

COMMENTS FROM ALAN THOMPSON (COMMUNITY MONITOR) 4 Mar 2017
(written in February)

You asked me to assess the process of the Neighbourhood plan so far as it concerns the land allocations identified by the Steering Group.

I would like to comment as follows:-

Nigel has set out **guidelines** which will be used by Planning Authorities to assess their suitability for housing. these are to me very straightforward and clear. He has stated at different meetings of the S.G. this criteria and suggested the guidelines should be followed if the Group wish to see S.L.D.C. eventually recommend approval of Burneside Neighbourhood Plan.

As I understand the criteria for approval marks each site as to it's suitability. If a site identified by the S.G. for housing receives a minus mark there is no chance of it ever receiving planning permission. Obviously this does not apply to the sites already approved by SLDC in the Local Plan. (This is a laymans' view of it)

Why then does the sites with a minus score still remain on the plan which has been discussed by the S.G?

The two main sites suggested with a minus score and which stand out are:-

- 1.The Football Field
2. The School.

I acknowledge there are other minus sites but the above are the most controversial (Steering Group description)

I do not have to go over all the discussions about the ambitions, needs etc of housing for the village. I agree with them.

Why then does the S.G continue to suggest the sites marked with a minus? Why have they not been removed?

The land owners of sites 1 and 2 have stated they do not wish to make these sites available for housing.

If they are left in the land allocation which will be presented to the community, in my opinion, it is very possible the Neighbourhood Plan would be rejected. I would vote against any plan which included these two sites.

Whatever our individual thoughts are about wanting new build in the village, because of the Flooding, Flood Plains, keeping the green belt between Burneside – Kendal – Bowston land for building is in short supply.

The Football field in the past has been in various parts of the village. The first area used that I know about was in Sprint Holme. (I dug up the remnants of the goal posts in my garden) The field was then in Chappel Field and then over the river next to the mill. In each case they were able to re-locate so building could take place because there was land available in another part of the village.

I am very disappointed that the S.G do not appear to have taken into consideration the fact land will be required to replace The Willink Field and possibly the Bowling Green and Tennis Courts, when they have persisted in keeping the Football Field and School designated for housing.

There has been too much time wasted on designating areas which everyone knows can not been used.

I understand by including all suggestions in the discussions by the S.G. it will show SLDC that all things have been investigated