 'the Plan' and 'the DPD') in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the Plan's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate, in recognition that there is no scope to remedy any failure in this regard. It then considers whether the Plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for my examination is the submitted draft plan dated May 2012.
3. My report deals with the main modifications that are needed to make the Plan sound and legally compliant and they are identified in bold in the report (**MM**). In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should make any modifications needed to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound/not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted. These main modifications are set out in the Appendix. Other changes have also been put forward by the Council. However, these comprise minor or consequential revisions, and factual updates. Whilst generally helpful and to be welcomed, their inclusion in the Plan is not necessary for soundness and I have therefore not referred to them in this report.
4. The main modifications that go to soundness have been subject to public consultation and, where necessary, Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and I have taken the consultation responses into account in writing this report.
5. On 27 March 2012, the Government published the NPPF. This requires Local Plans to be consistent with its principles and policies, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The Council has proposed a modification to reflect this, which is considered under Issue 2 below. Both this modification and the question of the Plan's consistency with the NPPF were subject to public consultation.
6. In November 2012, the Council requested that the examination be suspended to allow further work to be carried out. I agreed to this. The additional evidence produced and consequent modifications to the Plan were all the subject of public consultation before the further hearing sessions took place in June 2013.
7. An Order revoking the Regional Strategy (RS) for the North West came into force on 20 May 2013. All directions under paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the 2004 Act preserving policies contained in structure plans in the area to which the RS relates were also revoked. Comments on the revocation, and its effects on the Plan, were invited as part of the engagement process undertaken during the suspension period.

Assessment of the Duty to Co-operate

8. The Council's Statement of Compliance [Ex035] lists relevant joint working arrangements on a wide range of issues, including housing and infrastructure provision, retail catchment areas, regeneration and environmental linkages. It sets out the ongoing and standing arrangements for cooperation. It is clear that the Council has sought to engage constructively with the bodies prescribed through Section 33A of the 2004 Act at appropriate stages in the Plan making process, as well as with other partner organisations.
9. The Council has worked in partnership with the Lake District National Park Authority in relation to identifying land for allocation in Broughton-in-Furness. Most of Broughton-in-Furness is within the National Park, but its south eastern quarter is in South Lakeland District's planning area. The Plan includes land intended to serve the housing and employment needs of this settlement as a whole.
10. Regeneration is a priority in neighbouring Barrow-in-Furness. This is recognised in the CS, and has shaped the CS approach to the development in Ulverston and the Furness peninsula. This Plan reflects all this. In particular, a significant proportion of the housing allocations proposed in this area are indicated for later phases of the Plan, between 2018 and 2023. This is largely to allow new housing in Barrow-in-Furness to become established in the market ahead of development in South Lakeland.
11. Moreover, following concerns being raised about the approach to accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the Council has decided to pursue partnership working solutions. The former will involve cooperation with all of the other Cumbria planning authorities. The latter will include working jointly with Lancaster City Council and in partnership with local groups. In selecting these ways forward the Council has proactively chosen to cooperate and collaborate in its pursuit of the most robust planning outcomes.
12. There are few other strategic, cross-boundary issues of relevance to the Plan. There are no requirements for the development needs of the District to be met elsewhere or, apart from in Broughton-in-Furness, for the needs of neighbouring authorities to be met in the District. A review of the boundaries of the Lake District and Yorkshire Dales National Parks is currently taking place. This seeks approval to extend both National Parks, including across areas presently within South Lakeland District. If the proposed extensions are approved, the two National Park Authorities will become the local planning authority for the areas involved. It will be for those Authorities to apply the adopted policies of the South Lakeland development plan in those areas until such time as new Local Plans covering them are drawn up. This also applies to Levens and Kirkby Lonsdale, which some have sought to have included in the extended National Park area. Whatever the outcome, as the National Park Authorities are content with the Plan, I see no reason why any of this should result in difficulties during any transitional period.
13. Correspondence has been provided [Ex050] by the prescribed bodies confirming that they consider the Council to have met the duty imposed by Section 33A and that there are no outstanding issues. I conclude that the Duty to Co-operate has been met.

Assessment of Soundness

Background and main issues

14. The primary purpose of the Plan is to allocate and identify land for future development and to identify land to be protected from development. To this end, it defines development boundaries around settlements. It proposes sites for new housing, businesses and mixed uses. It identifies town centre boundaries, primary shopping areas and both primary and secondary retail frontages. It also identifies land to be safeguarded, including 'Green Gaps' between settlements and open spaces.
15. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings I have identified three main issues upon which the soundness of the Plan depends.

Issue 1 – The basis for the proposed allocations

Whether the Plan has been positively prepared and whether the approach taken justifies it when considered against the reasonable alternatives

Engagement

16. The Council confirms that the DPD has been prepared in accordance with its Statement of Community Involvement, which was adopted in 2006 and amended in 2008. It is apparent that the Council has sought to engage with a wide range of people, from the local community to statutory technical consultees.
17. From the evidence, it is clear that the Council has sought the views of the community and others from the early stages of the Plan's formulation. This has been an ongoing process, including through the examination stage and the period of suspension. The Council's consultation statement says that existing channels of communication have been used, such as Member groups, Town and Parish Councils, Residents' Associations and Neighbourhood Forums. Liaison has been undertaken with key stakeholder groups. Exhibitions, displays, 'road show' events and workshops have been held.
18. Much criticism has been made of the extent of engagement and the methods used, especially in relation to community involvement. While it is possible that more could have been done, one must be realistic. I am of the firm view that even in the context of the scale and complexity of the site allocations process involved in this Plan, the level and type of engagement has been proportionate to it. As I see it, while the large number of representations might reflect how the Plan has been received, it also suggests that the Council has 'reached out' to the community, and gives an indication of success in this respect. Proper engagement and positive preparation is not the same thing as agreeing on solutions to the issues involved.

Assessment of options

19. The evidence base underpinning the CS has formed the starting point for formulating site options, including the Strategic Housing Land Availability

Assessment (SHLAA) and the Employment and Housing Site Search Study. Existing allocations have been considered, and land owners' requests through consultation and 'call for sites' exercises. Updated study evidence has been commissioned and taken into account as the site selection process has progressed. New land parcels suggested have all been evaluated throughout the course of the options assessment. Aside from land deliberately excluded through the application of specific criteria, discussed below, no potential sites have been turned away without consideration. It is clear that the Council has reacted to changing circumstances, for example in relation to land availability, throughout the course of the Plan's production, including at the examination stage. Given all this, it is reasonable to suppose that the Council is aware of all possible options for allocating land.

20. At quite an early stage of the Plan's formulation, the Council applied site size thresholds. In effect, it decided that sites within Service Centres below 0.3 hectares (ha) and sites elsewhere below 0.1 ha would not be allocated.
21. According to the Council's calculation, more than 500 individual sites have been considered. Given the large number of land parcels suggested for allocation, including sites below the thresholds would have been likely to cause serious practical difficulties. Appraising all of them would have been a task disproportionate to the likely advantages of including smaller sites and would, in all probability, have jeopardised the timely progress of the Plan. In any case, the non-allocation of smaller sites does not necessarily prevent them from coming forward. Indeed, in relation to housing, the Plan relies in part on non-allocated sites to deliver the CS aims, and CS Policy CS6.1 sets out criteria for considering them. There is no reason to suppose that the development of those which perform well against these criteria will be resisted. Perhaps more importantly than all this, as a consequence of CS Policy CS6.3, sites below the threshold will be unlikely to deliver much needed affordable housing. Any significant reliance on such sites would threaten the Plan's ability to deliver the CS objectives in this respect. All in all, I regard the introduction of the site size thresholds to be practical and reasonable. The exception to this is their application in the Arnside and Silverdale AONB, which is discussed below under Issue 3.
22. Other 'exclusion criteria' have also been applied. These include land: in the Kendal Canal Head area, which is to be the subject of a separate Local Plan document; in Flood Zone 3b; covered by a national or international nature conservation designation; which has not been made available by the landowner; with an extant planning permission for development; which is in an active recreational use; on which development would conflict with the spatial strategy of the CS. These are all sound reasons for excluding land from consideration.
23. Assumptions have been made in relation to the types of use suitable for each site. These have been informed by landowner intentions, the numerous studies in the evidence base, regeneration and other initiatives, flood risk vulnerability and the effects on neighbouring uses, among other things. It is clear that there has been ample opportunity for alternative site uses to be put forward, and the Council has considered such suggestions. I regard these assumptions to be appropriate.
24. Except where ruled out by the exclusion criteria, the Council's approach has

been to carry out a SA of all the land put forward for allocation. This has been undertaken from the early stages of the Plan's formulation and at appropriate points thereafter. Details of this are set out in the Council's SA Process Note [Ex087]. It is clear to me that SA has been an integral part of the plan preparation process.

25. In partnership with Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency, the County Council has developed a SA Framework for Cumbria. This formed the basis of the SA for the adopted CS, and of the SA methodologies used by other Cumbrian authorities to formulate Local Plans subsequently found to be sound.
26. The SA for this Plan is an adapted version of the Cumbria SA Framework, specifically tailored to enable the comparison of individual sites. It includes a wide range of social, economic and environmental objectives. Criteria relating to the objectives have been drawn up and the performance of every site not discounted by the exclusion criteria has been appraised against each SA criterion. A scoring system has been deployed relating to the degree to which the site contributes to the sustainability objectives. All of this is wholly appropriate. The objectives are suitable and sufficiently comprehensive. There is a meaningful relationship between the objectives and the associated criteria, such that the latter are relevant for measuring performance against the former. Even if other criteria could have been used, those chosen are appropriate sustainability indicators and are satisfactory for their intended purpose. The SA methodology and criteria have remained largely unaltered throughout the Plan preparation process.
27. From the SA, sites considered for housing have been compared on the basis of the spatial strategy set by CS Policy CS6.1 and the table supporting it. This is a logical method. Similarly, CS Policy CS7.2 has directed the comparison and selection of sites for business uses. In particular, the sequential approach for the identification of strategic employment sites set out in CS Policy CS7.2 has been followed. This is appropriate and necessary for soundness.
28. It is clear that the Council's general approach through the SA has been to fully reflect the CS expectations. This is necessary for soundness and is wholly appropriate. Overall, I consider the SA methodology to be sufficiently robust.
29. A Habitats Regulations Assessment screening report dated January 2012 [SLA12a and b] found several European wildlife sites to be likely receptors of significant effects from sites being considered for allocation. Consequently, an Appropriate Assessment (AA) [SLA12c] has been carried out. The AA report concludes that the Plan can only be confirmed as not having an adverse effect on the integrity of the Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC)/Special Protection Area/Ramsar Site and the River Kent SAC if certain mitigation measures are incorporated into the Plan. All of this has informed the Council's assessment of the alternative options. Indeed, a number of sites have been discounted as a result of this process. Modifications (**MM1 and MM2**) have been put forward by the Council to necessarily clarify considerations and requirements in relation to the SAC. Moreover, the mitigation measures referred to have been included in the Plan. Addenda to the AA have been produced at relevant stages to assess changes to the Plan. This is an appropriate approach with which Natural England is clearly content.

30. A 'Fact File' [EvFF01] has been compiled for all of the settlements in the District. Each one sets out a strategic overview of the settlement and the key issues and interventions anticipated in the CS. For every site considered, the settlement Fact File provides a range of information. This includes drawing together information from the AA and SA, any relevant evidence base studies, evidence on availability, an overview of consultation responses from the community and technical consultees, and planning officer site visit observations. The entries also give a commentary about possible yields, phasing and any mitigation measures needed.
31. In short, the Fact File records represent a substantial body of information. They provide a respectable and suitable basis for comparing site alternatives and assessing the options for allocating land.
32. The Fact File entries give an initial conclusion about whether the site is proposed for allocation or not. The reasoning leading to the conclusion is not always wholly clear from the information given. However, the Council has confirmed [Ex020] that the AA and SA findings have been key factors. This is appropriate.
33. Moreover, the Council has produced spreadsheets [Ex020A] showing the performance of each site against the range of suitability criteria applied. The Council's general approach has been to select the sites which perform best in this analysis.
34. In circumstances where the performance of two or more sites has been comparable, judgements have been made on the basis of individual factors which the Council considers to 'tip the balance'. This has been done on a case by case basis. Consequently, there is scope for inconsistency which could have been avoided by, for example, weighting the suitability criteria. However, introducing an element of professional judgement in relation to site specific circumstances within the otherwise largely systematic selection method is reasonable. A weighting system would also involve making value judgements about the relative importance of the suitability criteria. The chosen path has the advantage of comparing the overall effects of developing the land parcels in question and their relative merits in that regard. To my mind, it amounts to a 'reality check'. In the context applied here, I am firmly of the view that this is a sound approach to take.
35. Criticisms have been made about the SA and the overall methodology employed for assessing the site options, and its execution, including in relation to matters of consistency. However, the SA and methodology must be seen in the context of their function and nature. They are tools to enable a reasonably consistent and disciplined analysis of the sustainability credentials of sites and the likely impacts of development on them. Though systematic, they are not automated. As with most aspects of town and country planning, they rely on human input and value judgements. Disagreement on the latter, it seems to me, lies at the heart of many comments. While it may be that there are some errors in the documentation produced, some degree of inaccuracy and/or inconsistency is almost inevitable, especially given the scale of the task in this case. That being said, I can see no flaws of such a fundamental nature that they invalidate the overall assessment process or undermine its outcomes.
36. In addition to excluding sites within Flood Zone 3b, the Council has also applied

a sequential, risk-based approach to allocating land informed by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Most proposed allocations are wholly within Flood Zone 1. Others largely within this zone include proportionately small areas of land in Flood Zones 2 and 3a. In respect of these, the Council has advanced a number of modifications (**MM3 to MM13**). These will ensure that only 'appropriate uses' (as defined in the Technical Guidance to the NPPF) will be permitted in Flood Zones 2 and 3a, unless a Flood Risk Assessment shows that other uses can be safely included. They also clarify the mechanisms and approach for ensuring that surface water is properly managed. These are necessary for soundness.

37. Although not large in number, some sites proposed for allocation are wholly or substantially in Flood Zones 2 and 3a. For each, the Council confirms that there are no reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The 'area of search' for sequentially preferable sites has been based on the reason for proposing the allocation. This generally relates to the geographical area within which the need for that development arises. In addition, on these sites, the Plan restricts residential development to land within Flood Zones 1 and 2 and it has not been necessary to apply the exception test.
38. Concerns have been raised about flooding on a number of the sites involved. I note all the evidence in this regard, including the photographs and accounts of instances of flooding. This is a very important issue. However, considering all of the above, I am satisfied that flood risk has been considered in a robust and appropriate manner. The Statement of Common Ground between the Council and the Environment Agency [Ex039] confirms that both bodies have worked closely together at each stage in the Plan's preparation. It is clear from this that the Agency supports the Council's approach to the assessment of flood risk.
39. In assessing the proposed sites, the Council has drawn on the Cumbria Biodiversity Evidence Base (CBEB). I am told that this was set up in 2008 by the County Council, Cumbrian local planning authorities, Cumbria Wildlife Trust and Tullie House Museum. The latter organisation maintains and annually updates the database. It includes information about formal biodiversity designations such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Local Nature Reserves, other survey work undertaken by groups such as local volunteers, and also survey information provided by bodies such as Cumbria Wildlife Trust. I understand that people can submit formal records for entry onto the database at any time, and that information provided with planning applications is sometimes added.
40. Though not fully comprehensive, it is quite apparent that the CBEB represents a significant body of biodiversity information. It is existing evidence and using it to inform this Plan is appropriate. In the terms of the NPPF, it represents a proportionate base of evidence on which to found the Plan.
41. Clearly, in relation to a number of sites proposed for allocation, site specific surveys will be needed. It is appropriate that these be undertaken at the planning application stage, when necessary details of the development are known, at a point in time closer to its delivery. Including sites where protected or other key species are or may be present does amount to an element of risk to the Plan's delivery. Development could be delayed or even prevented. However, the SA and site selection processes have taken into account the

presence of protected species. To my mind, as there is no definitive evidence that the presence of wildlife renders the sites concerned undeliverable, it would be unreasonable to conclude that this matter will undermine the Plan. I consider that it should be regarded as sound in this respect.

42. The scope and depth of some of the assessment criteria are not as detailed as some consider they ought to be. For example, the proximity of sites to services is assessed on a 'straight line' basis, and the sustainability disadvantages of locating sites at elevated positions on hillsides are not considered. I accept that this does amount to imperfection in the process. But I do not regard the absence of such detailed consideration to render the process invalid and in my view the assessment process has been satisfactory.

Conclusion on Issue 1

43. Considering the above, I conclude that the Plan has been positively prepared and that, with the main modifications put forward by the Council, the approach taken justifies it when considered against the reasonable alternatives. There is, therefore, a sound basis for the proposed allocations.

Issue 2 – Overview of the proposed land allocations

Whether the proposed land allocations are consistent with national policy and the Core Strategy, are justified and deliverable

The starting point for the Plan

44. The fundamental starting point for the Plan has been to achieve consistency with the CS. A number of matters raise questions as to whether this is the most appropriate approach.
45. As previously mentioned, the RS was revoked during the examination. Consistency with it is no longer a soundness issue. Some argue, in effect, that the revocation of the RS undermines the basis for the CS. I disagree. The CS examination took place at a time when the Government had announced that the RS was revoked. While that position was subsequently found to be unlawful, the CS examination was nonetheless held in that context. It is clear that the CS was found to be sound in the absence of the RS.
46. It is the case that some evidence underpinning the CS has now altered. In particular, the Government has issued a statistical release setting out household interim projections for 2011 to 2021. These indicate a rather lower level of household growth than that planned for in the CS and this Plan. However, the interim projections should be regarded with some caution. They are interim figures, based on five year trends coinciding with a period of recession. They do not take account of future economic growth in the District, notably the investment planned by GlaxoSmithKline which the Council indicates is likely to generate around 500 new jobs. Moreover, the pressing need for affordable housing in the District remains. Realistically, delivery of affordable housing depends quite heavily on market housing coming forward. All of these factors, among others, have led the Council to conclude that the path set by the CS

remains the most appropriate.

47. I concur that these matters do weigh in favour of continuing to follow the CS, for the time being at least. For my part, the Council's position is also a significant aspect in itself. The Council clearly wishes to pursue the higher level of housing delivery set out in the CS. This strikes a harmonious chord with the Government's general aim for housing.
48. In the circumstances arising from the combination of factors set out above, I regard the CS as the only appropriate starting point for the Plan. Consequently, its soundness rests in part on whether it is consistent with the CS and will deliver the outcomes the CS seeks.

Presumption in favour of sustainable development

49. As referred to above, in the light of the NPPF, the Council has put forward a new policy and explanatory text setting out a presumption in favour of sustainable development (**MM14 to MM16**). It directly reflects the NPPF, and is necessary for soundness.

Settlement development boundaries

50. The development boundaries of the Principal, Key and Local Service Centres have been drawn up following criteria set out in the Plan. The criteria are logical and appropriate. On the whole, I consider that the approach taken will result in clear boundaries to settlements, adding to certainty in the planning process.
51. I note that the defined boundaries bisect land in the same ownership. There is no particular reason why it should not. The geographical scope of a development plan policy's influence should not be determined by who owns which tract of land when the plan is formulated.

Housing: level and supply

52. The CS aims to deliver 8,800 new homes between 2003 and 2025. The Council's Housing Land Position Report March 2013 [Ex067] indicates that 2,044 of these have been completed, leaving a residual requirement of 6,756.
53. As submitted, the Plan allocates land which the Council estimates could deliver around 6,085 dwellings. With the modifications proposed by the Council, this figure is reduced to 5,277. This is short of the CS residual requirement. However, while the land allocations are the main component of housing land supply, there are other sources. Contributions are anticipated from sites with planning permission which are presently under construction or not yet started (854 homes), sites in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which fall below the allocation threshold (277 homes) and windfall sites (838 homes). It seems reasonable to me to include these sources of supply, particularly at the fairly modest level assumed. This approach is not inconsistent with the CS or NPPF.
54. I note the argument that the windfall allowance relied on by the Council is actually 1,969 dwellings. This total is reached by adding together the contribution from sites with permission, small sites identified in the SHLAA and

windfall sites together. I recognise that the vast majority of sites with planning permission were windfall sites. But the NPPF states that sites with permission should be regarded as deliverable, and thus available now, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented. Windfall sites are those which have not been specifically identified as available. Consequently, in the absence of evidence to show that development will not be implemented, sites with permission do not fall within the NPPF definition of windfall sites. The contribution from small sites in the SHLAA is not high and has little effect on this issue.

55. Some suggest that the windfall allowance is over-optimistic. But, district-wide, it amounts to only 70 windfall dwellings per year to 2025. The Housing Land Position Report indicates that between 2003 and 2013, an average of 162 windfall dwellings have been completed each year. For the period 2008 to 2013, 852 windfall units have been delivered. This equates to 170 a year. In the context of these historic windfall delivery rates and the fairly permissive approach to unallocated sites in the CS, particularly Policy CS6.1, the district-wide level allowed for strikes me as reasonable.
56. I note from Table 1A of the Plan that the windfall allowance includes 491 windfall dwellings in rural areas. This is around 41 per year over the plan period. Between 2003 and 2013, 305 rural windfall dwellings were completed, being approximately 30 per year. The Plan does, therefore, anticipate some increase in rural windfall delivery.
57. However, this only amounts to an additional ten homes per year on average. This is not a significant increase. The Council points to a number of factors which suggest such an increase to be credible. I am told that until the adoption of the CS, the Council treated conversions in the countryside as exceptions to policy. The approach now is considerably less restrictive than in the reasonably recent past. The Council says that when they last operated a similarly favourable policy approach to conversions, rural windfalls were in the region of 60 per annum. From the Housing Land Position Report, I note that 62 rural windfall dwellings were completed in 2003/4 and 66 in 2004/5. The CS effectively allows infilling to take place. Moreover, there is the possibility of Neighbourhood Plans coming forward in rural areas.
58. Taking all this into account, I consider there to be a reasonable prospect of the windfall delivery planned for being realised. I regard the Plan to be sufficiently realistic in this regard. A modification (**MM17**) is proposed setting out the Council's general support for self-build housing, many of which are likely to be on windfall sites. This is necessary to clarify how self-build fits into the overall delivery of housing in the district.
59. Taken together, the various sources of housing land supply are estimated to provide sufficient land for roughly 7,246 new homes, being a little more than the residual CS requirement. As the CS figure is not a ceiling or maximum, this should not be viewed as an over-supply. Rather, it introduces an element of flexibility or 'buffer' to the Plan. Although of only 490 dwellings and therefore a limited cushion, I note that this figure is, coincidentally, roughly equivalent to the level of rural windfalls expected. In any event, I consider the land proposed for allocation to be sufficient to ensure that the CS objectives for housing delivery stand a decent chance of being met.

60. In reaching the above view, I have taken account of the housing density assumption underpinning the estimated site capacities. CS Policy CS6.6 requires all housing developments to provide an average density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare. Higher densities are sought in certain, more sustainable, locations. The allocations DPD has taken this as a starting point. Final estimated site capacities have been derived through adjustments to the average density figure to reflect both the CS and site specific circumstances. This is an appropriate approach.
61. Three phases of housing delivery are indicated in the DPD. Phase 1 represents the first five future years of the Plan, 2013 to 2018. The Council has identified a supply of sites to deliver around 3,581 homes in this period. Of these, 1,993 dwellings are expected through the proposed allocations. Sites with an extant planning permission represent most of the remainder. An allowance of 497 dwellings on windfall sites is included for this period. At just over 99 windfall homes a year, this is a higher delivery rate than that anticipated in later years of the Plan. Nevertheless, even this level is significantly lower than the average rates experienced in the last 10 and 5 years. In the context of these, I consider the windfall element of the five year supply to be credible.
62. On this basis, I consider that the Council has demonstrated that with the proposed allocations, there is sufficient land to provide five years worth of housing against the residual CS requirement with an additional buffer of 20%. The Plan is therefore consistent with the CS and NPPF in this regard.
63. Towards the end of the Plan period, the figures given in the Plan include delivery in identified 'Broad Locations for new housing' and in the forthcoming Local Plan for the Kendal Canal Head as part of the planned supply. The Broad Locations are areas the Council considers suitable for housing development in the future but which are not yet available or would require more detailed investigation. Policy LA1.4 of the Plan clarifies that the Council will allocate land in these areas if required to meet needs during the period 2022 to 2027. The Council intends to bring forward a new Local Plan by 2021.
64. Notwithstanding the arguments made by some, I consider this to be an appropriate approach. The NPPF does not rule it out. Indeed, it expressly allows for the identification of specific, developable broad locations for years 6 to 10 and, where possible, for years 11 to 15. From the submissions made, I am persuaded that the Broad Locations should be regarded as 'developable' in the terms of the NPPF, and I have been given no compelling or weighty evidence to the contrary. The modifications proposed by the Council to delete the Firs Road Broad Location and effectively allocate it for housing is discussed under Issue 3 below.
65. Some question whether the Kendal Canal Head area can be regarded as 'developable'. I have been left in no doubt that the regeneration of this area presents significant challenges. However, only 200 dwellings are in question here. It is clear that the Council and other partners are firmly committed to tackling the issues. It seems to me that many in the local community would welcome its regeneration, in principle at least. There is no evidence before me which irrefutably demonstrates that it is not possible for housing to be delivered at the canal head as envisaged. For the time being, until the Canal Head Local Plan is examined, I consider it reasonable to include these dwellings in the

supply figures.

66. Core Strategy Policy CS6.6 seeks to ensure that at least 28% of housing development takes place on previously developed ('brownfield') land. Of the 5,277 homes expected through the allocations proposed in the Plan, only 306 are anticipated to be on previously developed land. This is a very low proportion, significantly below the CS target.
67. However, the Council's evidence indicates that, across the Plan period from 2003 to 2025, 28.11% of new homes delivered will be on brownfield land. This calculation relies heavily on the inclusion of brownfield delivery since 2003 and existing, unimplemented planning permissions. These are a legitimate part of the supply and their contributions should be taken into account.
68. Regarding the forward looking supply elements, it seems to me that the main assumptions on which the Council's estimates rest are those relating to small SHLAA and windfall sites. Given the level of detail known by the Council in relation to the former, it is highly likely that the level of previously developed land anticipated is reasonably accurate. Regarding the latter, it is assumed that 64% of windfall land will be brownfield. While on the face of it quite high, this level reflects delivery between 2003 and 2013, as shown in the Housing Position Report. I have been given no compelling reason to suppose that this level will reduce significantly in the future, even taking account of the changes to the definition of previously developed land.

Housing: nature of the proposed site allocations

69. I note the comments about the high level of greenfield allocations proposed. In the context of South Lakeland's predominantly rural nature, a significant contribution from greenfield sites is inevitable. Many of the sites proposed for allocation are indeed fields, often on the edge of settlements. I fully appreciate that many people find these fields pleasant and attractive, and perhaps understandably wish them to remain undeveloped. But one must be realistic about what this Plan can achieve. Much of the district comprises rural, greenfield land of this sort, and previously developed land is not in abundant supply. In order to meet the housing needs identified in the CS, significant greenfield development and consequent changes in the landscape are unavoidable.
70. The Council's site selection process has been robust. Previously developed land, where deliverable or developable, has been prioritised. Matters of landscape character and the likely effects of developing the proposed sites on the appearance of the surrounding area have clearly been taken into account. As I see it, the Council has done what it realistically could to ensure that the sites proposed are those which would have the least visual impacts, bearing in mind other site suitability factors. This approach is consistent with the NPPF. In the context of all this, in general terms, I regard the proposed sites to be justified in these respects.

Housing: spatial distribution

71. CS Policy CS6.1 and the table accompanying it give spatial expression to the housing requirement. Tables 1A and 1B of the Plan show the present position,

or 'balance to be found' for each tier of the settlement hierarchy through land allocations, taking account of delivery since 2003 and the other components of the supply discussed above.

72. For both Kendal and Ulverston, individual figures are given by the CS. From Table 1B, the allocations in both settlements are anticipated to deliver in excess of their individual balance, particularly in Kendal. I have considered this 'buffer' above and my broader points apply equally in relation to individual settlements. Indeed, it seems to me that as the greatest proportion of housing is required in Kendal and Ulverston, they should also be provided with the greatest 'buffer' or margin over and above the 'balance to be found'. This will, over the plan period, give greater choice to the market and reduce risks to the delivery of the quantum of housing required by the CS in these settlements.
73. A combined figure is given in the CS for the Key Service Centres of Kirkby Lonsdale, Milnthorpe and Grange-over-Sands. The table supporting CS Policy CS6.1 apportions the Key Service Centres a combined total of 13% share of housing growth, and the CS says that, individually, they should receive a moderate level of housing development.
74. Overall, it is anticipated that the proposed allocations across the three Key Service Centres will deliver 779 homes. This is a little more than the 696 necessary. This combined apportionment is consistent with the CS.
75. The Plan does not split the CS requirement for the Key Service Centres equally between the three settlements. It is anticipated that the proposed allocations in Grange will deliver 506 homes. Those in Kirkby Lonsdale and Milnthorpe are expected to yield 109 and 164 houses respectively. There is clearly a disparity here. However, the CS does not demand an equal split. The requirement for 'moderate' growth in each does not introduce clear prescription. Compared to the levels of new housing allocated to Kendal and Ulverston, the figures for each of the Key Service Centres could reasonably be regarded as moderate.
76. In reaching the proposed distribution between these three, the Council has considered a range of factors, primarily settlement size, evidence of need and environmental issues. In relation to the question of need, the 2011 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) [EvH05c] has been drawn on, and the distinct Housing Market Areas involved have been an influencing factor. That the need for affordable housing in Grange is significantly higher than in Kirkby Lonsdale and Milnthorpe is particularly pertinent. In my view, this is a reasonable and appropriate approach, and the proposed distribution resulting from it is generally consistent with the CS.
77. From Table 1B of the Plan, the proportion of growth allocated to the Local Service Centres and Small Settlements roughly mirrors that in the CS, being just one or two percentage points lower. This can largely be attributed to the separation of the settlements in the AONB following the Council's proposed modifications. On this basis, the proposed allocations will meet the balance needed through this Plan, and it will be for the AONB Local Plan to secure land for the remainder.

Housing: affordable and extra care housing

78. To help meet the pressing need for affordable housing, CS Policy CS6.3 requires schemes of nine or more dwellings in the Principal and Key Service Centres, and three or more elsewhere, to include 35% affordable housing. CS Policy CS6.4 allows wholly affordable schemes on 'rural exception' sites. The Plan adds to this. It makes clear where residential allocations have the potential to accommodate affordable housing and allocates some land specifically for affordable development. It includes commentary on the mix and tenure type that will be sought in many settlements. All of this is appropriate.
79. CS Policy CS9.1 aims to meet the needs for extra care housing. The County Council, as a consultee in the development management process, has been considering the need for extra care provision in relation to residential schemes of 60 or more dwellings. The basis for this has been the County Council's 'Draft Planning Obligations Policy' document, published for consultation in December 2012 [Ex102]. I understand that this has now been adopted by the County Council. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) clearly indicate that development management policies to guide the determination of planning applications must be in Local Plans. The County Council's publication is not a Local Plan document.
80. The Council has put forward a main modification in relation to extra care housing (**MM18**). This clarifies the approach to delivering the aims of the CS and lends the development plan transparency which is presently lacking. It also includes the 60 dwelling threshold referred to above. I concur that it is necessary for soundness.
81. Some have criticised the Council for its uncertainty about precisely where extra care developments will take place in the plan period. The CS does not explicitly commit to allocating land for extra care housing, and the Plan does not attempt to. To my mind, given the financial viability issues and other inherent challenges associated with this kind of development, it is unrealistic to expect more.

Housing: accommodation for gypsies and travellers

82. Policy B of *Planning for Traveller Sites* says that local planning authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities. It also says that in producing their Local Plan, local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites against their locally set targets, among other things. As submitted, the Plan does neither of these things. Moreover, the evidence of accommodation needs is not up-to-date. Overall, the Plan is not consistent with national policy and is not sound in this regard.
83. However, during the examination's suspension period, the Council engaged with the other Cumbrian planning authorities on this issue. I am told that they have agreed to work in partnership to produce an updated accommodation assessment for the period 2013 to 2025. The Council has clearly expressed its

commitment to this and to producing a separate, specific Local Plan document. This will replace, if necessary, the CS insofar as it relates to accommodation for gypsies and travellers. It will also identify sites in line with national policy. The Council has proposed modifications (**MM19 to MM21**) effectively deleting much the Plan's text on this issue and introducing new text pledging to undertake this work. The revisions also set out the interim approach which largely rests on applying the criteria in CS Policies CS6.5a and CS6.5b.

84. This situation is not ideal. Neither is the timescale, which puts adoption of this new Local Plan document in 2017. However, the proposed approach will involve collaboration on a Cumbria-wide level. Solutions proposed on this basis would be a positive outcome for the proper planning of gypsy and traveller needs. Given the challenges of joint working, particularly on potentially controversial matters such as this, and in the context of the Council's other significant plan-making commitments, a more ambitious timeframe is unlikely to be realistic.
85. Overall, modifications to the Plan are clearly necessary and, on balance, I regard those put forward by the Council to be acceptable. While further work is clearly required, delaying the rest of the Plan whilst it is undertaken would not best serve the interests of delivering sustainable development.

Economic development: business, industrial, storage and distribution uses

86. As submitted, the Plan provides just under 65 hectares of land for economic development. Following the necessary main modifications, employment sites providing around 57 hectares of land are proposed. An additional 3.8 hectares of land for employment uses is earmarked on mixed use sites. Together, this very slightly exceeds the 60 hectares required by the CS. I consider the Plan to be generally consistent with the CS in this regard.
87. Again taking account of the main modifications needed for soundness, the spatial distribution of proposed employment sites does not exactly mirror the CS. The land at Scroggs Wood, Milnthorpe Road (E4M) is 17.9 hectares overall, although a modification (**MM22**) which, for the landscaping, biodiversity mitigation and other reasons given by the Council I agree to be necessary, restricts the net developable area to 11 hectares. Its allocation as a Strategic Employment Site exceeds the 9 hectares identified for Kendal in the CS. Conversely, the proposed Business and Science Park site on land east of Burton Road (M2M) in Kendal is 6.52 hectares, whereas the CS seeks 9 hectares.
88. But it seems to me that the Plan will nevertheless provide the opportunity for the CS aims to be delivered in Kendal. While the Scroggs Wood allocation allows for a range of employment uses, it is eminently suitable for high quality office/research and development/light industrial space of the type sought by the CS. It is clear that the Council expects particularly high quality buildings on this site. The developable area of land at Scroggs Wood, combined with that of the land east of Burton Road, falls only slightly short of the 18 hectares of strategic employment and business/science park land sought by the CS. It seems to me that the Plan ensures that Kendal will have sufficient employment land of the type envisaged, and is generally consistent with the thrust of the CS in this respect.

89. In Ulverston, the Plan allocates around 2.1 hectares of Strategic Employment land and roughly 3.1 hectares of land for Business/Science Park uses. The CS seeks six hectares for both kinds of uses. On the face of it, this shortfall is quite significant. However, during the examination, GlaxoSmithKline announced its selection of its Ulverston operation as the site for a new £350 million biopharmaceutical research and development facility and manufacturing plant. According to the Council, GlaxoSmithKline intends to have the plant built and fully operational within the Plan period, albeit towards the end. In the context of this investment and development, the Plan's technical deficit is of little significance.
90. Local Employment Sites are also sought by the CS. The Plan provides a little more than twice the three hectares required in Kendal and Ulverston. But the CS figures do not represent a ceiling or maximum. Exceeding the CS requirements, within the reasonable limits involved here, offers choice to the market and lends the Plan flexibility.
91. Of the CS requirement for Kendal and Ulverston, the Plan allocates the vast majority in Kendal. Similarly, of the nine hectares of Local Employment land required across the three Key Service Centres, allocations to meet this are only proposed in Milnthorpe. But for Local Employment Sites, Policy CS7.2 of the CS does not explicitly demand any particular proportionate split between the settlements within the groupings.
92. Moreover, the distribution of Local Employment Sites proposed is a product of the Council's site selection methodology. There has been no deliberate attempt to focus on Kendal over Ulverston or on Milnthorpe in preference to Grange-over-Sands and Kirkby Lonsdale. It is just that the process has revealed the sites in Kendal and Milnthorpe to be more sustainable and/or realistically deliverable than the alternatives elsewhere.
93. Furthermore, the apparent disparity here is not as clear cut as these figures suggest. The mixed use sites proposed for allocation include elements of employment use which may well fall into the 'Local Employment' category. For example, the land south of Allithwaite Road, Kent's Bank (MN25M) in Grange-over-Sands includes 1.5 hectares earmarked for B1 and B2 uses.
94. The CS seeks 12 hectares of land for Local Employment uses in the Local Service Centres and six in other rural settlements. As proposed to be modified, the Plan allocates a little over ten in the former and none in the latter. It does not fully reflect the CS. However, the degree of divergence is not considerable. That the Plan allocates employment sites in the more sustainable settlements rather than the smaller villages and hamlets scattered between them is not a significant disadvantage. Given this, and in the wider context of delivering economic development across the district, this matter is not one which should undermine the Plan or result in a finding of unsoundness.

Economic development: retail

95. The Plan identifies town centre boundaries, primary shopping areas and both primary and secondary retail frontages. This is an appropriate approach and, from the evidence, I consider the areas identified satisfactory.

96. No sites have been allocated for larger format convenience and comparison stores. The South Lakeland Retail Study Update 2012 (the Retail Study) [EvER04a] and the Revised Retail Capacity Tables (November 2012) [EvER19 and 20] identify capacity in Kendal and Ulverston for both types of retailing during the plan period. More modest levels of convenience capacity are identified in Grange and Milnthorpe and, in the latter, a very small capacity for comparison retail is identified.
97. In Kendal, an outline retail development scheme at Kendal Rugby Union Football Club was dismissed on appeal (reference APP/M0933/A/11/2166628) in June 2012. The primary reason for this rejection is that a site for retailing in the emerging Kendal Canal Head Local Plan is preferable. This decision and the emerging Canal Head Local Plan both give a strong spatial steer to any larger format retail schemes. Indeed, the Retail Study says that this represents a suitable location to accommodate some of the retail floorspace needed. The Council says that the vacancy rates in Kendal indicate that the town's existing sites and premises also have potential to contribute.
98. Planning permission has been granted for a supermarket at the Old Brewery site in Ulverston. The Retail Study says that this has the potential to take up some of the identified capacity, and that Ulverston Canal Head also has potential in this regard.
99. As I understand it, the planning permission given for a supermarket in Grange remains extant. The Retail Study concludes that this store, if built, will absorb the capacity identified. It reaches the same conclusion in relation to the Booths supermarket in Milnthorpe, which has now opened.
100. All things considered, in the circumstances, the absence of retail allocations should not be regarded as undermining the soundness of this Plan. The existing commitments and other existing sites and premises are, on the whole, sufficient to meet needs, and those remaining are not such that land allocations should be required. I recognise the Kendal Canal Head Local Plan's stage of preparation and that it has yet to be examined. I also note that the permission in Grange was given some time ago and has not yet been implemented. As with all aspects of the Local Plan, it will remain incumbent upon the Council to monitor and review the position in relation to retail provision, and to consider the necessity for allocations again if needs are demonstrably not being met. This is, perhaps, especially pertinent in Grange where, without the planned store, the Retail Study considers there to be a 'food desert'.
101. I note the points about the robustness of the Retail Study, particularly those relating to the population base used. But the Retail Study is clear that ONS mid-year population estimates (2002 and 2008) and sub-national (2008) population projections have been used. This generally reflects the Plan's basis for projecting household growth, and is therefore appropriate.

Effectiveness and deliverability

102. A willing landowner is critical to delivery. The Council has confirmed that the necessary landowners concerned have all agreed to the proposed allocation of their land. In this regard, changes in circumstances through the examination have led to the Council putting forward a number of revisions (**MM23 to MM27**)

deleting some sites no longer available or amending site boundaries to reflect the extent of available land. These modifications are clearly necessary.

103. In addition, the costs of any development, including normal development costs and those arising from planning policies and obligations, should provide competitive returns to both a willing landowner and willing developer. Put simply, developing the land for the proposed use should be a financially viable prospect. Albeit rather late on in the process, a Viability Study [Ex065] has been produced for the Council. The Study is based on a residual valuation method and compares the residual value against the alternative use value. It assesses financial viability in relation to residential and non-residential uses across the district. It does this by modelling a range of sites which broadly reflect those proposed for allocation.
104. Like all 'high level' studies of this sort, a number of assumptions are made in relation to key factors influencing the residual value, including development values and costs, land prices and acceptable levels of return. Information from sources such as the Land Registry, national and local agents, and the Valuation Office Agency has been used. In relation to profits and returns, a number of alternative values suggested through the consultation process have also been considered. The costs of delivering affordable housing in line with CS Policy CS6.3 has been included, as have those of achieving Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4, Lifetime Homes standards and a BREEAM Excellent rating. All of this is appropriate. Overall, I consider the Study to be adequately robust in terms of the evidence sources and methodology used. The judgements made appear reasonable and a reassuringly cautious approach has generally been taken.
105. The Study indicates that greenfield housing development is viable. This supports the vast majority of residential allocations. It also indicates that brownfield housing development and employment development are not viable.
106. However, this is largely based on present costs and values, which could well alter throughout the plan period. In addition, the Study's conclusions are largely drawn on the basis of site modelling rather than specific sites. They apply equally well to both the proposed allocations and any other alternative sites which fit the modelling typology. In short, there is little in the Study to suggest that these viability problems are a consequence of the sites chosen for allocation.
107. Furthermore, I am mindful that the Study is, in effect, an analysis of the profit to be had from undertaking development. The delivery of business uses is not necessarily dependent on creating profit from the development itself. It is not uncommon for economic development to be delivered because the building concerned is required for a business purpose. This factor points to the possibility of a more positive outcome than the Study might suggest.
108. The CS requires the delivery of both brownfield housing land and land for economic development. It is imperative for soundness that the Plan includes appropriate allocations. Notwithstanding the viability issues identified in the Study, from the evidence produced I am not convinced that there are other sites which, when considered on the same basis, are unquestionably more appropriate in viability terms. Even if there are, this advantage has to be considered against

the other site selection criteria. In my view, less suitable sites should only be selected ahead of more appropriate ones where a consistently applied appraisal of viability clearly supports the former and discounts the latter, or at least gives rise to very significant doubts. That is not the case here. In relation to housing, the majority proportion of greenfield allocations is sufficient to ensure delivery in line with the CS expectations.

109. It was suggested at the hearing that the Study's assumption in relation to planning obligations, amounting to £1,500 per unit, is an underestimate. I share reservations about this figure, to some extent, particularly as the evidence is not wholly clear about how it has been derived or what elements are accounted for within it. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that this aspect is critical to the overall conclusions reached by the Study. It seems to me that factors such as land prices and sales values, rents and yields have a significantly greater bearing. Given this, and the degree of caution taken in relation to value assumptions, this issue does not materially dilute the weight to be given to the Study.
110. The Plan sets out the Council's intention to produce Development Briefs for a number of sites, largely those of most strategic importance or those with particular issues to overcome. The modification (**MM28**) setting out the timescales for these is necessary for the clarity of the Plan. Some of these will clearly take some time to put in place, which could hinder site delivery. However, they should be very helpful documents containing useful detailed information and advice to assist the planning application process. So long as they do not purport to introduce site-specific policy, which can only be contained in a Local Plan document, the Development Briefs will aid the effectiveness of the proposed allocations. Notwithstanding this, such briefs are not crucial to site delivery. Consequently, that some sizeable or potentially complicated sites are not earmarked for Development Briefs does not undermine their allocation.
111. To ensure deliverability, a safe and satisfactory access must be achievable. A substantial amount of evidence has been produced in this respect, notably the quite detailed analysis produced for the Council by AECOM [Ex066 and Ex104] ('the AECOM Study'). From this and my site visits, I concur that with the modifications put forward by the Council, set out under Issue 3 below, the proposed sites need not lead to any highway safety problems.

Infrastructure: school places

112. Among the most critical of the infrastructure planning issues is the provision of school places. The Local Education Authority (LEA) says that the greatest challenges relate to Kendal and Ulverston. Major expansions to create new primary and secondary school places in Kendal will be needed during the Plan's third phase of housing delivery. The LEA told me that there is sufficient space within existing school grounds to provide the primary spaces necessary. Delivering the secondary spaces relies on the willingness of the schools involved, as they are academies run independently of the LEA. I have been given no reason to suppose that the academy schools would not wish to expand. It has been suggested that they would wish to, given the financial incentives. The LEA indicates that should resistance be encountered, then an appeal would be pursued.

113. In Ulverston, the LEA says that new primary places will be needed towards the end of Phase 2 and secondary places will be required between the first and second phases. The picture here is complicated by the school catchment areas and, again, by the secondary school being an academy.
114. Other settlements also have a shortfall of school places of varying levels. The waters are further muddied by the spatial relationship between the proposed residential developments and the schools. The likelihood that windfall sites will add to the demand for places introduces a further complication.
115. Overall, from the evidence and hearings, I have been left with the impression that planning for school places has not been as rigorously thought through as it might have been. There was considerable uncertainty on the Council's part at the outset of the examination hearings. The approach to delivering places apparently intended by the Council and LEA is more reactive than proactive. In my view, this is a rather passive strategy and is not ideal.
116. That being said, there is no absolute requirement for sites to be identified to extend schools or otherwise provide school places. CS Policy CS7.3 does not specifically demand the allocation of land through this Plan. It is entirely possible to deliver suitable places as and when they are needed through the planning application process. Importantly, the Council and LEA have together explicitly and confidently told me that the difficulties involved here can be overcome, and that the land needed can be found. Both authorities are clearly convinced that the necessary school places can be delivered in good time. I have heard no arguments of sufficient weight to lead me to seriously doubt this.
117. In terms of securing financial contributions to deliver the school places, the Council relies on the aforementioned 'Planning Obligations Policy' document [Ex102], a corporate planning obligations policy now adopted by the County Council. The intention is that the LEA will apply this policy in responding to consultations on planning applications. For my part, in general terms, I see no reason to suppose that financial contributions would not meet the tests in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). I consequently regard the Plan to be effective and deliverable in this respect.

Infrastructure: waste water and the sewer network

118. It is clear that the Plan will lead to the need for additional works to the waste water treatment and public sewer network, including upgrading and/or increasing the capacity. The areas most particularly likely to be affected, to some extent or another, are northwest Kendal, Ulverston, Cartmel, Grange-over-Sands, Milnthorpe, Endmoor, Flookburgh/Cark and Burneside. This is detailed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) [Ex068]. Housing delivery in the Plan has been phased to reflect this, with affected sites generally indicated as likely to come forward later. This is to allow time for the financing of the necessary works to be secured and for those works to be implemented. To this end, United Utilities has given assurances that it will seek the necessary funding from Ofwat, the Water Services Regulation Authority.
119. I have no doubt that the timely delivery of the necessary waste water and sewerage systems is among the risks to the Plan. But it is clear that both United Utilities and the Council are cooperating on an ongoing basis to overcome the

issues. Their Statement of Common Ground [Ex037], the correspondence from United Utilities and the IDP all support this. From this evidence, United Utilities' commitment to seeking funding for the necessary works is unambiguous. While finance from Ofwat cannot be guaranteed, it seems to me all that could be done is being. Overall, the Council and United Utilities are doing all they realistically can to create the conditions necessary for the Plan's successful delivery. With this in mind, the provision of waste water and sewer infrastructure is not a matter which undermines the Plan's soundness.

Infrastructure: traffic issues in Kendal

120. Strong concerns have been raised about the effect of the Plan on traffic in Kendal and the consequences for air quality in the town, especially in the Air Quality Management Area. Substantial evidence has been produced and detailed discussions held on this point. I have considered all of this.
121. The Plan's implementation will add to the present levels of traffic in Kendal, particularly in the centre and the routes to it. This is an inevitable outcome of the level of development planned for. Where congestion presently occurs, this level of development will unavoidably worsen the current situation unless mitigation measures are introduced. But, in general terms, it seems to me that this is the result of the CS proactively tackling the need for new homes and economic development rather than the specific choices made by the Plan under examination here. There is no compelling evidence to suggest that an acceptable alternative suite of sites meeting the CS aims would result in markedly less congestion problems or associated effects on air quality. Indeed, air quality impact is among the SA sustainability indicators which have influenced the choice of sites proposed.
122. A great deal of work has been undertaken examining the potential traffic impacts, from the Kendal Transport Assessment by Atkins (June 2009) [EvT01] to the County Council's Transport Study: Revised Modelling Results document (January 2012) [EvT04a]. How the impacts can be mitigated has also been considered in depth, including through the Kendal LDF Transport Improvements Study (September 2012) [Ex016]. Specific schemes have been identified, including a sustainable transport improvement package and a number of junction capacity improvements. Their costs have been estimated and included in the IDP.
123. I note the detailed criticisms of some elements of this work and the transport solutions identified. Nonetheless, I regard the evidence produced to be adequately robust and the measures identified are reasonable. This is sufficient to persuade me that the land allocations proposed in Kendal are appropriate and deliverable in this regard. Whether alternative or additional transport mitigation measures, such as a northern relief road, would be beneficial does not directly affect the soundness of the Plan.

Infrastructure: traffic issues across the Cartmel peninsula

124. Many strongly felt concerns have been raised about the combined effect of the allocations proposed across the peninsula on traffic congestion and highway safety. The A590 effectively by-passes the peninsula. From it, the B5277 and B5278 form a loop which is, broadly speaking, the main route around the

peninsula. While it does not pass through or particularly near to Cartmel, the B5277 is the primary link between Grange, Allithwaite and Flookburgh/Cark.

125. A Cartmel Peninsula Traffic Impact Assessment Study March 2013 [Ex066b] ('the TIA') has been produced by AECOM for the Council. Put simply, this examines existing traffic flows, forecasts the level of additional traffic arising from the proposed allocations and analyses the impact of this on the capacity of six road junctions. Details of the methodology are set out in the TIA.
126. I recognise that aspects other than the main junctions of the local road network will have an impact on traffic flows. In places, the road width is limited and of a winding nature. There are a number of pinch-points and other stretches where parked cars, people crossing the road and the like will inevitably slow traffic. This may cause delays from time to time, especially during the summer months when traffic levels are higher and feature larger leisure vehicles such as caravans. However, queues caused by such sources are more likely to be occasional rather than persistent or inevitable. They are unlikely to regularly continue throughout the day causing a build up of traffic over time, as could happen at a poorly performing road junction. Overall, it is clear to me that it is the main road junctions which represent the primary threat to decent traffic flows. The fundamental premise of the TIA is justified in this respect.
127. I note that the base traffic surveys were undertaken at peak times in January 2013. However, a seasonal uplift has been added based on Highways Agency data setting out the peak hour traffic flows on the A590 at the junction with the B5277 throughout 2012. The TIA has deliberately ignored 'internal commuting' from within the peninsula to the proposed employment sites, and assumed that all such journeys will be on the B road network. Base traffic flows for 2025 have been derived using an industry standard forecasting program. This, it seems to me, amounts to double-counting, at least to some extent. In effect, in this respect, a worst case scenario has been assumed.
128. The findings of the models used in the TIA identify no concerns with regard to the performance of the six junctions identified. The TIA consequently concludes that the local road network can accommodate the development of the proposed allocations comfortably.
129. The 'urban' modelling employed has been criticised, and some argue that the assessment does not properly reflect the types and timing of traffic on the peninsula. It may be that a high proportion of Grange's population is retired, and so do not travel to work. The patterns of travel associated with camping and caravanning, guest houses and hotels may well also be outside the usual peak periods. But the point here is that in assuming a typical peak period or 'rush-hour' the TIA has taken account of a theoretical worst-case scenario. If this does not reflect the actual travel patterns on the peninsula, then the capacity on the road network may well be better than the TIA concludes.
130. Overall, I consider the TIA to be sufficiently robust. To my mind, traffic levels and flows will not be such that additional congestion resulting in a significantly increased threat to the town's tourist industry will occur. Given this and its findings, I consider that the issue of traffic flow is not one which weighs against the allocations proposed on the Cartmel Peninsula.

131. I note the points made about the difficulties of emerging from a side access onto the B5277, in relation to both existing homes and the housing allocations. It may be that the occupiers of the new homes will have to wait a while for a gap in traffic before emerging, and that once on the road they will add to the traffic causing such situations. But in the context of the volumes of traffic set out in the TIA, it seems unlikely to me that the degree of inconvenience involved will be excessive. In any case, difficulties of this sort are not uncommon. The annoyance of slightly longer journey times is not a strong reason to resist new housing development, especially in the light of the needs identified in this district.

Green Gaps

132. CS Policy CS8.2 says that this Plan will identify land as forming a Green Gap where, if developed, it would cause or add to the risk of future coalescence of two or more individual settlements between which it is important to retain a distinction. The Plan does identify such land, and is generally consistent with the CS in this. By and large, the question is whether or not some of the proposed site allocations will undermine the Green Gap concerned. I deal with this at the relevant sections under Issue 3 below.

Other matters

133. The AECOM Study and the clarifications report recommends in a number of cases that the highway speed limit should be reduced around sites to ensure safe access and egress. Notwithstanding the views of some, this is a wholly legitimate approach. Controlling traffic speeds to enable development is not a point for which the Council should be criticised.

134. The impact of development on the landscape is clearly an important matter. Many objections have been raised in relation to many sites on this basis. I note that sites are frequently on a hillside or include sloping land, which almost inevitably will render development on it more widely visible than might otherwise be the case, from vantage points on higher ground or elsewhere. In short, development on many of the proposed allocations will be visible to a greater or lesser extent.

135. However, to meet the need for housing in the district, and considering the generally undulating topography, change of this kind is not realistically avoidable. In any case, the noticeable presence of buildings is not necessarily a negative impact. Buildings can have a positive visual effect, even in rural settings like that of this district. Moreover, it is clear that the Council has considered the landscape impacts of developing the proposed sites through the site selection process. Notwithstanding the elements of judgement involved, I have found this to have been a sufficiently robust exercise.

136. A number of sites are proposed in locations where footways are either on the other side of the road and/or are not continuous between the site and local services. This situation is not ideal, but many homes across South Lakeland are in places with this sort of footway provision. The Council has put forward a number of modifications (**MM29 to MM40**) requiring the provision of footways in cases where this is reasonable and realistically deliverable. This is a pragmatic approach. I agree that these modifications are necessary to ensure

that pedestrian access to the proposed allocations is as safe as it can realistically be.

137. Inspectors' decisions in relation to previous planning appeals are referred to in relation to numerous proposed allocations. Planning applications and appeals are decided on the merits of the specific scheme in question, on the basis of the development plan and other material considerations in evidence. However, this examination concerns the entire re-casting of part of the development plan. My recommendations here are reached in a wholly different context to the appeal decisions of my colleagues. They follow scrutiny of the whole evidence base underpinning the Plan, particularly in relation to the need for development and the Council's assessment of alternatives. In the light of all this, I have considered the soundness of the proposed allocations. That is not the task before Inspectors in planning appeals. Consequently, while I recommend the allocation of a number of sites previously rejected by Inspectors, this is not a matter of inconsistency. Rather, it is a question of the different legal framework and planning context involved.

138. I also note the references to the Inspectors' reports on previous Local Plans. It is clear that some of the same or similar sites were under consideration then as now. I do reach different conclusions to my colleagues in a number of respects. But there has been significant change since earlier plans were considered, both in relation to the development needs of the district and the national and local planning policy context. In particular, consistency with the present CS and the NPPF are important factors which underpin my conclusions. My colleagues' conclusions were reached on a materially different basis.

Conclusion on Issue 2

139. Considering the above, I conclude that, with the proposed main modifications put forward by the Council, the proposed allocations are generally consistent with the Core Strategy and national policy and are justified. In the absence of compelling evidence to demonstrate that there are more appropriate sites in terms of deliverability, I conclude that the proposed allocations should be regarded as the most appropriate.

Issue 3 – Whether the individual site allocations proposed and Green Gaps identified are justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to site specific matters

Kendal and the east of the district

(Kendal, Oxenholme, Natland, Kirkby Lonsdale, Milnthorpe, Burneside, Burton-in-Kendal, Endmoor, Holme, Levens, Brigsteer)

Kendal: housing allocations

140. At the north western tip of Kendal's built edge, three contiguous parcels of land are proposed for housing. These are on the land west of High Garth (R44), west of High Sparrowmire (RN169M and RN299#) and north of High Sparrowmire (R46). Planning permission was granted in April 2013 for 27 affordable

dwellings on the site west of High Garth. At around 8.55 hectares, the land west of High Sparrowmire is significant in size. It is prominent in views of the wider landscape, and development of it will have considerable visual impacts. However, the Plan clearly identifies the need to address this and other impacts. Indeed, it commits the Council to preparing a brief to guide the development of this site. This is, in my view, both appropriate and necessary.

141. A development brief is also proposed in respect of the housing allocation north of Laurel Gardens (R170M-mod). Through this mechanism, ways of mitigating the visual effects of developing the site, its traffic impacts and flooding issues can be addressed in detail.
142. In assessing the highways implications of this site in relation to visibility at the access, the application of the standards in Manual for Streets (MfS) has been questioned. However, the definition of a street in MfS leaves significant room for judgements to be made with regard to what may be regarded as a street.
143. From the evidence and my site visit, I consider that a safe and satisfactory access could be achieved. The Council's modification (**MM41**) to ensure that the 30 mph speed limit on Burneside Road is extended to include the site frontage is necessary in this respect, and is a suitable measure.
144. The Council has proposed modifications (**MM41 and MM42**) in relation to the proposed allocations on land west of High Sparrowmire and north of Laurel Gardens. These follow agreement with United Utilities. I concur that they are required for soundness, because the Plan as originally submitted may otherwise unjustifiably delay the delivery of schemes which would not cause unacceptable impacts on the waste water network.
145. A number of residential allocations are proposed along the eastern and south eastern edge of Kendal. The Plan ensures that much of the land east of Castle Green Road (R121M-mod) will be used as open space, for sustainable drainage and as an access to the portion of the site to be developed. I note the survey [Ex101] and other evidence concerning Great Crested Newts, but my views set out under Issue 2 apply equally here.
146. The quality of the landscape has been taken into account through the site selection process. The new houses will be adjacent to the existing dwellings and would largely be seen against this backdrop and in the context of the surrounding built environment. The degree of change would not be significant and need not be harmful. With careful design and landscaping, there is no reason why access through the field off Castle Green Road should cause visual harm.
147. I recognise that some of the new houses would be quite close to the railway line. But relationships of this sort are not uncommon. It is reasonable to suppose that acoustic measures will be capable of creating satisfactory living environments within the houses. While passing trains would be audible in any gardens provided, those occupying homes here do so in the knowledge of the railway's presence.
148. The land west of Valley Drive (RN117M) largely slopes upwards in a westerly direction from the existing residential estate on flatter land to the east and south

of it. As a result, its development would be quite visually prominent. However, the presence of homes on rising land is quite common in this district. The Plan seeks to avoid development on the crest of the drumlin. In my opinion, even though many surrounding properties are bungalows, houses on this site need not look out of place or be a detracting feature of the residential area.

149. It is argued that the site forms part of an amenity open space. Its open nature does contribute positively to the surrounding area. However, from my site visits, the same could be said of many sites proposed for allocation, as well as those rejected. In this wider context, that of the need for housing in the district and in Kendal, and the robustness of the site selection methodology, I am not persuaded that the quality and value of this site is such that this factor should weigh against its allocation to any significant degree.
150. Access to the site from one or more of the cul-de-sacs will result in greater levels of traffic on them. People living there will experience associated impacts, including more traffic noise and a busier street. Nonetheless, the relationship between the homes concerned and the street will be comparable to that commonly found. I see no reason why developing the site need cause harm to living conditions here. Although not wide, from my site visit I agree with the AECOM Study that the culs-de-sac are of sufficient width to provide safe and suitable access into the site.
151. The DPD acknowledges that surface water drainage is among the key issues to be addressed by any scheme coming forward on this site. This is not an unusual problem and I see no reason why it cannot be successfully tackled here.
152. The Plan says that a development brief will be produced in relation to the proposed housing allocation at Kendal Parks (R107M and R150M). Given its scale and the issues involved, this is an appropriate and necessary approach, and will help to ensure that the development's visual impacts are adequately limited. From the AECOM Study, I concur that a safe and satisfactory access can be provided from Kendal Parks Road. The Council has put forward a modification (**MM43**) to specify the depth and treatment of the buffer around Natland Beck. As it is part of the River Kent SAC, this is necessary.
153. Along with its supporting text, Policy LA2.5 of the Plan sets out the issues to be addressed in bringing forward the site on land west of Oxenholme Road (RN133M and RN301M). With the modification proposed by the Council (**MM44**), the Plan is sufficiently clear about the requirements of developing the site. I am satisfied that its development will not undermine the Green Gap between Kendal and Oxenholme. The intervening distance remaining is sufficient to retain the distinct identities of the two settlements. This proposed allocation forms the great majority of a site for which permission for residential development was granted on appeal (reference APP/M0933/A/13/2193338) in October 2013. Notwithstanding the site boundary differences, my colleague's view that developing the appeal site would not undermine the Green Gap adds to my opinion in relation to the proposed allocation.
154. In terms of other visual impacts, it seems to me that the site's position and the topography introduce the scope for development on the site to be something of a landmark and visual gateway into south east Kendal. High quality landscape and building design will be especially critical here. The Plan provides an

appropriate steer in this regard.

155. The land south of Natland Mill Beck Farm (R97M-mod and part of MN34#-mod) is between Helme Lodge and Natland Mill Beck Farm itself, both of which are Grade II Listed Buildings. However, it is set a little away from both. In respect of the former, the site is currently separated from Helme Lodge's outdoor space by a very high hedge. Even if the site was once part of the Lodge's parkland, the two are now distinctly separate entities. The Lodge has rather turned its back on the site in any functional sense, and the hedge adds to the disassociation. While I note the points about the condition and longevity of the hedge, I see no particular reason why a suitable replacement boundary treatment could not be found. The farm yard and outbuildings will generally remain between the listed farmhouse and the new development. Given these factors, I consider that it would be possible for the residential development of the proposed allocation to be undertaken whilst preserving the setting of the listed buildings.
156. The Plan identifies Natland Mill Beck Lane as an unsuitable access to the site. From the evidence, I agree that it should not be used to access this site, and that Natland Road should be, in line with the proposed modifications (**MM45 and MM46**). It is less constrained and offers greater potential for a safe, wider and more direct route than the Natland Mill Beck Lane. I note that this route may cause difficulties in relation to the reinstatement of Lancaster canal, which is a longer term project. However, it has been put to me that there is a realistic solution, and the Council agrees that development of this site need not prevent the canal restoration project. As such, this issue does not amount to a disadvantage of allocating it. There is therefore no conflict between the allocation and the Plan's aim of protecting the route. While the Council does not suggest any main modifications to reflect this issue, it is nevertheless a consideration to be taken into account and dealt with through the planning application process.
157. Milnthorpe Road is a main route into Kendal, providing the primary road link from the south, via the A591, into Kendal town centre. At this southern edge of Kendal, two sites which are currently fields are proposed for allocation.
158. The land south of Lumley Road (M41KM) is proposed for housing. Some consider that its development for housing would amount to an extension into the open countryside. But the housing to the other side of Milnthorpe Road projects much further southwards, beyond the proposed site. Indeed, the small cluster of buildings at Helsington Laithes is also to the south of the proposed allocation. In any case, as I have discussed above under Issue 2, this Plan is necessarily reliant on greenfield land, especially around the edges of settlements, not least Kendal. As such, many proposed allocations protrude into what is presently countryside. For reasons I have previously given, this is not, in itself, a disadvantage.
159. While development on this site will be unavoidably prominent, given the sloping topography, I consider this to be no drawback in this case. So long as the scheme is of a high quality design, as the Plan specifically demands, it will introduce a distinctive visual gateway into the town. At least, the allocation offers the opportunity for such an effect. While I note that buildings at Helsington Laithes Manor are Grade II* Listed, given the distance between the

manor and the site, and the intervening buildings and features, housing development on the site need not fail to preserve their setting.

160. At around 10.8 hectares, the proposed residential allocation on land at Stainbank Green (R103M-mod) along the western edge of Kendal is significant in size. However, because of the surrounding topography, it is not especially prominent in the wider landscape and development on it will not stand out. It is clear that the development brief to be produced by the Council will give guidance about landscaping and green infrastructure. This will help to ensure that it does not have a negative impact in views from the National Park. The Plan identifies the issues to be addressed and, as I see it, none are of a fundamental nature or otherwise undermine the proposed allocation. The modification (**MM47**) requiring that access be off Brigsteer Road is needed, to prevent highways problems on residential estate road what might otherwise be used. Given the comments from Natural England, the Plan should specify the need for an ecological survey in this case, in line with the Council's modification (**MM48**).
161. The Plan also commits the Council to producing a development brief in relation to the residential allocation on land south of Underbarrow Road (R129M and R143). The western boundary of this site abuts part of the Lake District National Park boundary. Given this, and as the site generally slopes downwards from Underbarrow Road, development on it will be clearly visible from parts of the National Park. But views of this sort are not unusual in National Parks, and I see no reason why this, in itself, should be a problem. There is no reason to suppose that a high quality design cannot be secured by the Council through the planning application process. Along with green infrastructure, to be guided by the development brief, I consider that housing here could integrate satisfactorily into the surrounding landscape. Given the proximity of the allocation to a former landfill site, a contamination assessment should be required, as the Council suggests (**MM49**).
162. Both the Stainbank Green and Underbarrow Road sites will increase traffic levels eastwards into the town centre. This may cause some queuing from time to time, particularly at the point where Underbarrow Road/Greenside and Brigsteer Road meet. However, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that this will be severe. In any event, the inconvenience caused to drivers by congestion is not a strong reason to reject allocations seeking to meet the need for housing.
163. The residential allocation on land at Vicarage Drive (R31#) comprises a largely overgrown parcel within a residential estate. From the evidence and my site visit, I see no reason why it should not be allocated.
164. The Council proposes (**MM50**) to delete the housing allocation at Acre Moss Garages (RN228#) as a consequence of evidence concerning surface water drainage problems. In this context, I agree that its inclusion is unsound.

Kendal: Broad Locations for new housing

165. Both of the Broad Locations for new housing in Kendal are in the vicinity of Listed Buildings. It is argued that, in combination with the residential allocation south of Natland Mill Beck Farm (R97M-mod and part of MN34#-mod), the Burton Road Broad Location will cause Helme Lodge to be 'sandwiched' and its

setting eroded. The Appleby Road Broad Location effectively includes two areas, one to the north of Spital Farmhouse and Threshing Barn Grade II Listed Buildings and the other to the south, which gives rise to similar issues.

166. Much will depend on the precise extent of the land to be developed, which is not defined as part of this Plan. It seems to me that great care will be necessary to ensure that the setting of the Listed Buildings concerned is satisfactorily preserved. In relation to Helme Lodge, the sloping topography may well prove helpful, while in the case of Spital Farmhouse and Threshing Barn the extent of land potentially involved offers considerable scope for new development to be set significantly away from the building. Overall, notwithstanding the sensitivity required, I am persuaded that the housing envisaged by the Council could be delivered whilst preserving the Listed Buildings' settings.
167. Modifications have been put forward by the Council (**MM51**) setting out the main issues associated with the Burton Road Broad Location and the expectation that Appleby Road will also meet identified needs for formal and informal recreation, potentially including an athletics track. Both, it seems to me, are necessary to ensure that the development plan properly addresses the question of what each site should deliver and establishes the issues to be squarely tackled. While I appreciate that any present need for an athletics track will not be met for some time, the Plan, as modified, offers the most realistic means of delivery.
168. I note that some wish to see these Broad Locations allocated as housing sites in this Plan. Even if I were to agree that the AA, SA and consultation work undertaken were sufficient to support this, given my overall conclusions set out below, allocating housing sites at these Broad Locations in this Plan is not necessary for soundness.

Kendal: employment allocations

169. At around 17.9 hectares, the proposed Strategic Employment Site on land at Scroggs Wood, Milnthorpe Road (E4M) is substantial in size. It is a field beyond Scroggs Wood, a linear band of woodland which visually demarcates the edge of the settlement here. The proposed allocation will disrupt this effect and development on the site will be rather noticeable. Consequently, the presence of high quality business premises of the kind sought by the Plan here would make a bold, positive statement about the economic environment and opportunities available in Kendal. At this gateway position, it would leave one in no doubt about the intended message. This is an important advantage of this site.
170. The Plan is clear that design, landscaping and boundary treatments are critical factors. Restricting the developable area to 11 hectares, as previously mentioned, will introduce the opportunity for the significant structural planting envisaged as part of the development. The 10 metre buffer and 15 metre set back proposed (**MM52 and MM22**) are both necessary and will enable a satisfactory relationship between the site and the wood. It could also provide a foundation for the design of landscaping on the site.
171. Because of the size, position and topography of this site, development on it will be quite prominent in the wider landscape. However, notwithstanding the

adjacent wood, in many views it will be seen in the context of the built development to the north. Even if site M41KM is not built, it will be readily apparent that the business premises are an integral part of Kendal's developed hinterland. The point is that it will be legible in the landscape. That it may introduce a widely noticeable, business-focussed landmark at a main gateway to Kendal need not be a drawback. Much will depend on the detail. I consider that the Plan is sufficiently robust in identifying the issues to be tackled. It will provide the Council with the necessary policy steer and control, especially as a development brief is to be prepared.

172. Highways issues and the possibility that improvements to Milnthorpe Road may be necessary are clearly among the challenges. Because of the site's scale and considerable road frontage, it is highly likely that even significant changes to the highway arrangement could be physically accommodated, if necessary. As such, in the absence of compelling or detailed evidence to the contrary, I see no reason why the allocation should lead to highway safety problems. This is not an inevitable outcome.
173. A viability assessment has been produced for the landowner of this site. Those promoting land at Junction 36 criticise it, including the values and assumptions made. In reaching my conclusions, I do not rely on it. I have already set out my view regarding viability matters under Issue 2 above. They apply equally in relation to the proposed allocation at Scroggs Wood. Even if I were to consider Junction 36 favourable in viability terms, it is clearly less preferable in respect of the sequential approach for the identification of strategic employment sites set out in CS Policy CS7.2. Moreover, I am of the firm view that the sustainability credentials of Scroggs Wood, though perhaps not overwhelming, nonetheless compare favourably to those of Junction 36. It is significantly closer to Kendal town centre and the services and facilities there, and also to the town's residential neighbourhoods where some proportion of the prospective workforce can reasonably be expected to live. It strikes me that this is why it performs better in relation to the CS sequential approach.
174. Land east of Burton Road (M2M-mod) is allocated for employment as a business and science park site. Development on it will reduce the Green Gap between Kendal and Oxenholme to some extent. Having said that, it is set on land below the level of much around it. Because of this, its development need not contribute to the sense of visual coalescence as much as it otherwise might. Moreover, a clear undeveloped swathe will remain between the two settlements. In my view, it will be sufficient to ensure that their individual identities are adequately safeguarded.
175. As originally submitted, the Plan proposes four Local Employment Sites. However, as a satisfactory access cannot be provided to the land at Boundary Bank (E33), I agree that it should be deleted as the Council proposes (**MM53**).
176. Of the three remaining Local Employment Sites, both the land at Shap Road Industrial Estate (EN28M) and land north of Meadowbank Business Park (E23K#) have a close relationship with current business uses. The former represents a small unused plot within an industrial estate. Subject to access being from the north and not off Gilthwaiterigg Lane (**MM54**), to avoid highway problems, it is wholly appropriate. The latter is adjacent to an existing business park. Though quite visually prominent, its development will be seen on the context of the

existing business uses here. It need not look out of place or otherwise detract from the surrounding environment to any material degree. As such, I see no reason why it should harm other businesses in the vicinity.

177. The land south of K Shoes, Natland Road (E31M) is a field close to an existing business premises. It is on a prominent corner position on the approach to Kendal along Natland Road. But at one hectare, the site is reasonably limited in size. With the Council's modification (covered under **MM29**), the Plan is clear that structural landscaping and tree planting to the southern, eastern and western boundaries will be required. In this context, development on it need not dominate the street scene or fail to preserve the setting of the nearby Watercrock Roman Fort and civil settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument. In the light of my site visit and the AECOM Study, I consider that a safe and suitable access could be provided here.

Oxenholme

178. Around 24 houses are anticipated on the land east of Burton Road (RN223#). It comprises a field on the southern fringe of Oxenholme. Between the two houses to the south and the main built form of the settlement to the north, housing on it need not detract from the surrounding environment to any material extent.

179. The allocation on land south of Fell Close (R108M) will bring Oxenholme a little closer to Natland. But, in my view, the Green Gap remaining between the two will be adequate to ensure that their separate and distinct identities, and prevent coalescence. The railway line separating them will help in this respect. The Plan clearly sets out the primary issues involved in developing the site.

Natland

180. The land west of Sedgwick Road (R62) comprises a field between the Appletree school to the south and houses to the north. The westward extent of the site is limited to reflect the western boundaries of other properties. New housing on it would be seen on the context of these, and the recent residential development on the opposite side of Sedgwick Road. I consider that this allocation need not lead to any harm being caused, and as such it is appropriate.

Kirkby Lonsdale

181. Land at Tram Lane (ref R640#) is proposed by the Council for deletion (**MM55**). I agree that it should not be in the Plan, as planning permission has been granted and construction has commenced.

182. Around 80 dwellings are expected on the proposed allocation on land north of Kendal Road (ref R127M – mod) along with open space and roughly one hectare of economic development. The site is well screened in the landscape, particularly from the west by the sloping land. There are few parts of the settlement from which it is prominent. A range of issues will need to be addressed by any scheme coming forward, including the presence of woodland and wildlife, and school playing fields. These are identified in the Plan, which also commits to the production of a development brief. This is an appropriate and justified approach.

183. I understand that planning permission has been granted on the allocation proposed adjacent to Binfold Croft (ref R642M). However, from the details provided, it appears that this is subject to design improvements. Given this, it remains appropriate to retain the site in the Plan.

184. I note the arguments in support of land south of Kendal Road (ref R118). However, I see no particular reason why Kirkby Lonsdale should require a gateway development here, to the west of the centre. Even if it should be advantageous, I regard the Plan to be sound without it.

Milnthorpe

185. Following the proposed deletion of the land north west of Milnthorpe as a housing allocation (M9M2-mod), previously mentioned, part of that site has been made available for employment purposes. The Council has put a modification forward in this regard, and also proposes to enlarge the adjacent employment allocation (**MM56**). In the circumstances, these are pragmatic and appropriate changes.

186. The Council has also put forward a modification to remove the residential allocation of land at Owlet Ash Fields, Ackenthwaite (RN140) (**MM57**). This site projects from the built edge of Ackenthwaite across the proposed Green Gap between Ackenthwaite and Milnthorpe. Its western edge is very close to buildings at the Dallam School. The development of this site would significantly undermine the function of the Green Gap. Its deletion and consequential identification as part of the Green Gap (**MM58**) is therefore required for soundness.

187. In combination, these modifications reduce the number of houses to be provided through allocations quite significantly. I concur that, in the light of the CS expectations for housing delivery in the Key Service Centres, and for affordable housing in this part of the district, this amounts to a shortfall for which the Plan should compensate.

188. To this end, the Council proposes to introduce land adjacent to Firs Road as a housing allocation (**MM59**), which it is anticipated will deliver in the region of 85 dwellings. It is consequently proposed to delete the Broad Location (**MM60**). In bringing this allocation forward, the Council has reviewed the options in Milnthorpe. The Council says the site now proposed is the most appropriate and the SA supports this view. From the evidence, I can see no preferable alternatives which would deliver housing of the order required to properly address the deficit here. Consequently, the proposed changes are justified and should be made. The remaining shortfall against the level of housing originally proposed is not so significant and, in my view, it is not imperative for soundness to redress this balance. For safety reasons, the modification (**MM61**) extending the lower speed limit to include the site access is necessary.

189. The Plan proposes around 8.07 hectares of land adjacent to Mainline Business Park (E13M-mod) for economic development in use classes B2 and B8. This is a sizeable site in the countryside some way from the built envelope of Milnthorpe. The proposed development will clearly have a visual impact, particularly given the topography here. I note the Council's intention to add text referring to views from Farleton Knott and the need for landscaping. This is helpful.

Nonetheless, the development will be visible in the landscape, including from some distant vantage points. However, it seems to me that it will largely be seen alongside the existing business park. Although a significant extension, it will not be of excessive. In this context, in my opinion, the additional visual impact need not result in material harm.

190. There are significant highways issues in relation to this site. It will be necessary to use land to the east of the allocation to provide a satisfactory junction arrangement with the B6385 and to ensure that the lengthy access road is of sufficient width for HGVs to pass. The analysis undertaken by AECOM indicates that a roundabout may be needed. I have been assured that all the necessary land is in the control of the proposed site's owner(s). As such, the allocation is appropriate in this regard.
191. More widely, the Council's aim is to avoid HGVs travelling to and from this site passing through Milnthorpe. However, the principal alternative route from the M6, A65 and trunk road network entails crossing the Crooklands Bridge over the Lancaster Canal in Crooklands. The bridge is Grade II Listed and not wide. The approach to it from the west includes a right angled bend which forces HGVs into the oncoming lane. Even though a signed route to a VOSA Goods Vehicle Testing Station, I agree with the Council's general position. In short, the likely increase in HGV traffic resulting from the proposed allocation would lead to highway safety concerns. This should not be allowed, and the development should be contingent on an acceptable solution being put in place. The Plan is appropriately clear in this regard, and refers to the alternatives considered by the Council through the Crooklands Bridge Initial Feasibility Review [Ex066c].
192. I am told that the Council has also given consideration to a more direct access to the A590, and they have proposed a modification to include this as a possible solution (**MM62**). For clarity, and to not exclude a potentially acceptable solution, this is necessary.
193. All of this, including providing an adequate site access from the B6385, will clearly have a financial cost. This strikes me as an abnormal cost not fully accounted for in the Viability Study. A range of possible funding sources have been identified, although no concrete commitment appears to have been made. More positively, though, the Council has identified access to employment sites among the priorities in the IDP to benefit from CIL. The County Council has also included this particular project to its schedule of major highways schemes. This lends a reasonable degree of confidence that the site represents a financially viable prospect with a realistic chance of being delivered at some point in the plan period. Overall, notwithstanding the problems, I consider it a sound allocation.

Burneside

194. The residential allocation on land adjacent to Hall Park (R489M) will provide approximately 70 dwellings. With the modification put forward regarding the need to extend existing footways if access is from Hall Park Road (included under **MM5**), this site is justified and effective.
195. The village recreation (Willink) field and tennis courts site (M38M) could provide around 23 homes. I agree it necessary to make clear that the site cannot be

developed until appropriate replacement facilities are provided and ready for use (included under **MM30**), whether on the allocated site to the south of Burneside Football Club (ON47#) or elsewhere in the village. The appropriateness of this arrangement hinges on the new facilities being equal or better in scale or quality than those they replace. The text demanding this (**MM63**) is also required. I note the AECOM Study's conclusions, especially in relation to visibility. However, these have been based on the premise that a new access would be needed. However, I am told that the existing access to the football club will be used. This is an appropriate arrangement.

196. In my view, it is essential for people's safety that the proposed employment site on land adjacent to Cropper's Paper Mill (E32M) is not accessed from Hall Road. The narrowness and curve of the highway, the wall along part of its edge and the vegetation above combine to render visibility here very poor. The text proposed by the Council (included under **MM6**) insisting that access must be through the paper mill's main entrance is therefore necessary.

197. I note the concerns about the Green Gap between Burneside and Kendal. However, taking account of the land allocations proposed in both settlements, I am of the firm view that the breadth of the gap between them will remain significant and will satisfactorily perform the function intended.

Burton-in-Kendal

198. Main modifications are proposed by the Council in relation to land east of Boon Town (RN226 and RN277#) and land at Green Dragon Farm (MN26#-mod). The former (**MM64**) is to ensure that the play space is appropriately screened, and is necessary. While Boon Town is not a wide street, I concur with the general conclusion of the AECOM Study that the additional vehicular movements along it to the site need not cause safety problems or other material harm. Any development on the Green Dragon Farm site must ensure that the setting of the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings is preserved. The Plan deals with this and is satisfactory. Again, from the AECOM Study and my site visit, I see no reason why a safe, adequate access could not be provided to serve this site.

199. The Council also proposes a modification in relation to the residential allocation on land east of Hutton Close (R76M) requiring the widening of Church Bank Gardens, the access road to the site. Church Bank Gardens is quite narrow. However, it is sufficient to allow two vehicles to pass. It already serves a number of homes and I have not been made aware that its width has caused problems in this regard. I recognise that the proposed allocation will lead to greater levels of traffic on Church Bank Gardens. But it seems to me that its restricted width will serve to slow traffic speeds, which is no disadvantage. While the widening suggested may be helpful in terms of providing a pavement, the site already has pedestrian links. A public bridleway connects it to Vicarage Lane and a passageway, albeit rather a narrow one, connects it to the A6070. Given all this, and as the submitted Plan identifies pedestrian access as a key issue, the proposed modification is not necessary for soundness. It is appropriate that this matter, along with the others mentioned in the Plan, be resolved through the planning application process.

Endmoor

200. At the northern edge of Endmoor, land north of Sycamore Close (M41M-mod) is proposed to be allocated for around 100 new homes. This may be a higher density of development than in other parts of Endmoor. Nonetheless, in my view, it is a low density which would be sufficiently respectful of the nature of the neighbouring buildings and the village in general.
201. Given its position and the speed limit at this point on the A65, the Council's suggested modifications (**MM65**) to extend the lower speed limit past the site and introduce associated gateway measures are necessary. It is also critical to ensure that the development does not affect water quality in Peasey Beck, which is downhill to the east. As such, I agree that text should be added as suggested by the Council (**MM66**).
202. Many arguments have been made against the allocation of this site, and I have taken account of them all. Perhaps the principal of these relates to landscape impacts. It is clear to me that the development will be quite prominent, particularly from the north and vantage points on higher ground. But the present northern built edge of Endmoor is similarly readily visible. While change will doubtless occur, good quality design and landscaping will ensure that impacts are minimised. The Plan says that a development brief will be prepared which will address landscape and green infrastructure issues, which should help considerably. Landscaping along the northern site edge, as set out in the DPD, will also help to ensure that Endmoor and Low Park do not visually coalesce, as some fear. In my opinion, though, the significant distance remaining between them will be the key aspect in this regard. Overall, to my mind, residential development here need not cause material harm.
203. Towards the south of Endmoor, land south of Bowling Green (R670-mod) is also allocated for residential development. It is estimated that it could provide 25 dwellings. The Plan identifies relevant issues to be addressed and none raised are sufficient to prevent allocation.
204. An employment site (EN20 and EN33#) is proposed to the northeast of Endmoor. It is a little way from the main built envelope of the village. However, notwithstanding the intervening presence of Peasey Beck and the trees and vegetation along its banks, the proposed site is adjacent to the Gatebeck Industrial Estate. The Policies Map clearly indicates that development must be limited to the north eastern part of the site closest to the industrial estate. As a consequence, the proposed site will effectively form an extension of the present commercial area. This is an appropriate approach. Clustering in this way will help to concentrate commercial traffic, especially lorries, along Gatebeck Lane, away from the narrower Gatebeck Road through the village. The Council proposes a modification seeking this outcome (included under **MM7**), which I agree will give necessary clarity.
205. A number of other changes are also proposed by the Council in relation to this site (all under **MM7**). One relates to protecting water quality at Peasey Beck. Another requires the site access to be staggered with the existing junction of Gatebeck Lane and Gatebeck Road. For the reasons the Council gives, these additions to the Plan are necessary for soundness.

206. I understand that a plan for nine houses on a non-allocated site is presently being brought forward. I see no reason why a reduction on the area of land allocated through the Plan should be a consequence of this. New housing is expected to be delivered on sites not allocated in the Plan. Indeed, as I have said under Issue 2, delivering the homes needed in the district relies on this and other sources.

Holme

207. Two housing allocations are proposed in Holme. The site comprising land east of Milnthorpe Road (ref R653M-mod) is to be the subject of a development brief. Given the issues involved, mentioned in the Plan, this is a necessary and satisfactory approach.

208. The allocation on land west of Burton Road (ref R675M-mod) does protrude from the present built settlement edge. But it would largely be seen in the context of the long ribbon of buildings along Station Road to the west. Views of the development from the canal would largely be against the backdrop of existing buildings in the village. In this context, it need not stand out in the landscape or detract from the surroundings to any significant degree.

209. Land is proposed to be allocated for economic development to the east of the existing Elmsfield Park Industrial Estate (ref E18M). Though some way to the north of the village, it represents an extension of the present estate. In this context, I consider it appropriate. A further employment site is proposed (ref M35M) off Milnthorpe Road, closer to the village. With the measures outlined in the Plan, this allocation is justified.

Levens

210. As submitted, two housing allocations are proposed. However, part of the former poultry sheds site (RN121M-mod) became unavailable during the examination. The owners of the remaining portion argue for its retention. However, while the Council does not resist its development in principle, they say that less than 0.3 hectares of it is suitable for development, such that it is below the threshold for allocation. Given the latter point, I am of the firm view that it would be inconsistent with the Council's site selection methodology and thus unjust to allocate the remaining portion of land. The Council's proposal (covered under **MM24**) to delete the allocation but retain the land inside the development boundary is the most appropriate course.

211. The other residential allocation on land east of Greengate Crescent (R51M) comprises fields on sloping land on the built edge of Levens. It includes mature trees. I have no doubt that developing it for housing will bring about changes, including to the immediate landscape, the outlook from neighbouring homes and on the levels of traffic using the existing residential roads. Density will have a bearing. But the Plan recognises the need to retain the tree belt, which will help the development to integrate into the surroundings. While it does not prescribe a specific maximum density as some wish, the Council will retain control through the planning application process. The need for good design and traffic management measures is also identified in the Plan, and I see no reason why this site could not be developed without causing material harm.

Brigsteer

212. Land opposite the Wheatsheaf (ref RN213-mod) is proposed as the only residential allocation in the Plan outside of a Service Centre. It will provide seven homes, around four of which are anticipated to be affordable, and has been brought forward by the Community Land Trust to meet local needs. As it comprises a small area of woodland there will be some impacts on biodiversity. The AECOM Study confirms that a safe access can be achieved. Given the low traffic speeds and volumes here, I concur. The Plan clearly identifies the main issues to be addressed. Overall, I consider this to be a suitable allocation.

The Arnside and Silverdale AONB

(Arnside, Storth and Sandside)

213. The NPPF says that AONBs have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. As such, in the AONB, the weight to be given to environmental considerations when balancing them against social and economic issues should be greater than elsewhere.

214. However, in allocating sites for housing, the Plan as originally submitted is based on the uniform application of the aforementioned exclusion criteria. As such, sites below 0.3 hectares have not been considered. But in the context of its status of protection, consideration of smaller sites in the AONB amounts to a reasonable alternative. Indeed, it seems to me that smaller sites would be more likely to ensure that the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB is protected in the way envisaged by the NPPF.

215. Moreover, some of the sites proposed for allocation add to my misgivings. At the hearing session, the Council confirmed that the land proposed to be allocated for housing at Station Road (RN337#), Hollins Lane (RN225-mod) and Redhills Road (R81) is considered to currently perform a greenspace function. I am told that the Council judges these sites to have amenity value, in that they contribute positively to the character and appearance of the settlement and thus of the AONB, to some degree. From my site visits, I concur with that analysis.

216. Overall, in the context of the policy protection applying to the AONB, the combination of discounting smaller sites from the site selection process and the visual contribution made by some of the sites chosen for allocation, I consider the proposed housing sites in the AONB to be unsound.

217. To address this, the Council has given consideration to a number of alternative options, set out in a letter [Ex057]. In effect, the proposed way forward is to modify the Plan so that rather than allocating land in the AONB it introduces a commitment to produce a new AONB Local Plan jointly with Lancaster City Council. This is set out in a number of modifications put forward by the Council (**MM67 to MM71**). Many other alterations to the Plan are needed in the light of these, including the deletion of settlement boundaries and land allocations. But they are consequential changes resulting from introducing the new approach, and I have therefore not included them in the Appendix.

218. From all of this, I accept the proposed solution to be the most appropriate. Crucially, it has been agreed with Lancaster City Council. Both planning

authorities have committed to producing the AONB Local Plan in their Local Development Schemes [Ex060 and Ex107] and in a Statement of Common Ground [Ex090]. Also importantly, this option has the clear backing of local groups, notably the AONB Management Unit and Parish Councils. That such groups are to be actively involved in the preparation of the plan is another good reason to support it.

219. I recognise that the effect of producing a separate plan for the AONB will be to delay housing delivery in that area. But, in my view, delaying the progress of the district-wide land allocations DPD would be an inevitable outcome of the reasonable alternatives. I consider this to be a greater disadvantage.
220. The Council envisages the new AONB Local Plan being adopted in January 2016. This is not soon. However, given the degree of partnership working and cooperation involved, and the Council's other plan-making commitments, an earlier adoption date would likely be unrealistic. In this context, I consider that the Plan, as proposed by the Council to be modified, should be regarded as sound in this respect.

The Cartmel Peninsula

(Grange-over-Sands, Allithwaite, Cartmel, Flookburgh/Cark)

Grange-over-Sands

221. Four sites are proposed solely for housing in Grange. The allocations on land opposite Low Fell Gate Farm (R74 and R449), land south of Thornfield Road (R110) and land north of Carter Road (R89) all involve fairly steeply sloping fields. Consequently, development on them would be readily visible. However, the former two sites are, in effect, extensions of the existing built edge. The latter site is surrounded on all sides by housing. In my view, dwellings on these sites need not look out of place. The Plan identifies the issues to be addressed in bringing these sites forward. While it is likely that drainage and water issues will also need to be overcome, that is not an unusual circumstance. I note the concerns raised about access to these sites. However, from the AECOM Study and my site visits, I consider that safe and suitable access arrangements can be achieved. I see no impediment to their allocation.
222. Housing on land west of Cardrona Road (R672M) will extend the built edge of Grange westwards towards Allithwaite. However, at a little over a hectare in area, it is not a large site and the degree to which it projects towards Allithwaite is limited, and significantly less so than the proposed allocation to the south (MN25M) discussed below. Considering these factors, the development of the site need not cause visual harm and will not result in coalescence with Allithwaite. The Green Gap identified will be sufficient in length to ensure that both settlements retain their individual identities. The sloping topography will also help in that regard. The proposed requirements in relation to setting new development back from the adjacent SSSI and provision of a landscape buffer (**MM72**) is necessary.
223. Three sites are proposed for a range of uses. It is evident that the Berners Pool site (M378M, R381 and R383) is a key regeneration opportunity for Grange. Its proposed allocation for housing, health care, open space, offices and leisure uses

is appropriate. The amendment proposed (**MM73**) to clarify that housing will not be allowed on the former lido is necessary, given the risk of flooding there.

224. Guide's Lot (R350M) is allocated for housing and employment. The Plan clearly identifies the main issues for its future development, particularly the proximity of the SSSI. In this regard, the proposed additions (**MM74**) relating to the provision of a fenced 10 metre buffer strip and setting development 15 metres back from the SSSI are needed.
225. At around 11.2 hectares, the mixed use allocation proposed on land south of Allithwaite Road, Kent's Bank (MN25M) is by some way the largest in Grange. Its development will involve a range of issues which are identified in the Plan. It is therefore appropriate that a development brief is proposed for this site. To avoid unacceptable impacts in the locality, storage and distribution uses should not be permitted. In this respect, the modification proposed by the Council (**MM75**) is necessary for clarity.
226. Many objections and comments on numerous points have been made. However, because of the site's topography, it is visually contained reasonably well in the surrounding landscape. While the development proposed on it would be visible in some views and even prominent in others, particularly from some nearby homes, more localised changes of this sort are inevitable with any development. Here, it seems to me, the sloping land would help to ensure that the development integrates with the surrounding buildings and wider landscape. In addition, it seems entirely possible to me that hydro-geological, surface and other water issues associated with the site could be overcome. It is not uncommon for developments to successfully tackle problems like this. Indeed, the Council's amendment (**MM76**) requiring a holistic approach to drainage management and a Sustainable Drainage System will go some way towards this, and is necessary.
227. At present, the site adds to the degree of separation between Grange and Allithwaite, especially when viewed on plan or from Allithwaite Road. Its proposed allocation raises the question of whether the remaining land identified as a Green Gap is sufficient to ensure the two settlements remain distinct from one another. From my site visits here, in my opinion and on balance, it is.
228. In reaching this view, the addition of the text proposed by the Council requiring the westernmost portion of the site to be kept for open space and landscaping (included under **MM75**) has been crucial. The modification is not explicit about the size of the area involved. But the critical point is that the development will not extend 'hard up' to the limit of the allocated site. There will be a cushion between the development and the identified Green Gap. In this context, the extent of the Green Gap is adequate to prevent the coalescence of Grange and Allithwaite and to protect their distinctive identities. The proposed allocation of land to the western edge of the Green Gap on land north of Jack Hill in Allithwaite (RN79#-mod) does not alter my view. The extent to which it projects towards Grange is limited such that it has little impact on the Green Gap.
229. I note that all of the new housing sites proposed are south of the town centre, away from its facilities and the prospective new supermarket. But the SA has considered proximity to services and facilities. Given the availability of land in

Grange and other suitability factors, I am not persuaded that preferable alternatives have been rejected.

Allithwaite

230. Two parcels bisected by the B5277 are proposed for housing on land north of Jack Hill (RN79#-mod). It is estimated that together they will provide 27 dwellings. The road frontage of both portions is close to the junction of the B5277 with Jack Hill and Kirkhead Road, at a point where the B5277 bends quite sharply. As a consequence, the configuration of the junction with the B5277 will be a central issue for the delivery of the site. Given the relationship with the proposed residential allocation to the rear of Bankfield (R347#), I concur that the access and junction arrangements for this site should be dealt with at the same time as the Council proposes (**MM77 and MM78**). With these alterations, both the Jack Hill and Bankfield sites are sound.
231. Barn Hey farm house and cottage are listed buildings. Land to the rear is proposed for allocation (RN224, RN86# and RN195) to provide around 30 dwellings. Pedestrian access from the site to the village centre presently involves negotiating a particularly narrow pinch point on the B5277 where there are no footways. I therefore agree with the Council that the provision of a direct pedestrian route to the village is a key issue for the site's development and that the proposed text (**MM79**) is necessary to reflect this. In line with that proposed alteration, it is also necessary for the Plan to require that Locker Lane be widened as far as the site access. With these modifications, as the Plan identifies the issues to be addressed through the planning application process, notably the need to consider the setting of the listed buildings, this site is appropriate and justified.
232. The B5277 slopes quite steeply at the point where access into the land to the rear of Almond Bank (M32#-mod) will be taken, and there are no footways along this stretch. In the circumstances, it would be unreasonable to expect or require footpath linkages. My general point about the adequacy of situations such as this, set out under Issue 2 above, applies here. Though not ideal, this should not be a determining factor. The Plan identifies access as the key issue. On this basis, I regard the site to be appropriate. That the local community is actively seeking to provide a network of footways around Allithwaite adds to my view on this.
233. The primary requirements for the proposed residential allocation on land south of Green Lane (R339# including RN73) are set out in the Plan. These include the provision of a 'village green' and space to extend the adjacent graveyard. In my view, this is appropriate and justified.
234. Following the deletion of the residential allocation on land west of Bracken Edge (RN265#), due to a land availability issue, the Council does not propose to 're-tighten' the development boundary. Instead, it is proposed that it should follow the outline of the deleted site. This would allow development to come forward on the land if it is made fully available. I note the points in objection to this. But land ownerships and access rights are capable of change. This applies to the land adjacent to the narrow lane access, and any other land necessary for delivery here. It is therefore possible that this site and a suitable access to it could come forward during the plan period. In the specific circumstances of this

case, and particularly as the notion of new homes on this land has been the subject of consultation through the process, enabling this through its inclusion within the development boundary is an appropriate approach.

Cartmel

235. Cartmel is particularly constrained by areas of flood risk. Many alternative sites have been discounted on the basis of the flood risk exclusion criteria and application of the sequential test. This is wholly appropriate and consistent with national policy.
236. Part of the proposed residential allocation to the south of Hags Lane (R112 and ON17) abuts the Conservation Area. However, this need not be any impediment. Rather, it should be seen as a catalyst for high quality and sensitive design. The Plan is clear that around one third of the site should be used as a vegetation and open space buffer to protect the biodiversity interest of Hesketh Wood. This is appropriate.
237. Whilst access into the site is not straightforward, from the evidence and my site visit, I consider that a safe arrangement can be achieved. Although this is likely to mean altering the present speed limit along part of Hags Lane, I see no problem with this.
238. A further housing site to provide around 15 dwellings is proposed at the Cartmel racecourse stables site (RN14#). This is contingent on the provision of appropriate stables elsewhere. While there are no footways to the centre of Cartmel, the road here is not particularly busy and traffic speeds are not excessive. People commonly walk along rural routes like this, and I do not consider this route to be dangerous in this regard. The Plan identifies the issues associated with the site. None, to my mind, should prevent the allocation, but will need to be addressed at the planning application stage.

Flookburgh/Cark

239. The proposed housing allocation (R687) to the north of Allithwaite Road (B5277) could accommodate around 24 dwellings. To the west of the site's road frontage is a railway bridge. The road bends either side of it. This will inevitably reduce visibility for drivers leaving the site and those turning right into it. However, I saw on my site visit that the highway alignment and bridge cause drivers to slow down considerably. Though only a snapshot in time, it seems likely to me that this is fairly representative and that many drive quite slowly along this stretch. In this context, I consider that an adequate site access could be provided.
240. To the opposite side of the railway bridge is a further residential allocation on land east of Manorside (R685). Given the constraints, it is likely that access will be from Manorside. Though not an especially wide residential cul-de-sac, with the Council's modification (under **MM9**) requiring a suitable pedestrian access connecting to the existing footway, I see no reason why it could not provide safe access for the site. While on-street parking may inconvenience existing and prospective residents, it is probable that it will heighten caution and ensure that traffic speeds remain low. The same point applies to the use of Eccleston Meadow to access the residential allocation on land east of Winder Lane (R321M). The AECOM Study supports an approach along Eccleston Meadow, and

I agree that this would be a safe arrangement.

241. The Council proposes to delete Station Yard (EN42#) as an employment allocation, and to identify it as an existing employment site (**MM80 and MM81**). On the evidence and from my site visit, as a matter of fact and degree, I agree that it should be regarded as an existing employment site.

Ulverston and Furness

(Ulverston, Swarthmoor, Broughton-in-Furness, Great/Little Urswick, Penny Bridge/Greenodd, and Kirkby-in-Furness)

Ulverston

242. Land is allocated for residential development at Stone Cross Mansion (RN250#), which is a Grade II Listed Building set in substantial grounds in the Conservation Area. However, the Plan is clear that only enabling development will be allowed to secure the future of the mansion. This is consistent with the NPPF and is appropriate.
243. A further, small portion of land is proposed for housing immediately adjacent to the above site, South of Stockbridge Lane (RN3). The Plan clearly identifies the effect on the setting of Stone Cross Mansion and Stockbridge House, and on the Conservation Area, as key issues to be addressed in bringing development forward. I consider this approach and the proposed allocation satisfactory.
244. Morecambe Road Scrapyard (R268) and land north of Watery Lane (R270M) are close to one another, separated by the railway line. The former includes brownfield land. The Plan sets out the issues to be addressed in bringing each forward for residential development, and they are both suitable for allocation.
245. A housing allocation is proposed as an extension of a recent residential estate on land south of Lund Farm (R274M, RN313# and RN314#). Raised above the surrounding land, development on this site would be quite widely visible. However, the same can be said of the existing housing. In my view, the degree of change from the present situation need not be excessive, and harm to the surrounding area could readily be avoided. With the modifications proposed by the Council relating to flood risk and dealing with surface water (included under **MM13**), this allocation is sound.
246. Both of the proposed housing allocations at West End Nursery (MN29#) and West End Farm (R692ULVM) are appropriate. While the latter is opposite Ulverston Cemetery, which includes the listed Wilson's monument, the Plan seeks to ensure a sympathetic design.
247. The proposed allocation at North Urswick Road (R689ULVM) protrudes into land which adds to the Green Gap between Ulverston and Swarthmoor. But even with this development, the distance between the two settlements will be substantial, and adequate to prevent their coalescence.
248. Three contiguous sites are proposed for housing along the southern developed edge of Ulverston. Individually they are of significant size. In combination they effectively form a sweeping southern extension of the settlement. Taking

account of the Green Gap function of land to the west of Ulverston, the sensitivity of much of the surrounding landscape and other constraints identified, this is an appropriate approach to meeting the CS housing requirement.

249. Residential development at Gascow Farm (RN131M, RN141#, RN321# and RN284#) will have some impact on the adjacent Bardsea Leisure Park. But the vast majority of the proposed site is substantially elevated above Bardsea Leisure Park. Policy LA5.2 of the Plan is clear that trees and hedgerows, including those along the former quarry edge, must be retained. It also demands that the quarry edge be screened, and that the rural setting of the Leisure Park's entrance be safeguarded. Given these factors, I consider that the proposed allocation need not lead to harmful effects at the Leisure Park or materially detract from its attractiveness as a holiday destination.
250. I note that Bardsea Leisure Park and the adjacent cemetery are both quite open in nature, particularly the latter. Nonetheless, I disagree that development on the Gascow Farm site would be dislocated from the settlement as a result. It seems to me that the presence of cemeteries within towns is common, and it is not unusual to observe premises occupied by caravans and holiday homes within settlement, particularly in more rural areas. In my view, that the new housing will visually integrate these uses within the built envelope of the settlement need not be a problem.
251. To the west, the Croftlands East (R697 and part of R242) and Croftlands West – Nook Farm (R690ulv, R691ULV, R126M, RN184, RN234# and part of R242) sites follow the southern built edge of the Croftlands residential estate. Notwithstanding the effect on the outlook from the closest homes, harm to living conditions can readily be avoided and is not an inevitable outcome. The Plan identifies the key issues for developing both of the Croftlands sites and Gascow Farm, and sets out appropriate requirements. The production of a development brief, as proposed, will ensure the suitable design and properly managed delivery of this significant settlement extension.
252. As submitted, the Plan proposes a mixed use allocation around the Canal Head (M28) and a Strategic Employment Site of 6.4 hectares (E30 and M26) extending north eastwards from it. However, changes in circumstances now mean that parts of these sites are no longer available, and/or following the production of the Viability Study, their viability is doubtful. The Council has put modifications forward (**MM82 to MM91**). In effect, these propose to delete the mixed use allocation and instead identify the land as a Regeneration Opportunity Area, to reduce the Strategic Employment Site allocation to an area of 2.1 hectares and to identify a Broad Location for employment on the land beyond it. I agree that these alterations are necessary. With them, the Plan remains generally consistent with the CS and does what it can to bring suitable development forward in this particularly challenging area. As proposed to be modified, I consider the Plan to be sound in respect of Ulverston Canal Head.
253. Around 3.12 hectares of land is allocated as a Business and Science Park on land at Lightburn Road (M11M-mod), on the western edge of Ulverston. It has been argued that this allocation should include land for retail development. I note all the points raised, and I do not doubt that the inclusion of retailing would improve the site's financial viability. But, as the Council points out, other necessary modifications to the Plan at the canal head enhance the importance of

this site for business uses. The shortfall of land for Strategic Employment and Business/Science Park uses in Ulverston is noted under Issue 2 above. Whilst noting investment at GlaxoSmithKline, the allocation of this site will represent one of few opportunities for other businesses wishing to locate in Ulverston. In this context, and the position in relation to the need for retail land, I am not persuaded that the allocation of this site for Business and Science Park uses should be allowed to be diluted by the inclusion or retail on this site at the present time. That being said, my general point concerning the Council's responsibility to monitor the delivery of necessary retail provision clearly has a particular bearing here. I have no reason to suppose that the Council, as a responsible public body, will overlook this.

254. A Local Employment Site is proposed at Phase 1, Low Mill Tannery (EN22). While some visual and traffic impacts will be caused, I see no particular reason why they should be excessive. Harm need not be caused.
255. The Council has proposed a modification (**MM92**) to 'loosen' part of Ulverston's western development boundary to include additional land to the north of Union Lane (RN193). I understand that the landowner wishes its allocation for housing and I note the objections to the site's development. From the Statement of Common Ground [Ex094] and other evidence it is clear that it is only the issue of access which has prevented this site being brought forward through the Plan. Whatever one's views about it, the Council has now allowed the repositioning of the stone wall along Union Lane to enable its widening. As such, it seems to me wholly likely that the land can be safely accessed.
256. On the one hand, with the Council's modifications, I consider there to be no need for further housing allocations in Ulverston or elsewhere in the district. On the other hand, delivering the housing needed relies in part on non-allocated sites coming forward. Whilst not guaranteeing that residential development will be permitted on this land, the modification now proposed by the Council will help this site to contribute in this respect. In this context and that of the circumstances in this case, I regard the proposed modification to be the most appropriate response.

Swarthmoor

257. As submitted, the Plan allocates two sites in Swarthmoor, both for housing. However, at the hearing, the Council's advisors were not able to confirm that the land adjacent to Kingsley Avenue (RN684 SWM) could be accessed safely. From my site visit, I share these reservations. The site should therefore be deleted as the Council proposes (**MM93**).
258. Land off Cross-a-Moor (RN315# and RN109M) is a large site in relation to the size of the village. The Plan's commitment to a development brief is therefore necessary to ensure that the impacts on Swarthmoor are limited. The Council proposes (**MM94**) that the site's yield should be increased by around 35 dwellings to compensate for the deletion of the Kingsley Avenue site. Given that the site's area is 8.02 hectares, the density of development need not be high, even taking account of the requirement to provide significant public open space.
259. I note the points about the site's present benefit to agriculture. However, I have been told that it is Grade 3 land. In the wider plan-making context, its

allocation should not be rejected on these grounds. Agents promoting the site say that information from the Coal Authority has not revealed the presence of mineshafts, and the Council confirms that there is no evidence of these or contamination of the site.

260. While the A590 is a busy road, that is not to say that a safe access onto it cannot be provided. On the contrary, from the evidence and my site visit, I am of the firm view that an appropriate site access can be achieved here. While traffic levels may result in people driving in and out of the site to have to wait a while for an appropriate gap, inconvenience of this sort is not a strong reason to resist the allocation of land for housing needed in the district.

Broughton-in-Furness

261. Land off Foxfield Road (R163M-mod) will provide around 16 new homes. The site is not large and the topography will limit views of the properties. The Plan sets out the matters to be addressed by the development, notably the provision of open space. Southwest along Foxfield Road, further from the village, 0.73 hectares of land is allocated for employment uses (MN19-mod). It is adjacent to an existing employment use. Both allocations are justified and appropriate.

Great/Little Urswick

262. Land at mid-town farm (M10M and RN216M-mod) is allocated for approximately 27 dwellings. To the rear of dwellings along Church Road, the site includes farm buildings in a poor state of repair, some of which appear to have been damaged by fire. The Plan sets out the issues to be addressed through the development of the site, and I consider it to be wholly appropriate.

Penny Bridge/Greenodd

263. The proposed housing allocation on land at The Old Vicarage (RN152) is appropriate. Though quite visible, it would not extend further south than the dwellings to the western side of Oak Vale. In this context, and between existing housing on High Garth and the church, the addition of around 21 homes need not look out of place here, or result in any other unacceptable impacts.

Kirkby-in-Furness

264. A small housing allocation is proposed on land at Four Lane Ends (R29), for approximately 11 dwellings. It is in effect an infill site, and is appropriate.

265. Land adjacent to Burlington Church of England School (RN11#) is allocated for approximately 41 dwellings. It would extend from the present built edge of the village northwards by 80 metres or so. The Settlement Appraisal accompanying the Employment and Housing Land Search Study [EvE12] does not recommend development to the north of the village.

266. I note that the area referred to as 'north' in the settlement appraisal, shown on the map, excludes the large part of the proposed site which is to the rear of the school. That aside, it is in any case clear to me that this spatial reference is made in quite broad terms and is not site-specific. It is a general recommendation. It primarily seeks to prevent detrimental impacts on views of

Kirkby from the Duddon Estuary and on the approach to the village from the north. But the extent of northwards development would not be excessive. The need to achieve a satisfactory standard of development at the entrance into the village is noted in the Plan. My view is that this allocation need not lead to the impacts which the Study aims to avoid. The significant distance between it and Wall End to the north will ensure that coalescence will not occur.

267. It has been strongly argued that land at Sandside Road (R189M), on land adjacent to site R29, is preferable to RN11#. I have taken account of all the evidence. I particularly note the points about the relationship of the two sites with the village centre, shop, railway station and school, the highways issues associated with each, their relative visual impacts and the other points made.
268. I recognise that CS Policy CS1.1 gives sequential preference to suitable infill opportunities within settlements. The underlying aim of this is to ensure sustainable development. But in this respect I consider the relative merits of R189M and RN11# to be rather finely balanced. I agree with the Council's comment that there is little to choose between them.
269. However, it is clear that both the Council and the Parish Council consider RN11# the most appropriate. These are views which, in the spirit of localism, add to the weight to be given to RN11#. All other things being roughly equal, as I consider them to be here, this factor 'tips the balance'. Consequently, RN11# should be regarded as the most appropriate option here, and its allocation does not conflict with the objectives of Policy CS1.1. Given this, and my conclusion below about the need for additional site allocations to be made, R189M should not be allocated in this Plan.

Conclusion on Issue 3

270. In the light of the above and having regard to all of the evidence, I conclude that with the main modifications put forward by the Council, the individual site allocations proposed and Green Gaps identified are justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to site specific matters.
271. Overall, to summarise in broad terms my conclusions on the three main issues, I consider the approach to selecting sites to be sufficiently robust. As this selection process has included detailed comparison of the range of sites suggested and put forward, the proposed allocations leading from it should be regarded as the most appropriate. The outcome of the selection process has led to the allocation of sufficient land to meet the needs for development in the district as identified in the CS over the plan period. Considering all this, it has not been necessary for me to scrutinise in depth the relative merits of alternative sites promoted by others. As such, with a few exceptions, I have generally not referred to them in this report.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

272. My examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the Plan meets them all.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The DPD is identified within the approved LDS (March 2013) which sets out an expected adoption date of November 2013. The Plan's content and timing are compliant with the LDS.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in September 2006 and amended in 2008. Consultation has been compliant with the requirements therein, including the consultation on the post-submission proposed 'main modification' changes (MM).
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out and is adequate.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	AA has been carried out and is adequate.
National Policy	The Plan complies with national policy except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the SCS.
2004 Act (as amended) and 2012 Regulations (as amended).	The Plan complies with the Act and the Regulations.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

273. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness and/or legal compliance for the reasons set out above which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

274. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in the Appendix the Land Allocations DPD satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Simon Berkeley

Inspector

This report is accompanied by the Appendix containing the Main Modifications

Appendix – Main Modifications

The modifications below are expressed either in the form of ~~strike through~~ for deletions and **bold** for additions of text, or by specifying the modification in words in *italics*.

Ref	Policy/para	Main Modification
MM1	Para 3.6	5th Bullet Safeguarding and enhancing the River Kent Special Area of Conservation an internationally important habitat, particularly for the seriously threatened White Clawed Crayfish. The implications of river restoration need to be considered in relation to development proposals located near and/or adjacent to the River Kent Special Area of Conservation (SAC);
MM2	Para 3.8	Natural England and the Environment Agency are working to restore the natural functioning of rivers. This may involve the removal of artificial river bank modifications, where feasible, to allow recovery of natural processes and river functioning, where this does not conflict with flood defences. The implications of river restoration need to be considered in relation to development proposals located near and/or adjacent to the River Kent Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
MM3	Para 2.25	Managing flood risk, whether tidal (from the Sea), fluvial (from rivers) or through surface water (through local drainage issues) is a key issue. No residential sites are proposed in Flood Zone 3b. Following the application of the sequential test, a small number of sites are partially within flood zones 2 and 3a. In such cases, new dwellings will not be permitted in the affected parts of the site concerned. The Council has held detailed discussions with the Environment Agency (EA) on all allocations and sites have only been proposed for allocation where the EA and the Council's own land and drainage team are satisfied that a solution can be achieved. The County Council now has a role preparing a Cumbria Surface Water Management Plan. Natural England and the Environment Agency are working to restore the natural functioning of rivers. This may involve the removal of artificial river bank modifications, where feasible, to allow recovery of natural processes and river functioning, where this does not conflict with flood defences. Once all elements of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 have been implemented, Cumbria County Council will assume responsibility for developing a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy which will include risks from surface water run-off, groundwater and ordinary watercourses, completing a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment and preparing Surface Water Management Plans for areas of greatest risk and approving, adopting and maintaining Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) that meet National Standards for development. The County Council's drainage team have also been engaged throughout the process and will use their new powers. Development Management and

		Development control decisions will use the Surface Water Management Plan to ensure that effective surface water management is incorporated in all new development.
MM4	Para 3.51	A significant part of Kirkby Lonsdale's housing and employment land development needs will be met in a single strategic allocation north of Kendal Road. This site has minimal impact on the historic core of the town, can be well linked to key facilities such as the schools, supermarket, doctor's surgery and town centre, is visually contained and the employment element can be accessed directly onto the A65. It is estimated that the site can accommodate around 80 dwellings and 1.0 ha of employment land as well as open space. The site is crossed by the Haweswater Aqueduct and no development will be permitted within 12.2 m of the aqueduct. ‡ The site also incorporates school playing fields. Other issues include measures to manage to surface water run off, traffic and access issues reflecting current weight restrictions on Kendal Road, the need for suitable pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre and the need to manage biodiversity impacts. The site is set in high quality landscape and careful design will be necessary. It has a number of mature trees, hedgerows, and continuous rows of trees including a woodland area to the north west corner. These are of landscape and wildlife significance and provide some screening of the site from external views. Development will not be permitted in those parts of the site which fall within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere. Development of this site will be guided by a Development Brief.
MM5	Para 3.107	<u>Land adjacent to Hall Park</u> 3.68 ha of land are allocated adjacent to the existing estate at Hall Park. This site is close to the centre of the village including the village shop, station, pub and school as well as to Cropper's paper mill. The site adjoins a prominent large drumlin known as Burneside Heads and its lower slopes contain a number of trees. The important heritage buildings at Burneside Hall are close to the existing Hall Park estate. Key issues are: the landscape treatment of the treed area and the lower slopes of Burneside Heads; the need for screening of the west boundary; the potential need to mitigate the visual impact of the development and access arrangements on Burneside Hall; the need for Sustainable Drainage systems; and the need to avoid development close to the River Sprint both because of flood risk and because of potential impacts on the River Kent and †Tributaries Special Area of Conservation. There will also be a need for well lit pedestrian links to the village centre. If access is provided via Hall Park Road, there will be a need for existing footways to be extended to serve the site. Development will not be permitted in those parts of the site which fall within Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere.
MM6	Para 3.109	<u>Land adjacent to Cropper's Paper Mill</u> 1.2 ha is are allocated for the future expansion of the Cropper's works. Key issues for future expansion of the paper mill include the biodiversity value of hedgerows and trees, perimeter landscaping, the need to address

		<p>surface water flooding issues and sustainable drainage, the need for a transport assessment and travel plan and the alignment of the Dales Way National Trail which crosses the site as well as the potential impact of buildings in this area on Burneside Hall Scheduled Ancient Monument. Access to the site should be via the existing main entrance serving the Paper Mill and not from Hall Road. Development will not be permitted in that part of the site which falls within Flood Risk Zone 2 unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere.</p>
MM7	Para 3.125	<p><u>Employment Sites around Endmoor</u></p> <p>Endmoor is well located for the M6. A 3-ha 3.13 ha site, north of Gatebeck Lane, adjacent to Gatebeck Industrial Estate, offers the opportunity for additional employment development. Visual impacts will be important and the site offers the opportunity to incorporate extensive landscaping to the south to screen the site from the village and Gatebeck Lane. The site will require the preparation of a Development Brief to provide more detailed assessment and guidance on careful consideration of access, landscaping, flood risk, biodiversity and the remaining structures associated with the site's previous use. Measures should be put in place to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the water quality and flow of Peasey Beck during construction, use and during on-going maintenance of any development. Development will not be permitted in those parts of the site that fall within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere. Access to the site should be staggered with the existing T junction of Gatebeck Road and Gatebeck Lane. Freight vehicles associated with the site should use Gatebeck Lane and not approach the site via Gatebeck Road through the village</p>
MM8	Para 4.11	<p>The Berners site incorporating the pool, lido and car park at the centre of the Promenade is the key regeneration priority in Grange-over-Sands. The site is being regenerated in partnership with Grange Town Council to create a cluster of facilities and attractions including commercial uses, an integrated health centre, new market and affordable housing and enhanced car parking and residential and business space. The Council is seeking to regenerate this site on a partnership basis involving local businesses, house builders, extra care home providers and a local medical practise. The site includes a former Lido which has recently been listed. It is estimated that 50 dwellings will be delivered in Phase 2 (2017-2022) and 53 in Phase 3 (2022-25). Residential uses are not appropriate for and are not proposed on the part of the site that contains the old lido, which falls within Flood Risk Zone 3a.</p>
MM9	Para 4.38	<p><u>Land East of Manorside</u></p> <p>This 1.11 ha site is capable of accommodating around 30 dwellings. The key issue is securing appropriate access arrangements including contributing to improved pedestrian access to village centre. Suitable pedestrian access should be provided to the site to connect with existing footway infrastructure. A small part of this site is subject to flood risk. Development will not be permitted in the at part of the site which falls</p>

		within Flood Risk Zone 2 unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere. Any resulting undeveloped land should be incorporated within the landscape framework. There is also a local drainage capacity issue.
MM10	Para 5.23.	Surface water management is a key issue. There is a need for a sound strategic solution across all south Ulverston sites, addressing culvert capacities, attenuation areas and surface water management through careful site layout. The whole development area should be phased to allow suitable surface water drainage infrastructure to be installed for catchment and ensure that increased flooding is not encountered downstream. The sites on either side of Mountbarrow Road should be developed as a whole to ensure that an effective drainage scheme resolves existing surface water flooding issues being experienced by adjacent properties and ensure that increased flooding is not encountered downstream. Sustainable drainage systems should be used. Compliance with Preliminary rainfall runoff management for developments should be to (EA/ DEFRA W5-074-A) standard and inappropriate development will not be permitted in those parts of the site which fall within Flood Risk Zone 2 unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere.
MM11	Para 5.25	Land at West End Farm This 4.31 ha site is capable of accommodating around 97 dwellings. The site is located on the corner of Priory Road and West End Lane opposite Ulverston's Leisure Centre. The site is level and currently in agricultural use. It comprises a small group of farm buildings and a large field. Its boundaries are a stone wall to Priory Road and a hedge along West End Lane and to the rear of the site. There are sporadic trees around the edge of the site. Although the site is not identified by the Environment Agency as lying within an area of flood risk, immediately adjoining fields are. West End Road is currently a narrow lane with no footway. A Transport Statement will be required and some off site work including making roads up to adoptable standard and providing footways will be required. The scope for developing this site in conjunction with the adjacent site at West End Nursery should be considered. The site also lies opposite Ulverston cemetery and a sympathetic design treatment along Priory Road is important. Within the cemetery, the listed Wilson's monument is close to the site boundary and attention to its setting will be necessary. Development will not be permitted in those parts of the site which fall within Flood Risk Zone 2 unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere.
MM12	Para 5.26	Land at West End Nurseries This 4.11 ha site can accommodate around 92 dwellings. It is located on West End Road and consists of West End Nurseries – a complex of polytunnels, plantations and shelter belts and two adjacent fields. Part of the site is identified as being at risk of flooding and this portion of the site should not be developed. Key issues include submission of a transport assessment and flood risk assessment and any necessary works to West End Lane. There are views of the Hoad Monument from this site. Development will not be permitted in those parts of

		the site which fall within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere. There may be scope to raise land within the flood zone if required.
MM13	Para 5.29	<p>Land South of Lund Farm</p> <p>The key issue for the development of this site is drainage and flooding. All development should be located in Flood Zone 1 and have green spaces towards the flood zones. Surface water should be dealt with via SUDS if ground conditions allow. Inappropriate development will not be permitted in those parts of the site which fall within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3a unless the developer can demonstrate through an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or increase flood risk elsewhere. Surface water run-off is picked up should be collected and stored within the site up to sufficient to cope with a 1 in 100 year plus climate change event. Any discharge to Lund Beck should be attenuated to Greenfield run-off or better equal to or an improvement on the run-off from the site in its greenfield state and an open channel should be considered rather than culvert from any attenuation for conveying to convey water to Town/Lund Beck.</p>
MM14	Para 1.23	<p>Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>Although the Local Plan - Land Allocations was prepared before the National Planning Policy Framework was published, the key principles in terms of planning positively to meet identified needs, have underpinned the process from the start. In determining planning applications, the Council will apply the principles set out in the Framework. The Local Plan is strongly supportive of economic growth and the creation of high value jobs in particular. Some areas where positive planning will be applied to ensure that necessary development takes place include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • having regard to the employment benefits of uses which fall outside the employment use classes when considering development in employment areas and employment sites, ; • taking a flexible approach to high quality enabling development where it can be shown to be essential to the delivery of employment sites and premises where compatible with the overall vision for the site and where compatible with maintaining the District's supply of employment land and premises; • a flexible approach to the phasing of development which allows for development to take place in advance of the phasing identified in the plan where infrastructure and site planning issues can be resolved. <p>Policy LA1.0 below incorporates the presumption in favour of development within the Local Plan.</p>
MM15	Para 1.23	<p>POLICY LA1.0 PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT:</p> <p>Purpose</p>

		<p>To reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and for the avoidance of doubt.</p> <p>WHEN CONSIDERING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS, THE COUNCIL WILL TAKE A POSITIVE APPROACH THAT REFLECTS THE PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK.</p> <p>IT WILL ALWAYS WORK PROACTIVELY WITH APPLICANTS JOINTLY TO FIND SOLUTIONS WHICH MEAN THAT PROPOSALS CAN BE APPROVED WHEREVER POSSIBLE, AND TO SECURE DEVELOPMENT THAT IMPROVES THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS IN SOUTH LAKELAND.</p> <p>PLANNING APPLICATIONS THAT ACCORD WITH THE POLICIES IN THE SOUTH LAKELAND LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY, THE OTHER POLICIES WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT LOCAL PLAN OR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WILL BE APPROVED WITHOUT DELAY, UNLESS MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS INDICATE OTHERWISE.</p>
<p>MM16</p>	<p>Para 1.23</p>	<p>WHERE THERE ARE NO POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE APPLICATION OR RELEVANT POLICIES ARE OUT OF DATE AT THE TIME OF MAKING THE DECISION THEN THE COUNCIL WILL GRANT PERMISSION UNLESS MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS INDICATE OTHERWISE – TAKING INTO ACCOUNT WHETHER ANY ADVERSE IMPACTS OF GRANTING PERMISSION WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY AND DEMONSTRABLY OUTWEIGH THE BENEFITS, WHEN ASSESSED AGAINST THE POLICIES IN THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK TAKEN AS A WHOLE; OR SPECIFIC POLICIES IN THAT FRAMEWORK INDICATE THAT DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE RESTRICTED.</p> <p>Implementation Through Development Management and Development Brief processes</p> <p>Monitoring Through Local Plan monitoring process</p>
<p>MM17</p>	<p>Para 2.36a</p>	<p><u>Self Build Housing</u></p> <p>Self build housing is an increasingly popular way for people to meet their housing needs and is encouraged in the National Planning Policy Framework. Self build includes a variety of types of development from individuals constructing their own homes to communities project managing small developments. The Council is supportive of self build projects. Many self build projects will be relatively small in scale and suitable for infill and rounding off sites which are too small to be allocated. Specific allocations which may include a self build element are the Community Land Trust</p>

		<p>site opposite the Wheatsheaf at Brigsteer and land south of Stockbridge Lane in Ulverston. Elsewhere development briefs for larger sites offer the opportunity to consider the incorporation of a self-build element.</p>
<p>MM18</p>	<p>Para 2.36b</p>	<p>Extra Care Housing</p> <p>South Lakeland has an ageing population and housing to meet the needs of the elderly is an essential component of the District's housing requirement. In partnership with the neighbouring district of Eden, South Lakeland has adopted an Older Persons' Housing Strategy covering the period 2012-2017. The strategy seeks to help ensure that peoples' existing homes continue to meet their needs as they grow older, to provide suitable housing related support to help older people to remain independent and to ensure that advice is easily available.</p> <p>In addition, the Strategy seeks to encourage the development of a range of housing to meet the needs and aspirations of older people by encouraging homes suitable for elderly people in housing association developments, including housing for the elderly within the market and affordable components of private developments, encouraging 'Lifetime Homes' and in partnership with Cumbria County Council, bringing forward sites for extra care housing on sites where there is evidence of need and of the right specification.</p> <p>Extra Care Housing is housing designed with the needs of frailer older people in mind and with varying levels of care and support available on site. People who live in Extra Care Housing have their own self contained homes, their own front doors and a legal right to occupy the property. Extra Care Housing is also known as very sheltered housing or simply as 'housing with care'. It comes in many built forms, including blocks of flats, bungalow estates and retirement villages. Extra Care housing provides one of the best opportunities for people with care needs to remain living independently rather than to move to a Residential Care Home. There is significant need for more homes of this type</p> <p>A number of extra care and other older persons' schemes have come forward in recent years. Major housing association extra care housing developments of 37 and 40 affordable homes were completed at Rydal Road, Kendal in 2008 and Lound Place, Kendal in 2012. The Lound Place homes were developed without any public subsidy due to an agreement between a private developer and the Council to provide their affordable housing requirement for the nearby K-Village scheme off-site on land in their ownership. Other specific older persons' housing association schemes were completed at Gowan Lea, Burneside (new-build bungalows and remodelling of an existing sheltered housing scheme) and Whinfell Drive, Kendal (new-build bungalows).</p> <p>A major private sector sheltered housing scheme is currently under construction at Kirkby Lonsdale. Other current housing developments for elderly people include a housing association development of independent bungalows at Nobles Rest, Kendal as well as several other general needs schemes which include a small number of bungalows for older people. Plans are also being developed for a new extra care housing scheme in Ulverston.</p>

		<p>Affordable extra care housing can be an appropriate component of the affordable housing provided in association with new development. On planning applications of more than 60 dwellings, Cumbria County Council will consider the need for new extra care provision as part of the scheme and may request affordable provision, having regard to the existing level of provision in the area and the appropriateness of the site. Market extra care schemes will be expected to comply with the Council's affordable housing policy. The Council recognises that the inclusion of affordable housing within a market extra care scheme can give rise to management difficulties and will look favourably on off site provision or a financial contribution in lieu of the above where these can be demonstrated..</p>
<p>MM19</p>	<p>Para 2.35</p>	<p>Core Strategy policies CS6.5a and CS6.5b set out enabling policies to guide the provision of accommodation to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People in the district outside the National Parks. The Cumbria Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA, May 2008) assessed these accommodation needs to comprise: 5 additional residential pitches; 5 additional transit pitches; and 3 additional plots for travelling show people. SLDC is, in partnership with Cumbria County Council and other Cumbrian authorities, delivering an updated Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment to identify Gypsy and Traveller needs for the Period 2013 to 2025 within South Lakeland District. This study will be completed by December 2013.</p>
<p>MM20</p>	<p>Para 2.36</p>	<p>The District Council commissioned a further study in 2009/10 of the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People from Home Space Sustainable Accommodation (HSSA) CIC, to provide more detail on the level of need and its location in the district. The study indicates no current evidence of accommodation need at the time of the survey. The study recommends that the needs identified in the GTAA report (above) remain appropriate and should be delivered through small-site self-build models of accommodation for any indigenous Gypsies and Travellers and those with a local connection, to address the needs of local people who have moved away to other areas of provision. In view of There is the limited current actual evidence of need (or location of need) and the study advises advice that any provision be made on very small sites on a self- build model.</p> <p>The short term</p> <p>In the short term, the District Council will it is not proposed that future provision is made through the allocation of sites in the Land Allocations document. Instead it is proposed that the District Council maintain an enabling role to accommodation provision including:</p> <p>a positive, facilitating approach, through the application of the criteria in Core Strategy policies</p>

		<p>CS6.5a and CS6.5b on a case by case basis;</p> <p>a multi-agency approach to monitoring actual need in the district and how to move forward under any new administrative arrangements and forthcoming legislation;</p> <p>maintaining joint working with District Councils in Cumbria, HSSA and other agencies to consider emerging evidence of need and potential funding sources in order to identify and deliver suitable sites in sustainable locations with appropriate management arrangements in response to such evidence of need;</p> <p>and ensuring that contacting identified Traveller groups, individuals and representative bodies are able to to ensure their input into the Land Allocations document and any other relevant planning documents.engaged in the preparation of relevant plans and strategies.</p>
MM21	New Para	<p>The long term</p> <p>Following the completion of the new Gypsies and Travellers Needs Assessment, the Council will prepare and adopt a subject specific Development Plan Document which will review, update and ,if necessary, supersede Policies CS6.5a and CS6.5b of the South Lakeland Core Strategy;</p> <p>-drawing on needs identified in that study, set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers and travelling showpeople in their area;</p> <p>-identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites against locally set targets for the period 2016-2021</p> <p>-adopt that document by the end of Calendar Year 2017.</p> <p>The timetable for the preparation of this document is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme approved in March 2013.</p>
MM22	Para 3.35	<p>Significant structural landscaping and robust boundary treatment will be needed, particularly along the southern and eastern edges of the site to ensure development is sympathetic to the existing landscape character and views from the A6 and A591. Pedestrian/cycle links should link development with Milnthorpe Road (A6) and existing public rights of way north and east of the site. A landscaped buffer zone is required between Scroggs Wood and any development. A landscaped and permanently fenced buffer zone of at least 10m consisting of a hedgerow of native vegetation is required between Scroggs Wood and any development. Scroggs Wood should be allowed to expand into this buffer zone by natural re-vegetation. Any new development should be set back at least 15m from the boundary of Scroggs Wood. Flooding Mitigation measures may be needed to reduce the risk of flooding from a watercourse to the north of the site. Road improvements to the A6 may be needed as may mitigation measures to offset any potential adverse impact to the</p>

		existing highways network. Additional infrastructure is required to ensure the site is connected to energy and sewer networks. Taking into account landscaping, biodiversity mitigation and green infrastructure requirements a net developable area of 11 hectares has been applied to the site.
MM23	POLICY LA 1.3	Milnthorpe North West of Milnthorpe 3.49 20 40 25 .
MM24	POLICY LA 1.3	Levens, Former Poultry Sheds, Brigsteer Road 0.84 23 .
MM25	POLICY LA 1.3	Allithwaite, Land north of Jack Hill 0.54 1.26 0.98 24 34 27 .
MM26	POLICY LA 1.3	Allithwaite, Land west of Bracken Edge 0.34 10 .
MM27	LA2.13(2)	<p>POLICY LA2.13 14: MIXED USE ALLOCATION AT GREEN DRAGON FARM, BURTON IN KENDAL</p> <p>4.37HA 4.13HA (GROSS) OF LAND AT GREEN DRAGON FARM, BURTON IN KENDAL (ref MN26#) AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS POLICIES MAP IS ALLOCATED FOR MIXED HOUSING (ESTIMATED CAPACITY 92- 86 dwellings) AND B1 AND B2 EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT (0.75ha) 0.75HA:</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE.</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A DETAILED DESIGN MITIGATION STRATEGY TO ENSURE THAT DESIGNATED AND NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS WOULD NOT BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED, AND THE SETTING OF THE CONSERVATION AREA PROTECTED;</p> <p>A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK PROVIDING EFFECTIVE MITIGATION OF VISUAL IMPACTS ON THE CONSERVATION AREA AND IN ON VIEWS OF THE SITE FROM THE SOUTH;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT;</p> <p>PROVISION OF A PEDESTRIAN LINK TO THE VILLAGE CENTRE.</p>
MM28	Para 2.67	<p>Development Briefs are Supplementary Planning Documents which provide site specific guidance on major, complex or sensitive sites. The scope of such briefs will vary according to the needs of particular sites. The preparation of Development Briefs will be carried out in consultation with local communities. Development Briefs are proposed for the following sites:</p> <p>Briefs - First Tranche (to be adopted by December 2014) Housing Allocations, Land at Kendal Parks, Kendal Housing Allocation, Stainbank Green, Kendal</p>

		<p>Housing Allocation, Land at Underbarrow Road, Kendal Mixed-use Allocation, Land north of Kendal Road, Kirkby Lonsdale Housing Allocations, Land South of Milnthorpe and Land adjacent to Firs Road; Housing Allocation at Milnthorpe Road, Holme Business Park Site, Land at Burton Road, Kendal</p> <p>Briefs - Second Tranche (to be adopted by December 2016) Housing Allocation, Land west of High Sparrowmire, Kendal Housing Allocation, Land north of Laurel Gardens, Kendal Mixed-use Allocation at Green Dragon Farm, Burton in Kendal Housing Allocation at Land north of Sycamore Drive Close, Endmoor Mixed-use Allocation, Land south of Allithwaite Road, Grange-over-Sands Housing Allocation at Cross-a-Moor, Swarthmoor. Strategic Employment and Mixed-use Allocations at Canal Head, Ulverston</p> <p>Complex Briefs Strategic Employment Site, Land at Scroggs Wood, Kendal (to be adopted by March 2014) Housing Allocations at Croftlands, Ulverston (to be adopted by Dec 2016) Employment Allocation, at Gatebeck, near Endmoor Housing allocation, South of Quarry Lane, Storth and Employment Allocation, South of Quarry Lane, Sandside</p>
MM29	Para 3.37	<p><u>Land south of K Shoes Factory, Natland Road</u></p> <p>This site, south of the existing Natland Road employment area, could be considered a logical extension of this area. It is set within an area of open land used for agricultural/grazing purposes that extends southwards and westwards to the River Kent. It is considered a possible suitable location for local employment purposes. It is within reasonable walking and cycling distance from large parts of South Kendal and is also close to a Kendal town service bus route and is on a local bus route (Kendal to Natland). Significant structural landscaping and tree planting and robust boundary treatment along the eastern, western and southern edges of the site in particular will be needed to ensure development is sympathetic to existing landscape character and also views from Natland Road as well as protecting the setting of the Watercrock Roman Fort and civil settlement Scheduled Ancient Monument. A transport assessment and travel plan will be required with provision for improved linkages towards the town centre making use of the canal cycleway. Design should reflect the high quality gateway location of the site. There will be a need for footway connections from the site to Natland Road</p>
MM30	Para 3.108	<p>Village Recreation (Willink) Field and tennis courts</p> <p>Burneside Tennis Club has an aspiration to develop enhanced recreation facilities elsewhere in the village. The</p>

		<p>Village Recreation site is currently held in trust and contains tennis courts and a football pitch. The relocation of the Burneside tennis club and football pitch could deliver improved replacement sports facilities elsewhere in the village and create a 0.85 ha site at the north west end of the village which could accommodate 23 homes. The key issue for this site is ensuring that replacement facilities of equivalent or better standard are provided and made available and ready for use on an alternative site in an appropriate location. Other issues include achieving a satisfactory relationship with the adjacent railway line in terms of appearance and noise and enhancing the biodiversity value of the railway boundary and the need for a lit footway into the village. Appropriate pedestrian access to the site will be provided, either directly from Winter Lane or accompanying a new access point on Sharps Lane should this be proposed. No development on this site will be permitted before an appropriate site is provided and brought into use for tennis court, football pitch and recreational area. These facilities will either be provided on the identified site on land south of Burneside Football Club or to another equivalent site following further review.</p>
<p>MM31</p>	<p>Para 3.16</p>	<p><u>Land north of High Sparrowmire</u></p> <p>This 0.760.77 ha site could accommodate a small housing development accessed from Moore Field Close subject to the resolution of local drainage, sewerage and biodiversity issues. The site adjoins the Oxenholme-Windermere railway and noise impacts may need to be mitigated. Robust landscaping to the north west will be necessary to achieve a satisfactory urban edge. Hedgerows and trees should be retained. There will be a need for existing footways on Moorefield Close to be extended to serve the site.</p>
<p>MM32</p>	<p>Para 3.36</p>	<p><u>Burton Road Business Park</u></p> <p>At the present time, there are no sites within the built up area of Kendal capable of accommodating a Business Park. The site at Burton Road is identified in the South Lakeland Knowledge Based Employment Land Search and Assessment as being suitable in terms of size, location deliverability, availability, infrastructure capacity, market considerations and environmental capacity. Although not directly accessible to the strategic highway network, it adjoins the A65. It is within fairly reasonable walking and cycling distance from large parts of South Kendal and is also on has a half-hourly Kendal town bus service route and a less frequent service between Kendal and Kirkby Lonsdale and. It is also very close to Oxenholme Railway Station as well as being on the Kendal to Kirkby Lonsdale bus route. Part of the Thirlmere Aqueduct runs through the site near to the east eastern boundary and development will need to be located at least 10.06m from the edge of the aqueduct. Significant structural landscaping and robust boundary treatment along the edges of the site will be needed to ensure development is sympathetic to existing landscape character, views from the A65 and Oxenholme Road as well as to the Green Gap to the north. Pedestrian/cycle links should be provided linking development with to adjacent main roads and bus stops and to the existing public right of way between Oxenholme Road and Burton Road. to the north of the site which also runs through the site. If appropriate crossing facilities cannot be provided on Burton Road, suitable alternative pedestrian access should be provided, such as a footway along the eastern side of Burton Road or alternative access points to the east of the site</p>

		where possible.
MM33	Para 3.40	<p><u>Land North of Meadowbank Business Park</u></p> <p>This 5.15 ha site north of the new Meadowbank Business Park offers a natural extension to existing employment areas in the Shap Road area. Because of limitations on the local highway network, this would only be suitable for B1 (office, research and development and light industrial) and B2 (general employment use). Key issues here are managing the impacts on the landscape throughout the site and the northern boundary in particular. The site has known surface water issues which will require mitigation. Development will also require a Ttransport Aassessment and Ttravel Pplan and incorporate pedestrian and cycle links to Shap Road. There will be a need for provision of a footway along west end side of the A6 connecting the site southwards towards the town centre.</p>
MM34	Para 3.55	<p><u>Former Cedar House School</u></p> <p>This private school has now closed and represents a significant previously developed site. Key issues include the scope for incorporating existing school buildings within the development and the incorporation of existing perimeter landscaping and boundary treatment. It is estimated that this 0.87 ha site could accommodate around 20 dwellings. A second issue is achieving a safe pedestrian footway adjacent to the site. A suitable, wider footway should be provided to the east on the northern side of Kendal Road.</p>
MM35	Para 3.131	<p><u>Land west of Burton Road</u></p> <p>This 4.8 2.63 ha site could accommodate around 59 dwellings. Development here would require a Transport Statement, and junctions made up to adoptable standards and an access solution achieved which addresses . Potential visibility issues. Cumbria County Council (Officer Comments November 2011). A short section of the site adjoins the Lancaster Canal and the canal frontage should be incorporated as an amenity area and and public open space. Hedgerows and trees should be retained. A footway will be required along Mount Pleasant from the site access through to Burton Road</p>
MM36	Para 3.142	<p><u>Land west of Sedgwick Road, Natland</u></p> <p>A single housing allocation is proposed west of Sedgwick Road, Natland. This 1.05 ha site can accommodate around 28 dwellings. Key considerations include the retention of the hedgerow bounding the site and landscaping to avoid impacts on wider views. There will be a need to maintain the existing footway along Sedgwick Road adjoining the eastern boundary of site.</p>
MM37	Para 3.147	<p><u>Land East of Burton Road</u></p> <p>This 0.88 ha site can accommodate around 24 dwellings. Key issues include the achievement of a satisfactory landscape interface with open countryside rising to the Helm behind, and effective surface water management to address poor drainage, run off from the HHelm and infiltration into sewer networks, and opportunities for enhancing areas of biodiversity. There will be a need for the existing footway on the eastern side of A65</p>

		to be widened from the north along the boundary of the site to provide access into the site.
MM38	Para 4.24	<p><u>Land south of Green Lane</u></p> <p>This 0.8 ha site can accommodate around 22 dwellings. Key issues here are the need to include open space to act as a 'village green' and to retain the open view to the Listed church and school as well as making provision at the eastern end to fulfil an imminent need to extend the graveyard. There will be a need for a footway to be provided along Green Lane where possible to provide linkage with existing footways in the village.</p>
MM39	Para 5.70	<p><u>Land at Four Lane Ends</u></p> <p>A small infill plot at Four Lane Ends could accommodate around 11 dwellings at the centre of the village. A footway will need to be provided along the site's northern boundary</p>
MM40	Para 5.71	<p><u>Land adjacent to Burlington Church of England School</u></p> <p>This 1.52 ha site could accommodate around 41 dwellings. Key issues include the constraints posed by the need to provide spacing for an electricity transmission line and the need to achieve a satisfactory standard of development at the entrance to the village. Pedestrian connections from the site to the village should be provided.</p>
MM41	Policy LA2.2	<p>POLICY LA2.2 LAND NORTH OF LAUREL GARDENS:</p> <p>Purpose:</p> <p>To ensure that the site delivers high quality sustainable development and that landscape, transport, drainage and biodiversity impacts are effectively mitigated.</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND NORTH OF LAUREL GARDENS. AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A CLEAR LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK INCORPORATING THE RETENTION OF HEDGEROWS AND THE SAFEGUARDING OF ROUGH MARSHY GROUND AT THE SOUTH EAST END OF THE SITE FROM DEVELOPMENT AND NOISE ATTENUATION ADJACENT TO THE RAILWAY LINE;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND PROVISION FOR ON-SITE FLOOD ATTENUATION MEASURES;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN. PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN</p>

		<p>AND CYCLE LINKS THROUGH THE SITE TO ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND BURNESIDE ROAD AND EXTENSION OF 30 MPH SPEED LIMIT ON BURNESIDE ROAD AS A MINIMUM ADJACENT TO THE NORTHERN EXTENT OF THE SITE;</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE CANNOT TAKE PLACE UNTIL MEASURES ARE IN PLACE TO RESOLVE PRESSURE ON THE SEWERAGE NETWORK IN NORTH KENDAL. IF AN APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION IS BROUGHT FORWARD IN ADVANCE OF THE PHASING PROGRAMME IDENTIFIED, THE IMPACT ON THE WASTEWATER NETWORK WILL BE CONSIDERED TO ENSURE THAT THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL, PLUS THE IMPACT OF ANY RELEVANT PLANNING PERMISSIONS IN EXISTENCE, IS ACCEPTABLE IN ADVANCE OF THE DELIVERY OF ANY INFRASTRUCTURE SOLUTION FOR THE WIDER NETWORK.</p>
<p>MM42</p>	<p>POLICY LA2.1</p>	<p>POLICY LA2.1 LAND WEST OF HIGH SPARROWMIRE</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AT WEST SPARROWMIRE.</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK INCORPORATING THE RETENTION AND PROTECTION OF HEDGEROWS AND TREES, THE AVOIDANCE OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE CREST OF THE DRUMLIN ON THE NORTH EAST PART OF THE SITE AND TREE PLANTING ALONG THE NORTHERN AND WESTERN BOUNDARIES;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN, THE PROTECTION OF EXISTING RIGHTS OF WAY AND THE PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ACCESS THROUGH THE SITE AND TO ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND WINDERMERE ROAD;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND PROVISION FOR ON SITE FLOOD ATTENUATION;</p> <p>DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING OF A QUALITY WHICH REFLECTS THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS KEY GATEWAY ADJACENT TO THE NATIONAL PARK.</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE CANNOT TAKE PLACE UNTIL MEASURES ARE IN PLACE TO RESOLVE PRESSURE ON THE SEWERAGE NETWORK IN NORTH KENDAL. IF AN APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION IS BROUGHT FORWARD IN ADVANCE OF THE PHASING PROGRAMME IDENTIFIED, THE IMPACT ON THE WASTEWATER NETWORK WILL BE CONSIDERED TO ENSURE THAT THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL,</p>

		PLUS THE IMPACT OF ANY RELEVANT PLANNING PERMISSIONS IN EXISTENCE, IS ACCEPTABLE IN ADVANCE OF THE DELIVERY OF ANY INFRASTRUCTURE SOLUTION FOR THE WIDER NETWORK.
MM43	POLICY LA2.4	<p>POLICY LA2.4 LAND AT KENDAL PARKS</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AT KENDAL PARKS.</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A LANDSCAPED AND PERMANENTLY FENCED BUFFER ZONE OF 10 METRES AROUND NATLAND BECK (PART OF RIVER KENT SPECIAL AREA OF CONSERVATION) WITH ANY DEVELOPMENT SET BACK AT LEAST 15M FROM THE BECK AND ANY NECESSARY MITIGATION MEASURES TO ADDRESS IMPACT ON GREAT CRESTED NEWTS NEAR THE SITE AND THE RETENTION OF HEDGEROWS;</p> <p>A LANDSCAPING LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK INCORPORATING INCLUDING SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPING ALONG THE EASTERN BOUNDARY ADJOINING RAILWAY LINE INCORPORATING APPROPRIATE NOISE ATTENUATION; SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND PROVISION OF SURFACE WATER MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDING ON-SITE ATTENUATION;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN. PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS THROUGH THE SITE TO ADJACENT HOUSING AND TO KENDAL PARKS ROAD.</p>
MM44	POLICY 2.5	<p>POLICY LA2.5 LAND WEST OF at OXENHOLME ROAD</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK WHICH PROTECTS THE INTEGRITY OF THE GREEN GAP, SAFEGUARDS THE BIODIVERSITY IMPORTANCE OF NATLAND BECK, PROVIDE EFFECTIVE VISUAL SEPARATION FROM OXENHOLME VILLAGE RETAINS THE HEDGEROW TO THE WEST OF THE SITE, CREATES A LANDSCAPED BUFFER ZONE AND HABITAT OF 10 METRES AROUND THE WATERCOURSE AND INCORPORATES ANY NECESSARY MEASURES TO MITIGATE IMPACTS ON GREAT CRESTED NEWTS;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY NECESSARY ATTENUATION MEASURES;</p>

		<p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS TO ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND PROVIDES PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ACCESS BETWEEN OXENHOLME ROAD AND THE HOSPITAL;</p> <p>LANDSCAPE AND BUILDING DESIGN TO BE OF A QUALITY WHICH REFLECT THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS KEY GATEWAY SITE.</p>
MM45	POLICY LA2.6	<p>POLICY LA2.6 LAND SOUTH OF NATLAND BECK FARM</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>THE PROTECTION OF KEY TREES AND HEDGEROWS; PERIMETER LANDSCAPING;</p> <p>PROTECTION OF THE ROUTE OF THE LANCASTER CANAL;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS TO THE TOWN CENTRE UTILISING NATLAND MILL BECK LANE AND THE CANAL CYCLE ROUTE.</p> <p>NATLAND MILL BECK LANE SHALL NOT BE USED AS A VEHICULAR ACCESS</p>
MM46	Para 3.26	<p><u>Land south of Natland Mill Beck Farm</u></p> <p>A site of 3.79 ha at Natland Mill Beck Farm is proposed for residential development with an estimated capacity of around 73 homes. This is sustainably located, close to key facilities and public transport. It adjoins the Lancaster Canal cycle route. It also has good access to the main road network and is within walking distance of Oxenholme station. For this reason, it is a sustainable location for new homes. The site is set in high quality landscape of a park-like character with numerous mature trees. There are significant groups of mature trees alongside the Lancaster Canal, adjacent to Natland Mill Beck Lane and along the driveway to Helm Lodge. Careful design will be necessary. Particular careful consideration will need to be given to the impact of any development on the setting of Natland Mill Beck Farmhouse and Helm Lodge Grade II Listed Buildings. Improvements to the road access will also be needed. Natland Mill Beck Lane is a narrow road and unsuitable as an access in its current condition. Natland Road should be used as the main access The opportunity may exist to access the site off from Natland Road although any means of access here must protect both the tree belt and the line of the canal.</p>
MM47	Para 3.29	<p><u>Land at Stainbank Green</u></p> <p>This 10.8 ha site has a capacity of around 189 dwellings. It comprises open land used for agricultural/grazing purposes and is prominent in the local landscape but less so in the wider landscape on account of intervening topography. A belt of trees reinforces the boundary of the site with Stainbank Road and Maple Drive. A second</p>

		<p>belt runs across the site parallel with Brigsteer Road. A number of stone walls cross the site. The southeastern part of the site merges into the wider area of farmland to the south and west. Significant landscaping measures will be required to ensure there is no adverse impact from development to existing landscape character. A soft landscaped boundary treatment will be needed along the southern and southwestern boundaries of the site in particular. Development in this location is likely to result in a significant impact on existing traffic flows on adjacent roads and the Kendal Town Centre network. A transport assessment and travel plan will be required and it is likely that some off-site highways and transport mitigation would be required to realise this development site. The primary access to the site should be off Brigsteer Road. Green Infrastructure should be built into the development, retaining existing wildlife movement from east to west through the site and also to provide p. Pedestrian/cycle links and connectivity to adjacent residential areas and Brigsteer Road should be provided to ensure there are good sustainable access links to Kendal Town Centre. Mitigation measures may be required to ensure adequate arrangements for the disposal of surface water is are provided. Given the size of the site, development may result in the need for additional community infrastructure that could be provided/integrated within the site.</p>
<p>MM48</p>	<p>Para 3.29</p>	<p>POLICY LA2.7 LAND AT STAINBANK GREEN</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF STAINBANK GREEN.</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A LANDSCAPING AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK WITH A PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON MITIGATING IMPACT ON VIEWS FROM THE NATIONAL PARK AND INTEGRATION WITH THE VICARAGE ROAD GREEN WEDGE;</p> <p>THE SAFEGUARDING THE AREA OF MEADOW SAXIFRAGE AT THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF THE SITE; THE UNDERTAKING OF A DETAILED ECOLOGICAL SURVEY TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF MEADOW SAXIFRAGE WITHIN THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF THE SITE AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ACCEPTABLE MITIGATION MEASURES TO ENSURE THE DEVELOPMENT AS A WHOLE ENHANCES THIS HABITAT'</p> <p>RETENTION OF TREES AND HEDGEROWS;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN TO INCLUDE PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS THROUGH THE SITE TO ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND BRIGSTEER ROAD AND FOOTWAY ALONG BRIGSTEER ROAD AND THE RETENTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF EXISTING RIGHTS OF WAY.</p>
<p>MM49</p>	<p>POLICY LA2.8</p>	<p>POLICY LA2.8 LAND SOUTH OF UNDERBARROW ROAD Purpose:</p>

		<p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND SOUTH OF UNDERBARROW ROAD. AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK INCORPORATING THE RETENTION OF TREES AND HEDGEROWS,</p> <p>INTEGRATION WITH ANY ADJACENT AMENITY OPEN SPACE, A STRONG LANDSCAPED BUFFER ALONG THE BOUNDARY WITH THE LAKE DISTRICT NATIONAL PARK AND LANDSCAPING ALONG THE NORTHERN BOUNDARY;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN, INCLUDING THE WIDENING OF UNDERBARROW ROAD AND PROVISION OF LIT FOOTWAYS AND PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ACCESS THROUGH THE SITE TO UNDERBARROW ROAD.</p> <p>THE SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A CONTAMINATION ASSESSMENT TO EXAMINE THE RISK OF CONTAMINATION ARISING OUT OF FORMER LANDFILL ACTIVITY AT KENDAL FELL QUARRY AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY NECESSARY MITIGATION MEASURES</p>
MM50	POLICY LA 1.3	Kendal, Acre Moss Garages — 0.35 — 13
MM51	Para 3.31	<p>Broad Locations - Appleby Road and Burton Road</p> <p>Although not currently available, the area north west of Kendal has considerable potential as a broad location for new residential development in the longer term. Land at Appleby Road has been allocated for residential use in the past and the Appleby Road frontage remained identified for leisure and sports facilities in the 2004 Local Plan. In this context, the Local Plan also identified a need for an athletics track which derived from a Cumbria wide study carried out in the 1980s. In bringing forward proposals for the broad location through the 2021-2035 Local Plan, Key issues will include the potential importance of the flat land adjacent to Appleby Road in meeting identified needs for formal and informal recreation, including consideration of the need for an 8 lane, all weather athletics track. Other key issues will include managing landscape impacts, managing impacts on the River Mint which is part of the River Kent and Tributaries Special Area of Conservation, managing and mitigating traffic impacts, needs for community infrastructure, green infrastructure and landscape framework, and safeguarding the Thirlmere Aqueduct. Areas close to Sandylands have surface water drainage issues which will need to be mitigated.</p> <p>Broad Location - Burton Road</p> <p>In the long term, sites in the wider area between Burton Road and Natland Road may be able to accommodate</p>

		<p>further development. This is a highly sensitive area and an important approach to the town as well as forming the setting for the Helm Lodge Listed Building. Issues would include the potential visual impact of development at one of the main approaches to Kendal on Burton Road, the need to retain the listed Helm Lodge and its parkland setting, the need to maintain visual and functional separation with Natland, visual impacts on the line of the Lancaster Canal and Natland Road (which here forms part of the National Cycle Network as well as being an important recreational and walking route). It is estimated that this area could accommodate around 200 dwellings. Key issues such as the quantum of development, the site definition and site development will be considered through a future Development Plan document the 2021-2035 Local Plan</p>
<p>MM52</p>	<p>Policy LA2.9</p>	<p>Draft POLICY LA2.9: STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT AND SCIENCE/BUSINESS PARK ALLOCATIONS, KENDAL Purpose: To ensure that development reflects the Community's aspirations for high quality, has a positive impact on the surrounding area and its infrastructure, and conserves important site features. DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATIONS AT SCROGGS WOOD AND BURTON ROAD IN KENDAL. AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING: <u>LAND ADJACENT TO SCROGGS WOOD:</u> A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK TO INCORPORATE A SUBSTANTIAL BUFFER OF NATIVE VEGETATION OF AT LEAST 10M TO SCROGGS WOOD, BIODIVERSITY MITIGATION, COMPENSATION AND ENHANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS THE SITE AND SIGNIFICANT GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE RETAINED HEDGEROWS, LANDSCAPING ALONG THE PERIMETER OF THE SITE AND THE PROTECTION OF DRUMLIN CHARACTERISTICS; AVOIDANCE OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE VERY FAR EASTERN PART OF THE SITE CLOSEST TO THE RIVER KENT; USE OF SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEM (SUDS); SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN; PROVISION OF CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN LINKS THROUGH THE SITE AND TOWARDS THE TOWN CENTRE INCLUDING THE NEED FOR UPGRADES TO EXISTING FOOTWAYS CONNECTING THE SITE AND THE PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY ACROSS AND ADJACENT TO THE SITE; PROTECTION OF THE SETTINGS OF THE WATERCROOK ROMAN FORT SCHEDULED ANCIENT MONUMENT AND THE HELSINGTON LAITHES AND SNUFF MILL GRADE 2** LISTED BUILDINGS; A QUALITY OF DESIGN WHICH REFLECTS THIS VERY HIGH QUALITY GATEWAY SITE; <u>LAND EAST OF BURTON ROAD</u> A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK TO INCORPORATE SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL LANDSCAPING, THE PROTECTION OF THE DRUMLIN CHARACTERISTIC OF THE SITE AND LANDSCAPING WITHIN AND ALONG THE NORTHERN AND NORTHWESTERN EDGE OF THE SITE TO PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE GREEN GAP; THE SAFEGUARDING OF ADJACENT GREAT CRESTED NEWT HABITAT, THE RETENTION OF HEDGEROWS AND</p>

		TREES, THE REINFORCEMENT OF THE RAILWAY CORRIDOR AND THE CREATION OF HABITAT THROUGH TREE PLANTING AND WETLAND; MEASURES TO ADDRESS ANY CONTAMINATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE ADJACENT MAIN RAILWAY LINE; SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN; THE PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS THROUGH THE SITE AND TO THE ADJOINING HIGHWAY NETWORK AND STATION. PROTECTION OF EXISTING RIGHTS OF WAY THROUGH THE SITE; THE INCORPORATION OF SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEM (SUDS); THE RETENTION OF A 10M BUFFER ZONE EITHER SIDE OF THE THIRLMERE AQUEDUCT; A QUALITY OF DESIGN WHICH REFLECTS THE HIGH QUALITY GATEWAY LOCATION OF THE SITE.
MM53	Policy LA1.8	E33 KENDAL LAND AT BOUNDARY BANK 0.93 B1, B2
MM54	Para 3.39	<u>Land at Shap Road</u> There is an undeveloped plot on Shap Road Industrial Estate suitable for general employment uses. Possible issues ere include the incorporation of biodiversity issues and the possibility of contamination from nearby existing uses. Access should be provided from the north as opposed to the use of Gilthwaiterigg Lane.
MM55	Policy LA1.3	R640# Kirkby Lonsdale Land at Tram Lane 0.41 20
MM56	Policy LA1.8	M9M1-mod Milnthorpe Land adjacent to Bridge End Business Park, Park Road 4.02 1.81 B1, B2
MM57	POLICY LA 1.3	Land at Owllet Ash Fields, Ackenthwaite 0.47 22
MM58	POLICY LA1.9 and Policies Map	Amend boundaries of Milnthorpe/Ackenthwaite Green Gap to include Land at Owllet Ash Fields;
MM59	POLICY LA 1.3	Milnthorpe Land adjacent to Firs Road 3.19 85.
MM60	POLICY LA1.4 and Policies Map	Delete proposed Broad Location at Land adjacent to Firs Bank, Milnthorpe
MM61	Para 3.65	<u>Land south and east of Milnthorpe (includes land adjacent to Firs Road)</u> This 3.41 7 ha site is part of a larger site which occupies rising ground south and east of Milnthorpe. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies considerable potential in this area although only land for around 70 155 dwellings is required to could meet development needs during the plan period. Key issues for this site include mitigating landscape impacts, particularly around the frontage of the site with the A6 where it both forms the entry point to the village and secondly lies opposite very high quality landscape in the form of Dallam Park in the Arnside Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There is a group of trees in the centre of the site and there is a need for a high quality approach to landscaping in this area as well as sensitively designed access arrangements. The other key issue is to ensure that the access arrangements for development do not prejudice the possibility of further development to the north. A further issue is achieving satisfactory links with the village centre. A public footpath offers an important opportunity to create a direct pedestrian and cycle link from the

		development into the village centre. There is also a group of trees in the centre of the site. The Urban speed limit (30-40mph) should be extended past the site access, in order to help ensure safe access to the site and present a gateway into Milnthorpe.
MM62	Para 3.70	<p><u>Land at Mainline Business Park</u></p> <p>There is a significant area of around 8.0 8.07 ha of land adjacent to the existing Mainline Business Park off the B6385 Milnthorpe-Crooklands road next to the West Coast Main Line railway. This area is visually quite well contained and could accommodate a significant amount of new employment development including B8 employment uses. Major development here would need to provide for improvements to the canal crossing at Crooklands or a more direct access to the A590. This site is in a rural location and landscaping will be required, both to new employment development and any new access road. The potential visual impacts from Farleton Knott will also have to be considered in the selection of facing and roofing materials.</p>
MM63	Policy LA2.13	<p>POLICY LA2.13: FORMAL OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES SITE, SOUTH OF BURNESIDE FOOTBALL CLUB, BURNESIDE</p> <p>Purpose:</p> <p>To make provision for new outdoor sports facilities to meet local open space and recreation needs and to compensate for loss of current facilities on site M38M at the Village Recreation (Willink) Field and tennis courts.</p> <p>2.5 Ha OF LAND SOUTH OF BURNESIDE FOOTBALL CLUB, BURNESIDE (ref ON47#) AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS POLICIES MAP IS ALLOCATED FOR THE PROVISION OF NEW FORMAL OUTDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES. THE NEW FACILITIES WILL BE OF A SCALE EQUIVALENT OR BETTER IN QUANTITY OR QUALITY TERMS THAN THOSE IT REPLACES.</p> <p>IF AN EQUIVALENT SUITABLE REPLACEMENT SITE CAN BE FOUND, THIS ALLOCATION WILL BE REVIEWED IN THE FUTURE.</p>
MM64	Para 3.117	<p>Land east of at Boon Town</p> <p>This 0.94 ha site consists of strip fields behind Burton's main street and could accommodate around 23 dwellings without significant heritage impacts. A public footpath runs along the northern border of the site. The site contains a number of hedges and a substantial tree belt borders the site to the east. Key development issues include the need for a transport assessment. There are significant on street parking issues in the area and the opportunity exists to</p>

		accommodate some car parking. Biodiversity interest has been identified and hedgerows and trees should be retained. If play space is lost in accessing the site, replacement provision should be made, the play space fenced and screened from any new access road and the play space screened from adjacent new housing . The potential of the public footpath to provide access to the village centre should be utilised;
MM65	Policy LA2.1415	Land North of Sycamore Drive Close, Endmoor THE RETENTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY ACROSS THE SITE AND THE PROVISION OF PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS TO THE MAIN ROAD AND ADJOINING HOUSING AREAS AND THE EXTENSION OF THE URBAN SPEED LIMIT (30-40 MPH) ON THE A65 PAST THE SITE AND ASSOCIATED GATEWAY TREATMENT
MM66	Para 3.123	Land north of Sycamore Close, Endmoor This site at the northern end of the village will soften what is currently an abrupt urban edge. This site is proposed for residential and community use. Given its size and proposed mixed use potential, it would require a Development Brief. The key issue to be addressed is the need to provide a form of boundary treatment along the northern edge to minimise visual impact from the north and A65, by means of open space and landscaping. The provision of a public footpath/cycle link from site to Gatebeck Road should also be provided, if practicable. Community facilities could be incorporated within the development scheme where required. Development in Endmoor is currently constrained by the capacity of the Waste Water Treatment Works and development of this site is unlikely to take place until Phase 2 of the DPD (2017-22). Measures should be put in place to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the water quality and flow of Peasey Beck during construction, use and during on-going maintenance of any developments.
MM67	Para 3.74	The Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) The Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is an area of national landscape importance and its special characteristics are protected by national planning policy. This protection is echoed in Core Strategy Policy CS8.2 which states that: development proposals should be informed by and sympathetic to the distinctive character landscape types set out in (inter alia) the AONB Management Plan and Landscape and Seascape Assessment; that development should protect, conserve and enhance the special quality of the environment associated with national designated areas of the...Arnside and Silverdale AONB including their settings...and the setting of and views into and from the AONB. The AONB is split between South Lakeland and Lancaster Districts. Out of a total population of around 7,800, around 2,300 live in Arnside (the largest settlement) and a further 1,500 live in parts of Beetham Parish within the AONB. The remainder live on the Lancaster side, the major settlements being Silverdale, Warton, Yealand Conyers and Yealand Redmayne.
MM68	New 3.74A	In South Lakeland's Core Strategy, Arnside and Sandside/Storth are identified as Local Service

		Centres. In the Lancaster Core Strategy, Silverdale is identified as a rural settlement. Both Core Strategies seek to protect the special character of the AONBs and make provision to meet local housing and other needs within them at an appropriate scale.
MM69	New 3.74B	In order to deliver the best possible plan, which is sensitive to the needs of the AONB, produces a strategy for the AONB which dovetails with the AONB Management Plan and delivers a consistent approach to development on either side of the boundary, South Lakeland District Council and Lancaster City Council are co-operating on the preparation of a Local Plan for the AONB. The Local Plan has the support of, and is being worked up in partnership with, the AONB partnership and the constituent Parish Councils.
MM70	New 3.74C	The AONB Local Plan will be shaped by the strategic framework and will address the following issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of settlement boundaries; • Delivery of sites to accommodate around 123 dwellings on the South Lakeland side by 2025; • The identification of sites for new employment; • Cross linkages with AONB Management Plan; • Landscape and Building design; • Important features and characteristics to be retained/enhanced; • Areas in need of improvement; • Biodiversity enhancement/nature improvement areas; • New visitor facilities; • Car parking and traffic management; • Strategic pedestrian and cycle networks
MM71	New 3.74D	Preparation will commence in January 2014 with a view to the plan being adopted in January 2016
MM72	Para 4.16	This 1 ha site can accommodate around 28 dwellings. This field also adjoins Wart Barrow Site of Special Scientific Interest. The key issue is the need to take the proximity to the adjacent SSSI must be taken into account and any new development should be located at least 15m from the boundary. There is a need to incorporate new planting including the erection of a permanent hedge to create a protected site buffer of 10m width the provision of protected site buffer and the extension of woodland to north to act as wildlife corridor /screening for existing properties.
MM73	Policy LA3.1	POLICY LA3.1: MIXED USE ALLOCATION AT BERNERS POOL, GRANGE-over-SANDS Purpose: To set out the policy framework for the regeneration of the Berner's Pool site to deliver housing, care facilities, and open space. 2.22 1.87 Ha OF LAND AT BERNER'S POOL, GRANGE-over-SANDS, AS SHOWN ON THE POLICIES MAP, IS ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING (Estimated capacity 103 dwellings), INCLUDING EXTRA CARE HOUSING (60 units), HEALTH CARE (D1) OPEN SPACE and WHERE APPROPRIATE OTHER USES INCLUDING EMPLOYMENT (B1) AND LEISURE USE DEVELOPMENT (0.35ha).

		RESIDENTIAL USE WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON THE FORMER LIDO EAST OF THE RAILWAY LINE
MM74	POLICY LA3.3	<p>POLICY LA3.3: MIXED USE ALLOCATION AT GUIDE'S LOT, GRANGE-over-SANDS</p> <p>4.26 1.15 Ha OF LAND IDENTIFIED ON THE POLICIES MAP AT GUIDE'S LOT, GRANGE-over-SANDS IS ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING (Estimated Capacity 16 dwellings) and EMPLOYMENT (B1) (0.63 ha) (0.57 ha)</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST ENSURE THAT AN APPROPRIATELY PLANTED AND PERMANENTLY FENCED BUFFER STRIP OF 10M WIDTH IS RETAINED ADJACENT TO THE WART BARROW SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (SSSI). ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE SET BACK AT LEAST 15M FROM THE BOUNDARY OF THE SSSI SITE.</p>
MM75	POLICY LA3.2	<p>POLICY LA3.2: MIXED USE ALLOCATION AT LAND SOUTH OF ALLITHWAITE ROAD, KENT'S BANK, GRANGE-over-SANDS</p> <p>41.25 11.2 Ha OF LAND SOUTH OF ALLITHWAITE ROAD, KENT'S BANK (ref MN26#) AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS POLICIES MAP IS ALLOCATED FOR MIXED HOUSING (Estimated capacity 202) AND B1 AND B2 EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT (1.5 ha). B8 EMPLOYMENT USES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON THE SITE</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE.</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK INCORPORATING THE RETENTION OF THE WESTERNMOST PORTION OF THE SITE FOR OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING, THE RETENTION OF EXISTING WOODLAND, ADDITIONAL PLANTING, LANDSCAPING AND BIODIVERSITY PROVISION AND LINKS TO EXISTING WOODLAND AREAS TO CREATE AND IMPROVE WILDLIFE CORRIDORS;</p> <p>SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT AND TRAVEL PLAN;</p> <p>PEDESTRIAN ROUTES THROUGH THE SITE TO CREATE NETWORK WITH EXISTING FOOTPATHS AND HIGHWAYS;</p> <p>NEW BUS STOP(S) AND A PEDESTRIAN LINK TO THE TOWN CENTRE .</p>
MM76	Para 4.12	<p>Land South of Allithwaite Road</p> <p>The second major allocation is a large site on Allithwaite Road west of Kents Bank. This is the only large site</p>

		available in Grange-over-Sands and can accommodate both housing and employment needs. The site is topographically complex and significant in landscape terms. Development will require highly sensitive design to ensure that separation is retained between Kents Bank and Allithwaite, that landscape impacts are minimised and important site features conserved and that the development represents an organic and sympathetic extension to the town. The Promenade footpath offers the opportunity to provide improved pedestrian and cycle access to the Town Centre. A development brief will be essential to ensure that a high quality sustainable development is achieved. A holistic approach to drainage management on this site will be needed, including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).
MM77	Para 4.25	<u>Land rear south of Bankfield</u> This 0.35 ha site behind the large house of Bank Field can accommodate around 9 dwellings. Key issues include ensuring appropriate access arrangements, traffic management measures to ensure greater traffic and pedestrian safety -, (particularly on and around Holme Lane), measures to facilitate safe active travel within the village, retaining trees and hedges at the edge of the site and ensuring that housing styles respect that those of existing properties. Appropriate junction configuration will need to be achieved in conjunction with access arrangements for the site(s) north of Jack Hill.
MM78	Para 4.27	<u>Land north of Jack Hill</u> These two small sites totalling 0.5-1.26 0.98 ha can together accommodate around 34-27 dwellings. Key issues include access arrangements, local traffic management to facilitate safe active travel within the village and to ensure greater traffic and pedestrian safety, particularly on and around Holme Lane and the need for housing to be of a style that respects that of existing properties. The sites will each require a single access point. Appropriate junction configuration will need to be achieved in conjunction with access arrangements for the site land rear of Bankfield.
MM79	Para 4.26	<u>Land to the rear of Barn Hey</u> This 1.1 ha site offers a significant opportunity to improve what is currently an unsatisfactory entrance to the village from Flookburgh. 'Barn Hey' is a listed building and this portion of the B5277 Flookburgh Road is narrow and difficult for both vehicles and pedestrians. It can accommodate around 30 dwellings. Key issues include: the need for access to be achieved off Locker Lane rather than Flookburgh Road; giving careful consideration to be given to the setting of 'Barn Hey'; the development of better pedestrian access into the village, including the creation of a direct pedestrian route to the centre of the village; to facilitate ing safe active travel traffic management measures on Flookburgh Road and, in particular, improvements to The Narrows; and the need to create an attractive entrance to the village using a style and layout of development that respects the amenity of existing properties and the setting of listed 'Barn Hey'. There will be a need for Locker Lane to be widened along the extent of site boundary as far as the site access point.
MM80	Policy LA1.8	EN42# — GARK — STATION YARD 1.6 — B1,B2,B8

MM81	Policy LA1.5	EEA54 Cark in Cartmel Station Yard 1.6ha B1, B2, B8
MM82	Policy LA1.6	ULVERSTON, LAND AT CANAL HEAD - PHASE 1, 6.4 2.1 Ha B1(b,c), B2,B8 and ancillary B1A
MM83	Para 5.34	<p>Ulverston Canal Head Business Park</p> <p>This 6.43 ha site at Canal Head, adjacent to the E H Booths store was identified as a potential Business Park site in the informal Ulverston Head Master Plan which and is taken forward through Core Strategy Policy CS3.2 which sets out a strategic development framework for the regeneration of this area. 2.1 ha of this land is allocated as the first phase of a strategic employment site.</p> <p>The allocated site is part of a wider employment and regeneration opportunity bounded by the embankment carrying the Furness Railway Line to the south east, the Ulverston Canal to the south, by E H Booths Supermarket and the Lakes Glass Centre, glass factory and by residential properties along Next Ness Lane to the north and by open countryside to the east. The Barrow Monument on Hoad Hill features strongly in views from the site and conversely, the site is prominent in views from the Monument. This surrounding area is identified as a Broad Location for employment development;</p>
MM84	Para 5.38	<p>Because of the complexity of this site, and the need for development to be co-ordinated with the regeneration of the Canal Head area, a Development Brief will be prepared which will cover both sites. (See Policy 5.3 below).</p> <p>The Council can only be certain that the allocated portion will come forward during the plan period. The Council will continue to work with partners such as Furness Enterprise, the Cumbria Local Economic Partnership and Cumbria County Council to bring forward the development of the remainder of the site and to implement the infrastructure necessary to deliver this. The status of this area will be reviewed in the 2021-35 Local Plan. It is important that the development of early phases within the plan period enables the longer term development of the wider site.</p>
MM85	New Policy	<p>POLICY LA[5.2A] ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD BUSINESS PARK AND EMPLOYMENT REGENERATION AREA</p> <p>Purpose To maximise the potential economic and regeneration benefits of the Ulverston Canal Head site</p> <p>DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE 1 OF THE ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD BUSINESS PARK MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING;</p> <p>A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK;</p> <p>MEASURES TO MITIGATE IMPACTS IN VIEWS FROM OUBAS HILL</p> <p>ANY NECESSARY MEASURES TO ADDRESS BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS;</p>

		<p>THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE GAS PIPELINE WHICH CROSSES THE SITE;</p> <p>THE SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY NECESSARY MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDING RAISED FLOOR LEVELS;</p> <p>THE PROVISION OF MITIGATION MEASURES TO OFFSET ANY POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAYS NETWORK;</p> <p>ADJACENT LAND AT ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD IS IDENTIFIED AS A BROAD LOCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT. DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE 1 OF THE STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT SITE AT ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD SHOULD ENABLE THE LONGER TERM DEVELOPMENT OF THIS AREA THROUGH ITS SITE DESIGN, LANDSCAPE STRUCTURE, ACCESS, SERVICING AND DRAINAGE ARRANGEMENTS.</p>
MM86	Para 5.43	<p>Ulverston Canal Head Mixed-Use Site Regeneration Opportunity Area</p> <p>The areas of land and buildings at Ulverston Canal Head, grouped around the basin at the head of the Ulverston Canal make up are a key site regeneration opportunity at the entrance to the town below Hoad Hill and the Sir John Barrow Monument. The area adjoins site is bounded by the proposed Canal Head Business Park, the E H Booth Supermarket and mainly residential properties on the opposite side of the A590 (T) Canal Street and North Lonsdale Road. The important listed Sunderland Terrace adjoins the area at its western corner of the site.</p>
MM87	Para 5.45	<p>The site is the central element of the Canal Head and Corridor Regeneration Opportunity Area. A site of 3.93 ha (gross) at Canal Head is allocated for could accommodate residential, heritage, leisure and tourism uses in line with the advisory Canal Head Master Plan, with the overall objective of regenerating the Canal basin and corridor. Development here will be closely related to the adjacent Strategic Employment Site and a Development Brief will be required. The Council, in partnership with site owners, the County Council and the Cumbria Local Enterprise Partnership, will seek to regenerate the area in a way which achieves a strong 'sense of place' with a high standard of design and public realm reflecting the waterside location and the site's role as a 'gateway' to Ulverston and the retention and improvement of the canal as a public amenity and the opening up of views to the Canal and basin. Flood risk mitigation will be an important consideration in the development of this site.</p>
MM88	POLICY 5.3	<p>POLICY LA5.3: MIXED USE ALLOCATION REGENERATION OPPORTUNITY AREA, ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD</p> <p>Purpose: To provide a policy framework for the regeneration of the sites around Ulverston Canal Head.</p> <p>LAND AT ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD (ref M28) IS IDENTIFIED AS A REGENERATION OPPORTUNITY SITE</p>

		ALLOCATED SUITABLE FOR A MIX OF HOUSING (estimated capacity 86 dwellings), HERITAGE, LEISURE AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT (2 ha):																		
MM89	POLICY 5.3	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Area (Ha) gross</th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">Phase</th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">1</th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">2</th> <th style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Residential</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.93 Ha</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">86</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Heritage, Leisure and Tourism</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">2.00 Ha</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Area (Ha) gross	Phase	1	2	3	Residential	1.93 Ha				86			Heritage, Leisure and Tourism			2.00 Ha
	Area (Ha) gross	Phase	1	2	3															
Residential	1.93 Ha				86															
		Heritage, Leisure and Tourism			2.00 Ha															
MM90	POLICY 5.4	<p>POLICY 5.4: LAND AT ULVERSTON CANAL HEAD – DEVELOPMENT BRIEF</p> <p>Purpose: To ensure that development reflects the Community's aspirations for a high quality approach to Ulverston, manages key environmental impacts effectively, manages flood risk and surface water effectively has a positive impact on the surrounding area and its infrastructure, and conserves important site features.</p> <p>A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF WILL BE PREPARED TO GUIDE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO SITES AT CANAL HEAD, ULVERSTON.</p> <p>AS WELL AS OTHER CORE STRATEGY POLICY REQUIREMENTS, DEVELOPMENT MUST MAKE PROVISION FOR THE FOLLOWING:</p> <p>STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT SITE – CANAL HEAD</p> <p>THE SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A LANDSCAPE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE FRAMEWORK TO INCORPORATE SIGNIFICANT STRUCTURAL LANDSCAPING INCLUDING SCREENING FROM OUBAS HILL, SCREENING OF THE GAS FACILITY, THE RETENTION AND REINFORCEMENT OF EXISTING FOOTPATHS AND ANY NECESSARY MEASURES TO ADDRESS BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS; AND</p> <p>THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE GAS PIPELINE WHICH CROSSES THE SITE; AND THE SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF A FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY NECESSARY MITIGATION MEASURES INCLUDING RAISED FLOOR LEVELS; AND</p> <p>THE PROVISION OF MITIGATION MEASURES TO OFFSET ANY POTENTIAL ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE HIGHWAYS NETWORK;</p> <p>AND THE RETENTION OF EXISTING PUBLIC FOOTPATHS AND PERMISSIVE PRIVATE RIGHTS OF WAY;</p>																		
MM91	POLICY 5.4	<p>MIXED USE SITE – CANAL HEAD</p> <p>THE ACHIEVEMENT OF A STRONG 'SENSE OF PLACE' WITH A HIGH STANDARD OF DESIGN AND PUBLIC REALM REFLECTING THE WATERSIDE LOCATION AND THE SITE'S ROLE AS A 'GATEWAY' TO ULVERSTON; AND</p>																		

		<p>THE PROVISION OF A SYMPATHETIC SETTING FOR GRADE II LISTED BUILDINGS AT SUNDERLAND TERRACE; AND THE OPENING UP OF VIEWS TO THE CANAL AND BASIN, ESPECIALLY FROM THE A590(T) AND PROVIDE SAFER ACCESS; AND</p> <p>THE RETENTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE CANAL AS A PUBLIC AMENITY INCORPORATING PEDESTRIAN ROUTES AROUND CANAL HEAD, PUBLIC FOOTPATHS AND ACCESS TO THE CANAL SIDE; AND</p> <p>THE PROVISION OF STRONG PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN THE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CANAL HEAD SITE, THE STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT SITE, THE REST OF THE CANAL CORRIDOR AND THE TOWN CENTRE; AND</p> <p>THE PROVISION OF ANY NECESSARY FLOOD RISK MITIGATION / ATTENUATION MEASURES INCLUDING RAISED FLOOR LEVELS AND MITIGATION / ATTENUATION MEASURES TO ENSURE EXISTING SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE ISSUES ARE SATISFACTORILY ADDRESSED PRIOR TO ANY DEVELOPMENT;</p> <p>AND THE PROVISION OF MITIGATION MEASURES TO OFFSET IMPACT TO THE EXISTING HIGHWAYS NETWORK;</p> <p>AND THE MITIGATION OF ANY BIODIVERSITY IMPACTS;</p> <p>AND ANY NECESSARY WORKS REQUIRED TO THE CANAL ITSELF AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE; AND A SCHEME FOR CANAL SIDE LANDSCAPING.</p>
MM92	Policy LA1.1 and Policies Map	Amend development plan boundary to incorporate site RN193 in Ulverston
MM93	Policy LA1.3	RN684 SWM SWARTHMOOR ADJACENT TO KINGSLEY AVENUE 1.31 35
MM94	Policy LA1.3	SWARTHMOOR OFF CROSS-a-MOOR 8.02 35 36 126 90