

## **3<sup>rd</sup> NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP MEETINGS FOR LAND ALLOCATION**

### **Present**

Tony Hill

Chris Granger

Mark Cropper

Emma Butterworth

Sue Cook

Jenny Harrison

Claire Ellwood

Jannice Wilkinson

John McCurdie

Nigel McGurk

### **Agenda**

- Debrief from Tony and Nigel about their meeting with South Lakeland District Council (SLDC) and the Lake District National Park Authority (LDNPA).
- Further development of land allocation to include green spaces, sports, recreation.
- Discuss draft policies from Nigel.
- Discuss next steps leading to early draft plan and public consultation about land allocations.

### **Objective**

Tony reminded participants that the land allocations had to follow targets

- Realistic and achievable.
- The rationale could be explained.
- We should be looking to publish an early draft plan.

## Meeting with SLDC and LDNPA on outline objectives and the process

The meeting was held in order to inform each other what had been happening and the timescales involved. Nigel said that both SLDC and LDNPA were very supportive of the plans, and that we must understand that our Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is not SLDC's and will differ from SLDC's idea.

There is a legal obligation not to breach environmental considerations and the planned British exit from the European Union does not change that obligation. For the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), SLDC are checking with Historic England, Environment Agency, etc., but the flood risk and sewage disposal are the main areas to be assessed. These can be expensive to carry out, and our partners are supportive of a reduced process. Nigel said that he would produce a table of key questions, and SLDC and LDNPA will decide if we need more. We will then progress the HRA and SEA and put the skeleton of the NP to those local authorities. Nigel emphasised that these assessments are the biggest obstacles to any Neighbourhood Plan.

In addition to the above, we get LDNPA's experience of other areas that have developed NPs so that we can avoid pitfalls. Examples are:

- Matterdale has many little hamlets taking Lake District policies as their base, so we could create our own version of design criteria to apply to new developments.
- Coniston has designated special "quieter" area.
- One row of cottages as been designated as "heritage" despite not being listed. This policy can also be used for landscape, e.g. drumlins. In reply to a question from Mark, Nigel said that we can not refuse all development but we can influence the extent.
- Ancient woodland is protected

Mark: can we have "green gap" protection?

Nigel: we can not designate a green belt, but distinctive fields, etc. could be designated as special.

John: can we destroy woodland?

Nigel: yes, if the alternative is good. We do not have to replace it with better woodland.

## **Policies**

Nigel said that we can write the policies about housing allocation as vaguely as we wish, e.g. we could state that we anticipate  $x$  number of houses at a density of  $y$  to the hectare. We can leave it like that or add specific details, such as access details.

John: who has the final say about housing developments?

Nigel: the Inspector must take account the policies set out in the NP and SLDC's policies before approval is given, even after appeal from developers. We should engage with landowners and put out a "call for sites". Nigel said that he could bring information about the costs of different types of housing.

Sue: how much detail do we need to supply to attract builders but keep our ideas?

Nigel: Chris, Noel Farrer, and Nigel can advise.

## **Land allocation**

Chris said that the sites identified seem very much as in the Vision document. What is the status with the settlement tanks? Mark said that he could take proposals of resiting or alternatives to the current settling tanks to Cropper's board, but the machinery in the large green structure can not be moved. Nigel said the NP can put a line around the site and remark "if this were to become available, we could....."

Mark suggested that there could be houses at the rear of the mill, which is quieter because most of the noise from the mill is produced at the front. He mentioned also a row of houses on the other side of the road to present a better entrance to the village rather than the backs of houses on Hall Park. Chris asked about the heritage aspects with respect to encroachment on Burneside Old Hall. Mark said that Burneside Old Hall is a Grade II\* listed building but needs a fortune spent on it. Tony said that he would like to see housing areas 9-11 removed (Field N of Willink Fields, Field N of Holme Houses, Football Ground). Sue questioned where these 70 houses could be allocated in the rest of the village.

Mark said that he would like to see the proposal to straighten the currently offset crossroads and for lorries to access the mill further along New Road. Emma said that if the school playground were moved elsewhere, it would not be in the centre of the village.

Nigel said that he was supportive of a large number of houses as long as it generates the improvement of the whole village. The phasing of developments would be important in raising funding and for the Community infrastructure Levy (CIL) etc. Sue reiterated her point that, if we remove plans for 70+ houses beyond the current boundaries, where do we fit them in? Nigel said that we should be wary about including easy sites to develop on the outskirts and finding that the harder sites in the core of the village were not taken up. He suggested that all sites should be left under consideration and the sieving process would remove them. Under the consultation process, we must state the reasons for considering the sites, and we have to score them. Emma asked if we can **specify** the phasing, to which Nigel replied that it was a very good idea.

Tony asked what Nigel could do to move us along? Nigel said that he could structure something to assess the sites, giving a weight to each score depending on the vision. We need to consider the transformation of the village. Mark asked if we could task Nigel to calculate the densities for each site.

## **Conclusions**

Tony said that the plan would be for Nigel to return in under 3 weeks (from 14 November) and for there to be a presentation to the whole NP team. We still need to allocate areas for sporting and recreation facilities.

The latest table of possible sites follows.

John McCurdie  
Secretary, Burneside Neighbourhood Plan  
22 November 2016

## Identified sites

Site		Type	Units	Types and notes
1	Hall Park	Residential	70 60	In SLDC allocation. Possible extra area.
2	Sprint Holme	Residential	15	In keeping with Churchill Court. Access?
3	Hall Park Minor	Residential	6	High density
4	Church Car Park	Residential Industrial	10	High density Flats above commerce
5	Engine Sheds	Residential	15	Mid density Terraced, 4bed with garage under
6	Station Yard	Residential Industrial	10	Access from Engine Sheds?
7	Melmore Gardens	Residential	10	Mid density Terraced, garage under
8	Willink Fields	Residential	20	Family homes, to mirror Holme Houses ?
9	Field N of Willink Fields	Residential	30	As above
10	Field N of Holme Houses	Residential	20	As above
11	Football Ground	Residential	20	Higher end family homes
12	School and grounds	Residential Industrial	20	
13	Behind pub, Steeles Row	Industrial		
14	Behind churchyard	Commercial Residential ?		Flats above commerce
15	Bridge Street (river side)	Industrial		
16	Beside effluent tank	Industrial		
17	Bridge Street (mill side)	Industrial		
18	Land adjacent to mill	Industrial		In SLDC allocation
19	Land adjacent to mill	Industrial		(Formerly part of 18)
20	Field NE of Mill Stream	Residential	?	
21	Play Area	Residential	?	
22	Settling tanks	Residential	?	
23	Gowan Lea	Residential	?	