

Spatial Options Responses – summary of written comments received

105 comments received via written representation

Name	Date	Method of response	Organisation	Summary of comments
Suzette Heald	20.07.14	E-mail	Dolphinholme Residents Associations	<p>Express concern regarding the evidence base used to determine future housing need in the district.</p> <p>Raise specific concern regarding the level of development proposed in Dolphinholme, noting the existence of only one of the key services (primary school) used to determine the sustainability of development. Transport and environmental impacts were also noted including limited public transport provision and parking availability, loss of farm land and potential increased flood risk by building on upland storage areas and increasing run-off rates. The need for a new sewerage system was also noted.</p> <p>Recommend that development should reflect the scale of the existing village e.g. 10% of the existing stock. Above this level is not viewed to be appropriate.</p>
Winne Clark	18.07.14	E-mail	Lancaster Civic Society	<p>Express concern regarding the level of information available to comment on and the consideration of housing in isolation from employment and transport.</p> <p>The level of housing proposed is not supported by the Civic Society with specific concerns raised regarding the information used and the need to include student population and accommodation in the calculations.</p> <p>Specific comments are then provided on each of the options including detailed advantages and disadvantages. The need for more information was noted for most of the options.</p> <p>Specifically do not support option 5.</p> <p>Recommend an alternative option combining elements of each of the 5 options.</p>

				<p>A number of additional comments are also provided including the relationship with social housing and empty properties. Highlight the need to retain control over phasing ensuring that those sites that do the least environmental and landscape damage are released first.</p>
Rachael Bust	17.07.14	E-mail	Coal Authority	<p>Notes the location of limited pockets of coal resources across the district and the need to ensure that coal resources are not sterilised by new development.</p> <p>The need to be aware of past coal mining activity and potential land instability is also noted. Noted to be approx. 284 recorded mine entries in the district as well as other coal mining related hazards.</p> <p>Noted to have no particular preference for any of the options presented.</p> <p>Highlight that if option 3 is selected then there may be potential for some of the western areas to fall in the surface coal resource and/or to be affected by mining legacy features.</p>
Pamela Duff	16.07.14	E-mail	Member of the public	<p>Recommends that full use be made of the new northern link road. Highlights the traffic issues surrounding Galgate. Highlights opportunity at Skerton High School for additional development.</p> <p>Suggests a new bridge over the River Lune to alleviate traffic in Lancaster.</p>
Sue Holden	14.07.14	E-mail	Member of the public	<p>Comments note the need to fully understand the housing needs figure, insist on affordable housing delivery, use brownfield land first and then after considering all of these look at option 3 spreading new housing across the district.</p>
Kevin Price	16.07.14	E-mail	Ireby with Leck Parish Council	<p>Express concern regarding option 5. Option 5 is not viewed to be of a scale or in keeping with the characteristics and natural beauty of the surrounding landscape or villages.</p> <p>Also note concern regarding option 3 which would spread impacts through the majority of the rural areas of the district.</p> <p>Specific comments are provided in relation to employment and transport. Note that option 5 is not serviced with a road network capable of supporting the level of increased traffic. Employment opportunities are also noted to be limited. Wider infrastructure concerns are also raised including increased flood risk.</p>

				<p>Concern is also expressed regarding the impact of option 5 on the landscape and heritage of the area. Consider that housing development of the scale proposed would intrude upon this landscape and consequently impact on tourism in the area. The need to consider the proposed extension to the Yorkshire Dales National Park is also noted.</p> <p>The need for additional housing is specifically questioned.</p> <p>Option 1 is noted as the most appropriate and sustainable option.</p>
Colin Pooley	14.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public (Lancaster Vision)	<p>Provides a detailed appraisal of the Housing Requirement Study.</p> <p>The appraisal considers that the housing requirement study provides a balanced analysis of the districts future housing needs using an established methodology to suggest a range of housing needs up to 2031. It is recommended that a range of other considerations should also be included including the social and spatial distribution effects of any employment growth, the segmented nature of the districts housing market, the disproportionate impact of the student population on demographic data and the impact of future housing development on traffic generation in the city.</p>
Emily Hrycan	10.07.14	E-mail	English Heritage	<p>Note that due to the absence of boundaries English Heritage are unable to assess the options and the impact that they might have on the historic environment.</p> <p>Earlier comments were made by English Heritage in relation to the Site Allocation methodology (letter dated 19th June 2014). This highlighted the need to assess and evaluate the impact that development might have upon the elements that contribute to the significance of a heritage asset including their setting. The need to consider strategic cross boundary issues was also highlighted.</p>
Caroline Cattermole	10.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Option 1 was viewed to be a good idea offering opportunity to link the university with the rest of the town.</p> <p>Opposed to option 2 – viewed to be important to keep Lancaster and Carnforth as separate towns.</p>

				<p>Unsure about options 3 and 4. Whilst it could help improve the vitality and viability of villages it could also spoil the character of them. Concentrating on just two villages may be a more preferable solution.</p> <p>Option 5 viewed to represent opportunity to return to the Garden cities approach.</p>
Keith Hyde	04.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Considers that the housing requirement study fails to address the needs for low cost housing and housing for disabled and older people. Highlights the need to reduce migration of graduates from the district.</p> <p>Goes onto discuss each of the options providing advantages and disadvantages for each.</p> <p>Recommends that option 2 be considered with options 1 and 3. Option 4 viewed to be the worst option.</p>
Peter Turnbull	31.05.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Recommends that any review of the green belt should only include land to the east of the west coast railway line, with land that has direct access to the A6 and the new by-pass the only reasonable option.</p> <p>Land to the west of the west coast railine should be excluded due to concerns regarding traffic impacts and that the currently undeveloped land provides a much needed buffer between dense existing housing development and the countryside and contains several important areas including Barley Cop Wood, the Crematorium, the rugby club, the cricket club, Torrisholme Barrow and a conservation area of wetland/reed bed.</p> <p>Considers the obvious areas for development to be land along the A6 between Lancaster and Slyne, along the A6 between Lancaster and Glagate and the road between Halton and Lancaster.</p>
Ian Hughes	12.05.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Expressed concern regarding the traffic implications of additional housing in the district and questions the need for additional housing.</p>
Tracey Hirst	16.07.14	E-mail	Wyre Borough Council	<p>Note the area to the south of the district as being most relevant to Wyre Borough Council. Highlight the need to consider housing growth alongside employment growth before making any final decisions.</p>

				Highlight how proposals to the south of the district together with growth proposed by Wyre as part of its own Local Plan will have an impact on the local highway network, particularly on the A6 and junctions 32 and 33 of the M6.
Tim Hancock	24.06.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	Strongly opposes option 5. Dispersal is viewed to be more appropriate, allowing existing social structures to help support new arrivals.
Geoff Gregory	22.06.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	Questions the need for additional housing and raises specific concerns regarding additional housing in Cockerham.
Cathy Dean	23.06.14	E-mail	Highways Agency	No comment
Barbara Fairbairn	07.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	Questions the need for additional housing. Notes that new housing is required if new jobs come to the area and highlights that both the NHS and Universities are cutting back on staff and that small new businesses do not employ large numbers of staff.
Kath Coleman	16.07.14	E-mail	Ellel Parish Council	Notes the need for new housing to be proportionate to the current housing in an areas and in character with the local environment. Current infrastructure, drainage, public transport, schools and employment are not viewed to be sufficient in Dolphinholme to accommodate the level of development proposed. Highlights that the Parish Council would like to see some new development but that this has to be in the right place and the right type of housing. Note the need for new housing for young local people. Express concern regarding development to the north of Galgate and the potential for Galgate to merge with the University and Scotforth. Note issues of drainage and flood risk in Galgate.
Daniel Hudson	11.07.14	Letter	South Lakeland District Council	Supports housing, population and employment growth in Lancaster district. Such growth is viewed to be complementary to South Lakelands own aspirations for growth. Option 5 noted as the the only option to cause them concern. Whilst some benefits are highlighted the response states that development of the scale proposed would have far reaching consequences, with such a settlement becoming the dominant settlement in the Upper Lune Valley area changing the geography of employment, shopping, health and education provision, traffic movements and public transport networks.

				<p>Potential impacts on the proposed extension to the Yorkshire Dales National Park are also noted.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that services would be provided as part of this option concern is expressed that during the early phases of this development new residents would put a strain on service provision in nearby settlements.</p> <p>Question whether option 5 actually reflects sustainable development.</p>
C Cross	23.06.14	Letter	Member of the Public	Requests that the council stop building on green belt land and starts renovating empty properties in Morecambe.
S Kaye	14.06.14	Letter	Member of the Public	Objects to development on green belt land and questions the need for additional housing. Notes that there are lots of empty homes in Morecambe.
Janet Baguley	21.07.14	Letter	Natural England	<p>Express concern that the options are being considered in isolation and not alongside the existing sites identified as part of the Land Allocations.</p> <p>Recommend a number of improvements to the SA objectives.</p> <p>Specific comments are then provided for each of the options.</p> <p>In relation to option 1 they note concern regarding the absence of commentary relating to the proximity of the option to the Bowland Fells SSSI and SPA and potential impacts on water pollution to the Lune Estuary SSSI. The need for a more detailed landscape assessment was also noted.</p> <p>Concerns were also expressed regarding option 2 in relation to its proximity to the Morecambe Bay SSSI/SPA/SAC/Ramsar and the likely increase in recreational pressure that will be experienced as a result of development in this location.</p> <p>The proximity of villages to designated sites was again highlighted as an issue in need of further consideration. Recommend early engagement with the AONB unit and further landscape assessment.</p>

				<p>Natural England object to the negative scoring under objective EN4 for option 4 noting that the impacts on both AONBs in the district could be huge. There was considered to be insufficient information to determine if impacts could be mitigated.</p> <p>Natural England recommend that HRA be undertaken as soon as possible and that this should feed into a revised SA. They advise that objective EN3 will need to be reviewed as a result of this work.</p> <p>Specific concern is expressed regarding the scoring of objective EN4 and the level of information available to determine conclusions.</p> <p>The need to consider impacts on air pollution on designated sites is not viewed to have been considered as part of the SA process.</p> <p>Express concern that the Appropriate Assessment of the original Land Allocations Plan is still outstanding with additional options being considered prior to any certainty that they can be delivered with respect to the natural environment.</p> <p>Natural England also question whether extension/increase in size of the original allocations was considered as an option to accommodate the additional development.</p> <p>Additional information in relation to environmental/landscape impacts should have been included in the document.</p> <p>Natural England recommend that further work be undertaken to identify solutions for managing recreational pressure to avoid disturbance on the coast.</p>
Allen and Jean Norris	21.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Raised concerns regarding the consultation process. Requested that Dolhinholme Residents Association be consulted on for further consultations.</p> <p>Express concern regarding the housing requirement study and the assumptions made in it in relation to job growth. Concern is also expressed regarding the housing requirement reports assessment of affordable and social housing need.</p>

				<p>Specific comments are then provided for each option. Option 3 is noted as the preferred option but at a lower level of growth than that currently envisaged.</p> <p>Highlight concerns regarding option 4 and the impact that this would have on Nether Kellet and Dolpholme. Concern is also expressed regarding option 5.</p> <p>The letter goes onto detail specific concerns regarding additional development in Dolpholme highlighting the loss of agricultural land, transport concerns, absence of public transport, lack of car parking, sewage and wider infrastructure concerns, increased flood risk and environmental impacts. Highlight how any development in the village must be of a scale proportionate to the village now. Land towards the school and land towards the Fleece Inn are viewed to be more appropriate options for the village.</p>
Brian Barden	22.07.14	Letter	Steven Abbott Associates	<p>Note the need for a combination of options. Recommend some adjustment to the green belt boundary in association with a distribution of growth through existing settlements.</p> <p>Support is also noted for option 1 although state that this option would not meet the needs of the district as a whole.</p>
Lyndsey Hayes	22.07.14	E-mail	Blackpool Council	Do not wish to make any specific recommendation.
Elliott Lorimer	31.07.14	E-mail	Forest of Bowland AONB Partnership	<p>Provides an overview of the status and purpose of the AONB, including detailed information on the Forest of Bowland AONB Management Plan.</p> <p>Specific comments are then provided in relation to each of the suggested options. Options 1 and 2 are supported.</p> <p>The AONB Partnership do not support option 3 and note the impact of the proposed scale of housing development across a number of villages within the AONB (in particular Caton with Brookhouse and Wray and to a lesser extent Hornby in the AONB and Dolpholme within the AONB setting). Level of development proposed is considered to be classified as 'major development' and as such undeliverable when read alongside the NPPF.</p>

				Option 4 and 5 are also not supported. Specific comments are made in relation to the impact of expanding Dolphinholme which whilst not within the AONB, is adjacent to the AONB boundary and sits within its setting.
Councillor Carol Howard (letter also endorsed by Ireby with Leck Parish Council)	31.07.14	E-mail	Councillor	<p>Expressed concern regarding the consultation, specifically in relation to the time available to respond.</p> <p>Questioned the statistics used in the Housing Requirement Study and welcomed the proposed review of this information.</p> <p>Expressed specific concern regarding Option 5 noting the proposed extension of the Yorkshire Dales National Park and the negative impact of additional housing development on this; the need for and cost of additional infrastructure; highway capacity; highway safety concerns; impact on protected landscapes, conservation area and listed buildings; and impact on tourism in the area.</p> <p>Concern is also expressed regarding options 3 and 4. Considers that option 3 would also destroy the landscape of North Lancashire.</p> <p>Option 1 is viewed to be the most appropriate response – noting the opportunity that this provides to link to employment at the University and address traffic issues at Galgate.</p>
Douglas Williams	28.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Expresses specific concern regarding the loss of good agricultural land for housing.</p> <p>Questions whether employment needs have also been considered, specifically querying where the people living in the new homes will work.</p> <p>Notes that some of the development will be in Caton which is within and AONB a fact considered to have been ignored within the consultation.</p> <p>Questions why the Bargh transport site has been excluded from the SHLAA.</p> <p>Questions whether sewage plans have been approved for Caton and expresses concern regarding the impacts of further sewage works on the river Lune.</p> <p>Expresses concern regarding potential for additional nitrates within the river Lune.</p>

				<p>Comments are also provided in relation to the need for additional housing and the impacts of changing population dynamics on this.</p> <p>Additional comments are also provided in relation to transport impacts, infrastructure capacity and the need to consider apartment based development with improved sound insulation.</p>
Justin Cove	31.07.14	E-mail	Nexus Planning Ltd on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency North West	<p>Welcome the approach and positive response being taken to accommodate the delivery of an additional 5,000 new homes.</p> <p>The HCA do not have any specific preference in regards to any of the 5 options presented but maintain that Lancaster should continue to be the focus for the majority of growth and investment.</p> <p>Specific HCA land interests are then discussed (land at Royal Albert Farm, Ashton Road, Lancaster and Moorpark Offices adjacent to Lancaster Moor Hospital). The HCA are committed to ensuring that both sites are brought forward for housing.</p> <p>Request that SHAA site 304 (land at Royal Albert Farm) be included as a future allocation. An amended boundary for the site is appended to the response.</p>
James Berggren	31.07.14	E-mail	Sedgewick Associates on behalf of HSL	<p>Comments made in relation to land north of Hammerton Hall Lane in Lancaster and its current status within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The land is no longer viewed to fulfil the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined in the NPPF, primarily as a result of the new link road. Additional comments are provided in relation to this. Estimated that approximately 420 new houses could be provided on this land. Opportunities for retail are also noted.</p> <p>Additional comments are also provided in relation to options 1, 3, 4 and 5.</p> <p>Conclude the need to undertake a review of the Green Belt.</p>
Simon Pemberton	31.07.14	E-mail	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on	<p>Support the continued allocation of Whinney Carr for housing-led mixed use development in addition to the proposed 5 options.</p>

			behalf of Peel Holdings (Land and Property) Ltd, Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd and David Townley.	
James Berggren	31.07.14	E-mail	Sedgwick Associates in regards to land off Sea View Drive	<p>Comments made in relation to land off Sea View Drive and its current status within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The land is no longer viewed to fulfil the five purposes of the Green Belt as defined in the NPPF. Additional comments are provided in relation to this.</p> <p>Additional comments are also provided in relation to options 1, 3, 4 and 5.</p> <p>Conclude the need to undertake a review of the Green Belt.</p>
James Berggren	31.07.14	E-mail	Sedgwick Associates in regards to land off Whinney Fold, Silverdale	<p>Comments made in relation to land off Whinney Fold in Silverdale. Comments are wrongly made in relation to the sites location in the Green Belt. This site is not located in the Green Belt.</p>
Emily Robinson	31.07.14	E-mail	Paul Walton Associates	<p>Discuss land at Melling identifying additional land for inclusion within the SHLAA.</p> <p>Option 3 is noted to be the preferred option from the consultation.</p>
Kate McGill	31.07.14	E-mail	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Commercial Estates Projects	<p>Note CEPs interest in land to the west of Scotforth Road and to the east of the railway in south Lancaster. The land is identified as part of the larger Whinney Carr site.</p> <p>Support the continued allocation of Whinney Carr but state that there is a need for a 'district centre' at this location rather than a 'local centre' as currently proposed.</p>
Peter Dutton	31.07.14	E-mail	Gladman Developments	<p>Welcome the publication of the councils Independent Housing Requirement Study. Reserve the right to comment on this further in the future.</p> <p>Note that growth should be directed to suitable sites in key settlements and villages that benefit from access to a range of services, facilities and infrastructure but state that the</p>

				<p>council should not overlook the need for further development in lower order sustainable settlements.</p> <p>Recommend that the council should identify further sites, over and above that required to accommodate the 5,000 new homes in order to provide flexibility should sites fail to come forward or deliver at a lower rate than originally envisaged.</p> <p>Recommend that the council progress a more balanced approach to meeting future housing need, distributing development to a broader range of suitable sites. Consider that the most appropriate strategy may be a combination of options.</p> <p>Welcome a review of the Green Belt.</p>
Ben Pycroft	31.07.14	E-mail	Emery Planning on behalf of Mr J W Waburton	<p>Object to option 5 and the potential identification of Cowan Bridge as a new settlement. The option is not viewed to represent sustainable development with concerns raised in relation to the need for significant infrastructure investment; the close proximity of this option to the proposed extension of the Yorkshire Dales National Park; the promotion of unsustainable travel patterns and the impact of this option on the neighbouring South Lakeland authority.</p> <p>Highlight concern regarding the absence of an economic strategy to accompany the consultation and therefore question how the employment needs of the district could be determined.</p> <p>Highlight how the councils 2011 Housing Need and Demand Study identified that most people surveyed wanted to live in Lancaster or Morecambe. Question how new housing at Cowan Bridge would achieve this.</p> <p>Note the need to investigate whether option 5 really is the best way of achieving sustainable development when compared to the other 5 options. The benefits of option 1 and 2 are discussed in more detail noting their proximity to existing services and infrastructure.</p>
Dave Sherratt	31.07.14	E-mail	United Utilities	<p>Unable to provide a specific response at this stage. A more detailed response will be provided once further details are provided.</p>

				Support and encourage the delivery of new development within sustainable areas that have the appropriate infrastructure in place.
Paul Smith	31.07.14	E-mail	NJL Consulting on behalf of Strategic Land Group	<p>Proposed housing target is viewed to be too low and should be increased. Note the need to ensure the target is sufficiently aspirational. Highlight the need to consider higher levels of employment growth when calculating future housing requirement.</p> <p>Recommend that additional sites are identified to provide a buffer should identified sites fail to deliver.</p> <p>Specific comments are provided for each of the proposed options.</p> <p>A single urban extension under option 1 is not viewed to be the most appropriate option with concern regarding the level of landscape and townscape associated with this option, the merging of Lancaster and Galgate and the level of infrastructure required. Delivery rates are also projected to be lower under this option when compared to delivery from a large number of smaller sites.</p> <p>Do not support option 2 – considered to be sufficient non-Green Belt sites to deliver an increased housing requirement without the need to amend existing boundaries.</p> <p>Option 3 is viewed to be the most appropriate option. Consider that the dispersal of new homes would allow a large number of benefits to be gained improving access to basic goods, services and amenities for existing residents, maintaining the vitality and viability of services and facilities and boosting local economies. Consider that this option would allow the widest range of choice and competition in the land market and ensure that new homes are delivered at the highest possible rate.</p> <p>Option 4 is not viewed to be appropriate. Consider that this option would place considerable pressure on facilities and services in these villages and that by focussing on just two locations the sustainability of other villages may be compromised.</p>

				Option 5 is note viewed to be appropriate. Consider that like option 1 this approach would be subject to significant delay with lower delivery rates delivered.
Jonathan Vose	31.07.14	E-mail	Walsingham Planning on behalf of Primrose Developments	<p>Endorse the councils promotion of housing growth.</p> <p>Option 3 is viewed to be the most appropriate response.</p> <p>Client owns/control of the former TDG site at Warton Road in Carnforth (SHLAA_84). Consider that this site could deliver more housing then currently proposed in the SHLAA and that it should be promoted solely for housing.</p>
Emily Robinson	31.07.14	E-mail	Paul Walton Associates on behalf of Lancashire Care NHS Foundation Trust	<p>Note that given the strategic nature of the consultation it is not viewed to be appropriate to make site specific comments or considerations at this stage.</p> <p>Highlight that proposals for the allocation of land must be compliant with the provisions of the paragraph 150 in the NPPF and the need to ensure that there can be a reasonable prospect that sites will come forward.</p>
Jennifer Hadland	31.07.14	E-mail	Smiths Gore on behalf of the Duchy of Lancaster	<p>Note the need to ensure that the Local Plan does not discount the importance of the rural areas within the district.</p> <p>Do not support options 1, 2 and 5. Question the deliverability of single large scale development sites given the significant infrastructure improvements required to deliver them. State that should they fail to deliver the plan would not be flexible enough to deliver the level of housing required.</p> <p>Do not believe that exceptional circumstances exist to review the green belt when there are so many non-Green Belt locations available.</p> <p>Concerned that option 3 would result in small scale development being spread too thinly across the district with such developments not supported by the necessary infrastructure or services.</p> <p>Support option 4. Believe that this would allow two new local service centres to be developed to meet rural needs. Would also support a hybrid of option 4 that includes some limited elements of option 1.</p>

				<p>Note the availability of land under single ownership in Dolphinhholme to support delivery of this option. Wish to work with the council and the local community to support and help deliver sustainable development at Dolphinhholme.</p> <p>More detailed comments are provided to support the delivery of sites identified in Dolphinhholme in the SHLAA.</p>
Peter Cook	31.07.14	E-mail	Lancaster and District Bird Watching Society	<p>Note that given the scale of development proposed it is likely that some of the proposed housing options will affect habitats of wildlife value.</p> <p>In view of the limited information available the society are unable to provide detailed comments. Would prefer to reserve detailed comments until the draft allocations are published.</p>
Stuart Booth	31.07.14	E-mail	JWPC Ltd	<p>Believe the link between transport capacity and development potential to be the key issue to consider when making any decision on where new development can be delivered.</p> <p>Consider that the best approach would be to spread new development across the district, without focussing on a single location.</p> <p>Specific comments are provided in relation to South Lancaster. Note that option 1 proposes additional development to that already suggested in the SHLAA. Agree that this area should be considered as a key area for growth in the district. Agree that potential for an additional junction between 33 and 34 should be investigated.</p> <p>Agree that a full Green Belt review should be undertaken with the need for additional housing and the construction of the new link road providing sufficient justification.</p> <p>Propose that all villages across the district be considered for additional growth at a proportion of existing dwellings. Development in some villages could go beyond this level where considered appropriate based on exceptional accessibility or the underlying need to support local services by establishing a critical mass of residents.</p>

				<p>Specific comments are made in relation to land at Aldcliffe. Consider the area to represent extremely sustainable development and state that consideration should be given to the release of land at this location.</p> <p>Conclude that development should be distributed with consideration to land to the south of Lancaster, review of the Green Belt, sustainable growth in all villages, substantial development of new land at Aldcliffe.</p>
Michael Gilbert	31.07.14	E-mail	Peter Brett Associates on behalf of Hurstwood Holdings Ltd	<p>Comments submitted on behalf of Hurstwood Holding Ltd in support of the development of land at the Lune Industrial Estate for residential use.</p> <p>Confirm that the site is suitable and available for residential development.</p> <p>Note the need to develop a balanced portfolio of sites across a range of locations. State that the focus should be on the most sustainable locations starting with the city centre and investigating all sustainable brownfield options.</p> <p>Believe that a combination of development within existing urban areas alongside well planned greenfield/Green Belt extensions will be required.</p>
Gary Troughton	31.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Query the need for additional housing.</p> <p>Express concern regarding the large scale expansion of two settlements under option 4. Considers that the level of growth proposed would destroy the character of existing villages and the local community.</p> <p>Questions the ability of existing infrastructure and services to support the level of development proposed with concern expressed regarding education capacity, public transport, and the capacity of the sewage network.</p> <p>Further comments are provided in relation to the remaining options. Considers that if additional housing is needed this should be distributed over a large area building a small number in every village, encroaching on some Green Belt land and filling in the gaps between Scotforth and Glagate.</p>

				The level of discussion between adjacent local authorities is also questioned with specific comments made in relation to development planned in Wyre and Preston.
Steven Abbott	23.07.14	E-mail	Steve Abbott Associates on behalf of Booths	Support the principle of option 1. Note the need for sensitive approach to landscaping on land adjacent to the A6. Recognise that a strategic approach will be needed.
Bruce Alexander	24.07.14	E-mail	Caton with Littledale Parish Council	<p>Would wish to limit development in the village to brownfield sites with numbers limited to sustainable levels and existing village boundaries retained. Would wish to see employment opportunities considered alongside additional housing.</p> <p>Would prefer a mix of housing with affordable, family and smaller units for the elderly preferred.</p> <p>Highlight the need to consider the villages location within the AONB when designing proposals.</p> <p>More detailed comments are then provided in relation to sites suggested in the village within the SHLAA.</p>
Mason and Shena Minnitt	30.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Specific comments are provided for each of the options.</p> <p>Option 1: recognise the benefits of proximity to existing infrastructure and good accessibility.</p> <p>Option 2: note that green space is essential for wellbeing. Strongly oppose this option.</p> <p>Option 3: recognise some benefit in this proposal but not to the level proposed.</p> <p>Option 4: Viewed to be a poor option. Would affect the character and heritage of two villages.</p> <p>Option 5: Also viewed to be a poor option as it ignores public transport links and employment opportunities. The proposed extension of the Yorkshire Dales National Park is also discussed.</p>

				Wherever additional development takes place the comments note the need for high quality design, access to greenspace and improved public footpaths, cycleways, public transport and broadband connectivity.
Michael Hine	30.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	Object to additional development in Halton. Considers that additional development in Halton will result in the village becoming a suburb of Lancaster. Note concerns regarding the local road network and its ability to cope with additional traffic as well as concerns regarding education and sewage capacity.
Jackie Copley	30.07.14	E-mail	CPRE Lancashire	<p>State that brownfield land in urban areas should be prioritised first for development.</p> <p>Suggest a reduced annual housing requirement, noting the downgraded population estimates by the Office of National Statistics.</p> <p>Option 3 noted to be the favoured option with this offering opportunity to meet rural housing needs, support the viability of existing communities and potential to support rural jobs. Note that quality housing schemes and improved public transport would need to be secured.</p> <p>State that additional information is required in order to understand fully the impacts on ecology.</p> <p>Further comments are provided in relation to each of the options with strengths and weaknesses highlighted.</p>
Karen Hine	30.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	Concerned about potential development proposals in Halton noting the availability of properties for sale in Halton and new development at Halton Mills.
Dr. C. Finnerty	30.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Provides a detailed analysis of the housing requirement report noting that the report presents a range of figures for consideration. The use of the 600 figure is questioned. Information from the David Coultie study is discussed with a requirement of 7,000 new houses highlighted. This is noted to be half way between the lower figure of 3,550 and 12,700 in the Turleys report.</p> <p>Comments note the need to provide further information on where employment opportunities will be provided.</p>

				<p>Considers that an additional option should have been presented addressing a situation where the council does not propose to build the additional 5,000 new homes.</p>
Eric Ollerenshaw	30.07.14	E-mail	MP for Lancaster and Fleetwood	<p>Does not support the housing figures recommended by Turley Associates noting the recently published reduced ONS dataset and the impact that this has on the projections presented. Notes that whilst the Turley report methodology is not based wholly on this data it does use them as a baseline for its projection scenarios.</p> <p>Concerned that the council has chosen a target at the top end of the options presented by Turley Associates.</p> <p>Believes that it would be unhelpful to identify a preferred option at this stage and would instead request that the options be looked at again along with the revised housing figure projections. Would be concerned about adopting as part of the Local Plan any of the options presented.</p> <p>Would urge that none of the options outlined are endorsed by the council and that work should instead proceed on the basis of a lower target which may be deliverable by modest amendments to the existing draft Land Allocations.</p> <p>Whilst not identifying a preferred option more detailed comments are provided on the options.</p> <p>Option 1: described as urban sprawl and presenting the worst characteristics of unplanned development. Concern is expressed for the residents of Galgate who would be swallowed up by the development. Traffic congestion is also noted as an issue as is flood risk and the loss of the existing area of countryside.</p> <p>Option 2: concerned about development in the green belt as well as other environmental impacts associated with this option. Impacts on the setting of listed buildings, scheduled monuments and local wildlife sites are also noted as are potential traffic problems.</p> <p>Option 3: notes the potential for a cumulative loss of countryside and rural character under this option.</p>

				<p>Option 4: note that this option would substantially change the character and surrounding areas of the villages identified. Note that the option would require high levels of transport infrastructure to support development.</p> <p>Option 5: believe that this option would have the most dramatic impact of all the proposals presented.</p>
Andrew Hewitson	30.07.14	E-mail	Lancashire County Council	<p>Note the status of Lancaster as a major location for economic and housing growth and its identification as a priority area by the Lancashire Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>Confirm that South Lancaster has been identified as a location in the Lancashire Strategic Economic Plan as being one which is capable of delivering significant development.</p> <p>State that on this basis it is the County Council view that option 1 provides the best strategic support to economic growth and delivering long term growth beyond the Local Plan period. Recognise that in the short term there would be merit in distributing some of the housing allocations to both Morecambe and Carnforth.</p> <p>Recommend that the authority reconsider its position in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and note that option 1 provides a suitable location and scenario for developing a package of infrastructure investment of which CIL could form a valuable part. Note that a Transport Master Plan for Lancaster is due for consultation in the autumn.</p> <p>Confirm that due to the scale of proposed development any of the options presented would require a school site. The council would be expected to work on behalf of the county council to ensure this is delivered.</p> <p>Also note the need to ensure that policies are compatible with the Lancashire and Blackpool Flood Risk Management Strategy (April 2014).</p> <p>The need to plan for sustainable urban drainage is also noted.</p> <p>Information on surface water risk, groundwater risk and main river risk are also presented.</p>

				<p>In view of the comments provided the county consider that option 1 should be supported in principle but would request that limited growth, in the short term, is also targeted to Morecambe and Carnforth to allow the positive benefits of growth to be distributed more widely.</p>
Gina Dowding	30.07.14	E-mail	County Councillor	<p>Believes the figures presented in the Turley report to be unreliable noting the publication of new population projection data for the district.</p> <p>Comment on the number of under-employed and economically inactive people in the district and the need to take this into account rather than relying on building more houses to attract people from elsewhere.</p> <p>Do not believe that the figures should include an allowance for previous undersupply stating that this ignores the relatively large number of new homes built relative to population increase and that the previous target did not reflect any definition of need.</p> <p>Note the need for a fresh start within the new Local Plan.</p>
Stephen Jury	30.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Expresses a number of concerns regarding option 5 noting the high cost of infrastructure investment, environmental and landscape damage and biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>The location of the option in relation to adjacent authorities is also noted with concern expressed regarding the need to amend boundaries in the future.</p>
Dr. David Walmsley	29.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Highlights the need to consider what we want our area to become, noting the importance of achieving an integrated and vibrant city-scape with a sound and expanding business economy attracting both investment and tourism, and a sustainable region of towns, villages and countryside that is able to maintain services suitable for local residents whilst becoming more attractive to visitors.</p> <p>Notes the need for another road bridge crossing over the River Lune and the benefits that this would deliver.</p> <p>Opportunities to utilise existing car parking is also discussed with potential for multilevel and underground car parking possible in combination with increased housing via apartment based development.</p>

				<p>A number of recommendations are provided with specific comments for Lancaster, Morecambe and the NW of the Lune and Carnforth provided. Comments focus on opportunities for brownfield development and benefits from an additional crossing over the Lune.</p> <p>Recommend that a review of the Green Belt is avoided.</p> <p>In promoting development throughout the districts towns and villages the authority should look to avoid ribbon development and sprawl and avoid development aimed at people commuting to other centres. The need to focus on brownfield sites is also noted as is the need to maintain local services and facilities.</p> <p>The comments conclude against options 4 and 5 stating that we need to maintain communities. Option 3 is viewed to be the better option with most development focussed in towns.</p>
Nick Gillibrand	29.07.14	E-mail	Architect	<p>Option 1 : Comments on traffic congestion at Galgate. Notes that without a resolution any sort of development in South Lancaster is impracticable. Notes the opportunity to resolve this via potential planning gain from development in this location and recommends that this be explored. Supports extending the City to embrace the University.</p> <p>Option 2: Recommends that the purpose of the Green Belt between Lancaster and Morecambe be rethought.</p> <p>Option 3 and 4: Considers that both options miss the possibilities of increasing the critical mass of Lancaster and Morecambe and the benefits that this can provide. Note that these options would damage one of the districts great assets, the countryside.</p> <p>Option 5: Believe that the wrong location has been identified and questions the ability of the council to deliver this option. A number of concerns are highlighted including transport constraints and poor accessibility, the effect on Kirkby Lonsdale and neighbouring authorities, difficulty in managing infrastructure projects on the edge of the district and the difficulty in managing the construction to provide the quality envisaged.</p>

				<p>Presents an additional option: Loving over the shop. Recommends that opportunities to increase people living over shops should be explored.</p>
Jenna Crombie	29.07.14	E-mail	Barton Willmore on behalf of Story Homes	<p>Welcomes the council's reassessment of its overall housing requirement. Whilst the approach followed is broadly welcomed it is felt that the SHMA fails to make clear what it considers the full objectively assessed needs to be noting that a range of scenarios are presented. Concerned that the report fails to provide a clear recommendation with the range presented viewed to be too wide.</p> <p>Highlight a number of specific concerns regarding the SHMA:</p> <p>Affordable housing: notes the significant requirement for affordable housing in the district and the implications of this when determining the annual housing requirement for the district. Note how the higher end of the SHMA housing range would only just address the 578 dwelling per annum shortfall in affordable housing, let alone the need for market housing in the district.</p> <p>Backlog: Notes that the SHMA identifies a backlog of 981 dwellings. Consider that the need to factor in the backlog has been overlooked in the conclusions of the SHMA despite earlier parts of the SHMA recognising the need to do this.</p> <p>Job growth: Concerned that the employment based projections fail to reflect the economic aspirations of the district and specifically do not reflect the growth aspirations of the Lancashire Local Economic Partnership (LEP). Recommends that further information is needed to understand the actual jobs growth forecasts for the district.</p> <p>The councils SHLAA is also discussed. The following points are made:</p> <p>Discounting: concerned that no discounting has been applied to take account of any slippage that is likely to occur for delivery of both approved and non-approved sites. Recommends that a clear methodology is presented which provides a discounting of the supply figure. This would ensure that the council is not reliant on sites which might fail to deliver the number of dwellings expected.</p>

				<p>Optimistic density assumptions: concerned that the SHLAA over estimates density delivery on sites.</p> <p>The exclusion of all Green Belt sites: recommend that Green Belt sites be included in the SHLAA in order to fully understand the role that they make. Note the need to release land from the Green Belt in order to meet the minimum requirements set out in the councils evidence base.</p> <p>In view of the mismatch between supply and demand the comments note the need for a strategic whole-scale release of land in order to address the required level of housing over the plan period and address the backlog in the supply of affordable housing, specifically in rural areas.</p> <p>More detailed comments are provided in relation to the options presented. The comments express concern that there is no clear indication of the specific areas of land which would be selected for growth in each of the options presented.</p> <p>Option 1: note the deliverability issues associated with this option, specifically capacity issues along the A6. Also note that it is unlikely that the market could support such delivery in one location. Believe that this option in isolation will not deliver the required growth.</p> <p>Option 2: A Green Belt review is considered essential to meet the districts housing needs, and that the overwhelming need for housing growth warrants exceptional circumstance to release land from the Green Belt. Recommend that safeguarded land should be identified in order to ensure that there is flexibility for future years. Consider that there are a number of areas across the district which no longer perform Green Belt function and as such should be reviewed.</p> <p>Option 3: considered to be a sensible approach offering opportunity to address affordability issues in the districts towns and villages. Note that Story Homes are promoting development around the settlement of Carnforth.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Option 4: Question the sustainability of directing all development and safeguarded land to just two settlements.</p> <p>Option 5: do not believe the development of a new settlement in the broad area identified to be a feasible or sustainable option.</p> <p>Recommend combination of options. Consider the most appropriate and sustainable approach to be a combination of options 2 and 3 and to a lesser extent 4.</p>
David Wild	29.07.14	E-mail	Highways Agency	<p>Single large extension to the urban area viewed to potentially be the most sustainable in terms of reducing the need to travel and thereby the impacts on the road network.</p> <p>Would look to work with the City Council and County Council to understand the wider implications on the road network, particularly in relation to the two motorway junctions (J33 and J34).</p>
Rhian Davitt-Jones	29.07.14	E-mail	DTZ on behalf of the Royal Mail	<p>Note that all 5 options will have implications for the Royal Mail.</p> <p>If options 1 or 5 were pursued the Royal Mail would need to invest in a new delivery office. State that when considering infrastructure requirements the council will need to consider including land to accommodate a new delivery office.</p> <p>If options 2 or 3 were pursued the Royal Mail would likely need to invest in upgrading a number of existing facilities.</p> <p>If option 4 was pursued an additional facility to service the southern village expansion might be required.</p> <p>Note the need for the council to understand that proposals of 1,000 or more dwellings may trigger the need to provide for a new delivery office.</p>
Christine Holdsworth	29.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Comments provided in relation to land suggested for development in Nether Kellet (SHLAA site 554). Highlight that a small part of the land suggested is subject to a restrictive covenant restricting development on this land. The site is also noted to be located within Nether Kellet Conservation Area.</p>
Matthew Good	28.07.14	E-mail	House Builders Federation	<p>Generally supportive of the council re-assessing its housing requirement. Note that the housing requirement is at the lowest end of a possible acceptable range and therefore is</p>

				<p>not viewed to be sufficiently aspirational as required by the NPPF. Conclude that the figure should be increased with the upper end of the spectrum of scenarios considered. The HBF would however suggest that the scenarios themselves under-estimate need.</p> <p>The economic scenarios modelled within the Turley report are not viewed to be sufficient aspirational to meet the likely growth in jobs likely to be experienced within Lancaster.</p> <p>Note that the NPPG identifies a number of market signals which need to be taken into account when considering housing need. This includes affordability. The comments note how affordable housing needs are unlikely to be achieved.</p> <p>Note that the council has failed to deliver its existing housing requirement with an under-supply of 981 dwellings identified.</p> <p>Question the use of a 2.5% vacancy rate within the SHMA. Further justification on the use of this figure is requested.</p> <p>The headship rates used is also questioned.</p> <p>Recommend that in order to increase delivery the council provides a wide portfolio of sites appealing to different parts of the market.</p> <p>Support the potential review of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Express concern regarding the limited flexibility of sites already identified within the SHLAA and the implications of this on future delivery.</p>
James Mackie	24.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Highlights the opportunities that exist within the district to occupy empty spaces available in the city centre, primarily above shops.</p> <p>Request that the council consider more non-student accommodation within the city centre.</p>
Graham Bywater	25.07.14	E-mail	Bywater and Tweedale Architects	<p>Comments are provided for each of the options.</p>

				<p>Option 1: Viewed to be flawed noting the need for a major strategic review, assessment planning and investment and that given the time scale required would fail to satisfy the housing requirement.</p> <p>Support the principal of large urban extensions but only where these are spread across the district and not in a single location.</p> <p>Note that areas of Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth as well as land to the north presented by the construction of the northern relief road also offer significant opportunities, particularly in relation to the reclamation of brownfield land.</p> <p>Option 2: suggest that this be carried out as a matter of course addressing all land type uses not just housing. In conjunction with this review it is recommended that the authority also consider redundant/derelict brownfield sites.</p> <p>Option 3: Consider that this should be the primary approach in conjunction with option 2. Offers opportunity to strengthen local communities and facilities and if properly managed will have greater benefits for the whole district.</p> <p>Option 4: Viewed to be too restrictive in terms of overall benefits to the district.</p> <p>Option 5: Consider this option to be flawed and would not support this.</p> <p>Highlight the need to work with housing providers utilising their knowledge and experience.</p> <p>Recommend that the authority also look at proposals for the regeneration of the existing housing, particularly in the poorer areas of the district, with this potentially providing a speedy and cost effective way of meet housing need at the low cost/starter home end of the market.</p>
Diane Coward	26.07.14	E-mail	Scotforth Parish Council	<p>Specific comments are presented for each of the options.</p> <p>Option 1: traffic issues noted to be main factor for this option. Notes the superstore public inquiry in which traffic analysis concluded that south of Lancaster will become saturated</p>

				<p>when all the developments are completed. This option is not viewed to be viable. State that some form of traffic relief such as a western by-pass would have to be included.</p> <p>Option 2: Good connectivity to public transport and opportunities for improved infrastructure are noted to make this option attractive.</p> <p>Option 3: Note poor infrastructure and non-connectivity to public transport as major issues for this option.</p> <p>Option 4: the benefits provided by increased economies of scale from this option are viewed to be outweighed by the substantial investment needed to support the infrastructure required.</p> <p>Option 5: Limited infrastructure and poor connectivity are viewed to far outweigh the advantages presented for this option.</p> <p>Recommend a combination of options 1 and 2 as the optimum solution.</p>
Mary Searle-Chatterjee	28.07.14	E-mail	Member of the Public	<p>Surprised by the findings of the housing requirement study given the lack of jobs in the area and that many of the shops are boarded up.</p> <p>Would like to see more effort made in avoiding development of greenfield sites.</p> <p>Note the opportunities available in units above shops.</p> <p>Note the need for higher density three storey town houses in urban areas.</p>
Rhian Davitt-Jones	28.07.14	E-mail	DTZ on behalf of Mr. Metcalfe and Mrs Lloyd	<p>Response made to confirm the landowners intention to promote their land for residential development. More detailed comments are provided to justify the sites development.</p>
David Croxall	28.07.14	E-mail	Morecambe Town Council	<p>Unable to agree with the conclusions of the Turley Report without knowledge of the methodology employed in preparing the report.</p> <p>Supports option 5 identifying a number of advantages with this approach – allows for a cohesive approach to be taken, would allow for the required infrastructure to be planned in, would allow for a variety of houses to be constructed.</p>

Kathryn Molloy	28.07.14	E-mail	Lancashire Enterprise Partnership	<p>Confirm that Lancaster is identified as a priority area for the LEP within its 'arc of prosperity'. Highlight how independent economic forecasts project that Lancaster will see employment and GVA growth above the Lancashire average.</p> <p>Note that South Lancaster has been identified as a location capable of delivering significant development.</p> <p>Growth to the south of the city is noted to be a potentially viable option. Further development via option 1 could deliver the quantum of development needed to enable delivery of the significant infrastructure necessary to support development itself, the major housing sites already identified in the area and key university expansion. Option 1 is viewed to best align to the Lancashire SEP and as such should be supported in principle.</p> <p>Recommend that the position in relation to CIL be reviewed. Option 1 could provide a suitable location and scenario for developmeing a package of infrastructure investment of which CIL could be a valuable part.</p> <p>The transport measures and requirements will be investigated in more detail in the county councils Highway and Transport Master Plan for Lancaster.</p>
Nick Cofield	11.08.14	E-mail	EDF Energy	<p>Note the need to consult with the Office for Nuclear regulation (ONR) when dealing with development proposed in the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone.</p> <p>Note the need to safeguard land identified by the Government as potentially suitable for new nuclear development.</p>
David Morris	22.07.14	E-mail	MP for Morecambe and Lunesdale	<p>Raises the issue that a vast number of constituents in the rural areas object to Option 5.</p> <p>Express concern that the development would create a new town which would destroy the historic communities in the Lune Valley area.</p> <p>Questions the reasoning for the option due to its location. Concerned about the environmental and flooding aspects of the area.</p>

				<p>Questions if the council has approached the Government about the proposal and states that he has tabled a series of parliamentary questions specifically relating to; infrastructure, school places and education services. (Links to the questions have been given)</p> <p>Also objects to Option 3 which would have negative impacts on the Lune Valley villages.</p> <p>Support development in Scotforth and Lancaster due to its proximity to the university and its existing access to education, healthcare and transport.</p>
Shayne A Niemen	29.07.14	Letter	Niemen Architects	<p>Notes the need for new housing in Morecambe and Torrisholme. Believes that this could be best delivered through a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide some justification for this.</p>
Carol Ann Howard	19.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Express concern that the housing figure recommended by Turley Associates, of 20,000 houses, seems too high.</p> <p>States that in the long term Options 3, 5 and 5 may not be required.</p> <p>Raise specific concerns regarding Option 5. Concerns of expanding the population in the area of Cowan Bridge. Estimates 11,500 people may re locate to the area, which is not in proportion to the population figures of 1700 residents in Kirkby Lonsdale and 2000 in Ingleton.</p> <p>Considers the detrimental impact Option 5 would have on tourism and small business in the Yorkshire Dales National Park, in particular farming businesses which have been supported by Government Grants. States the area needs to be protected due to it being a conservation area, which contains listed buildings.</p> <p>Concern of the economic cost of the development due to the need of infrastructure and transport links in the area. Specific mention of the negative impacts on the A65 and A683. Also mentions that the area has no mainline railway. Mention of the dangerous impact of traffic increase in the villages, fears for pedestrians, cyclists and road users.</p> <p>Concerns also raised regarding Options 3 and 4, noting that the impacts on the landscape would be similar to those of Option 5 but on a smaller scale.</p>

				<p>Understands the necessity of housing in the area. Recommends Option 1 as the most suitable development for the area, noting the positive impacts on the University and potential to solve the congestion problems at Galgate.</p>
Joy V. Turvey	19.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Provides comments relating to each of the options:</p> <p>Option 1- Concern expressed regarding traffic in the area. Urban expansion in Lancaster should only be considered on small available sites.</p> <p>Option 2- Against large developments and developments which would be inappropriate in the rural areas such as, town houses or flats. However small areas can be considered with local approval.</p> <p>Option 3 and Option 4- Highlights the need to protect the character of villages and towns and states that the size of development in the area should be in proportion to the existing settlement.</p> <p>Comments on existing development in Caton stating that it is not suitable for the area. Also expresses concern regarding housing estates in rural areas and in particular Farleton where an increase of 40 houses will mean housing would increase by 100%.</p> <p>Notes concern regarding demands on traffic, schools, and health services in areas. States how rural areas can provide areas for new housing but it must be done sensitively.</p> <p>Option 5- Notes that this could be considered if an appropriate site can be identified and suitable services could be put in place.</p>
J Murrells	19.07.14	Letter	Member of the public.	<p>Specific concerns regarding Option 5 and in particular its impact on the landscape. Notes the option would create a population in the area that is not in proportion to surrounding areas such as, Kirkby Lonsdale.</p> <p>Recommends that development is more suited in Lancaster due to its existing infrastructure, services and job opportunities. Notes that Option 1 is the preferred option</p>

				due to its positive impact on the area and proximity to the University. Suggests brownfield sites should be used.
Elizabeth Tinker	20.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Express concern for the area of Hornby. Notes that new houses have already been erected at two ends in Hornby and states that no more housing should be required because of this.</p> <p>Concerned that enlarging the villages in the area will mean they become part of an urban sprawl.</p> <p>Notes the possibility of in-filling on the immediate outskirts of Lancaster. Including the areas between Sainsbury's and the Motorway junction and between Lancaster and Carton road.</p>
Lesley Murrells	20.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Express concern regarding the development of a new settlement near to Ireby and Cowan Bridge.</p> <p>Proposes that development of housing would be more appropriate near to Lancaster where the infrastructure is already in place and brownfield sites are available.</p> <p>Concerned that the green fields and rural setting of the area would be changed forever if building takes place in this area.</p>
David Thomas	28.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Express concern regarding options 3 and 5</p> <p>Option 5- notes concerns regarding road capacity and road safety in the area in particular, the A65, A683, B6254. Employment concerns are also raised.</p> <p>Notes that if traffic on the roads in the area is increased getting raw materials and products in and out of the Lune Valley would be difficult with this impacting on business viability.</p> <p>Queries of the necessity of 12,000 houses over the next 20 years. Suggests it would be beneficial to adopt a plan which allows for gradual development in the 20 years as option 5 does not lend itself to piecemeal development.</p> <p>Option 3- Concerned that main employment opportunities are in the Lancaster/Heysham area. Therefore, development further up the valley road would not be beneficial and would cause congestion on the roads.</p>

				Notes that reopening Midland railway line to Wennington may help the issue of commuter traffic.
Phil Rogerson	July 2014	Letter	Member of the public	Notes the need for new housing in both Morecambe and Torrisholme. and that the Green Belt should be reviewed in these areas. Suggests that the green belt should be reconsidered due to the new Heysham Bypass. Believes that this could be delivered through a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide some justification for this.
Graham and Sheila Parkinson	28.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	Object to Option 5. Reference the lack of employment, facilities, transport and lack of demand for housing in the area.
A Marcham	28.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	Object to development in Cowan Bridge. Express concerns that the roads surrounding the area are inadequate to support the suggested development. In particular makes reference to the A65 East and West. Notes that the A65 between Cowan Bridge and Junction 36 on the M6 is already congested. The A65 East is also noted to be busy during Appleby Horse Fair. No rail link in the area. Also suggests the lack of jobs in the area would cause problems. Suggests that the coastal plain between the M6 and the Fylde coast be considered. Noting transport links and availability of jobs in the surrounding districts. Also eludes to a bridge being built connecting Morecambe to Barrow.
Resident of Kirkby Lonsdale	July 2014	Letter	Member of the public	Express concern regarding the impacts of Option 5 on Kirkby Lonsdale, Burton in Lonsdale, Ingleton and all the other small villages in the area. Notes the existence of homes for sale in the area stating that the main problem for housing is affordability with many young people unable to access the housing market. States that development should be on the edge of Lancaster, Morecambe, Carnforth and Preston. Limited service and employment opportunities in the rural areas are noted.

P J Bates	30.07.14	Letter	Bannister Bates	Note the need for new housing in Morecambe and Torrisholme. Believe that this could best be delivered through a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide justification for this.
C J Harrison	29.07.14	Letter	C J Harrison Architects	Believes that development to the south of the district would be unsustainable and would cause irreparable damage to existing villages and settlements and the surrounding countryside. Considers that development would be better located in Morecambe and Torrisholme where there is already a great need for new housing. Recommends that this could be delivered via a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide justification for this.
P. Haslam	29.07.14	Letter	Member of the Public	Note the need for new housing in Morecambe and Torrisholme. Believe that this could best be delivered through a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide justification for this.
J F Collins	28.07.14	Letter	Member of the Public	Note the need for new housing in Morecambe and Torrisholme. Believe that this could best be delivered through a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide justification for this.
J Oliver	29.07.14	Letter	Oliver Land Consultancy	Note the need for new housing in Morecambe and Torrisholme. Believe that this could best be delivered through a review of the Green Belt. The new Heysham by-pass is believed to provide justification for this.
A Pepper	29.07.14	Letter	Persimmon	Provides further comments on each of the proposed options. Option 1: Notes to be the most sustainable option with opportunity to improve transport connections. Questions the ability of this area to absorb all 5,000 houses, believes that multiple avenues of development will be needed. Option 2: Support a review of the Green Belt. Option 3: Notes that this would allow some appropriate level of development in sustainable settlements – Galgate, Dolphinholme, Caton, Carnforth and Halton are specifically mentioned.

				<p>Option 4: Notes that further development in these settlements is unlikely to be of a scale that would meet the requirement. States that development in larger settlements should be seen as a priority with village expansion seen as an alternative.</p> <p>Option 5: Do not believe that this should be the preferred option noting viability issue as well as physical constraints.</p> <p>Recommend a review of the Green Belt boundary and expansion to the south of Lancaster, alongside smaller scale development in smaller settlements.</p>
Wray Parish Council	30.07.14	Letter	Wray Parish Council	<p>Express concern that the housing figure recommended by Turley Associates have not been calculated correctly, therefore, making the figure inaccurate. Do not believe the housing figures to be in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance. Concerned that the report was conducted at a time of recession. Do not believe the figures support the Duty of Co-operation agreement with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Questions if councillors support the figure and the level of development that the report suggests is needed.</p> <p>Comments on each of the options are provided.</p> <p>Option 1 is supported noting access to infrastructure and service provision, opportunity to maximise economic potential, integration of housing and employment. Also positive impacts on travel, connectivity motorway/ new junction, maximise local sustainable transport, increase of local authority housing, eco town, utilises greenfield land which is not specifically agricultural or in a designated landscape area. Opportunity to build in wildlife green spaces.</p> <p>Recommends the option would need to be taken forward on a phased basis in order to avoid a reliance on non-strategic, opportunistic SHLAA sites to fill the gap.</p> <p>Option 2 is supported. Recommends the green belt be reconsidered as legislation has changed since the establishment of the green belt in 1991. The existence of the new link road supports development in the area. Noted to locate homes where demand is</p>

				<p>generated. The development of housing in the area surrounding the link road would support economic growth in the area. Benefits to health e.g. capitalise on Lancaster's Cycling status.</p> <p>Recommends that this option be pursued together with option 1.</p> <p>Option 3 is not supported. Disadvantages considered include; the option is non-strategic, undermines urban concentration and sustainable development, damages communities, socially divisive, creates unsustainable travel patterns, adverse impacts on schools and education, infrastructure costs, sewage capacity, landscape impacts, AONB status. Believes that higher land values will reduce quality of development and would encourage undesirable development patterns on green field sites. State that the option is not supported by any Development Management DPD policy for phasing or sequential development and as such would result in cherry picking of sites.</p> <p>States the option would be in breach of national planning policy on numerous counts. The option does not take into account the individual villages and does not support the DPD Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Option 4 is not supported. Disadvantages include; loss of green field and agricultural land, loss of rural community, impact on landscape quality, high infrastructure costs and a lack of access to services.</p> <p>Option 5 is not supported. Disadvantages include loss of greenfield land, swamping of an existing rural community, insufficient consideration of landscape impacts (particularly the expansion of the Yorkshire Dales National Park), high infrastructure costs, ability to provide new services given proximity to existing settlements, lack of co-operation with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>Recommends simultaneous pursuit of Options 1 and 2.</p>
John Marshall	30.07.14	Letter	Wray Parish Council	<p>Additional comments provided by Wray Parish Council.</p> <p>Do not believe that the council has delivered a number of the national planning policy requirements.</p>

				<p>Believe that the housing requirements study has generated uncertain, aspirational, long term projected numbers that have resulted in an opportunistic and land owner led SHLAA.</p> <p>The separation of housing and economic research is also viewed to be unhelpful.</p> <p>The SHLAA is viewed to be socially divisive and environmentally destructive with limited regard to landscape quality.</p> <p>Concerned that the Forest of Bowland AONB is being treated differently to the Silverdale and Arnside AONB.</p> <p>Question the level of information available within the SHLAA and the methodology followed. Specific concerns are raised regarding the level of consultation undertaken.</p>
Susan Lynch	22.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Questions the recommended housing figure of 12,000 suggested by Turley Associates. Concerned that the figure was compiled in the recession. Notes that Lancaster could not sustain this number of housing and specific concern is expressed that the district could not supply enough job opportunities for the residents of the 12000 houses.</p> <p>Questions why the 7000 allocated sites are not sufficient for the expansion of housing in the area.</p> <p>Questions who the housing is being provided for.</p> <p>Opposed to Option 5- Impacts on food production, service and infrastructure in the surrounding area, hospital provision, school capacity, impacts on Kirkby Lonsdale, utility provision, employment provision and the lack of transport links in the area.</p> <p>Does not support developments on the Green Belt. Also questions the impacts of infrastructure and employment if Option 3 was considered.</p> <p>Recommends that allocation of houses in villages should be limited to 20 properties.</p> <p>Supports Option 1 as the most feasible option noting its access to infrastructure of gas, electricity, sewers, road links and public transport.</p>
Councillor Mace	July 2014	Letter	Councillor	<p>Attach a copy of the Nether Kellet 2012 village survey. The survey demonstrates support for small scale development in the village but opposes large scale development.</p>

Dr. Z. C Tootzecc	12.07.14	Letter	Member of the public	<p>States that no greenfield land should be developed until every bit of brownfield land has been developed and derelict buildings reused. Notes the need for an empty homes officer.</p> <p>Expresses concern regarding development at Caton, specifically land behind the Station Hotel.</p>
John Entwistle	July 2014	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Concerned about the level of development proposed in Dolphinhme – 10-20 new houses viewed to be appropriate.</p> <p>Believes that the housing requirement study has over calculated housing need.</p> <p>Sites already benefiting from planning permission should be developed first.</p>
JR and KC Klotz	July 2014	Letter	Member of the public	<p>Object to options 3 and 4.</p> <p>Level of development proposed is viewed to be inappropriate for rural areas. The ability of existing infrastructure to support the level of development proposed is questioned as is the ability to provide additional infrastructure.</p>
The Glory Hole Ltd (GHL)	July 2014	Letter	Organisation	<p>Comments made in relation to the former Pontins holiday camp at Middleton. Note the possibility of this being considered as an alternative strategic option.</p>
D Brookes	15.08.14	E-mail	Slyne with Hest Parish Council	<p>Note the need to ensure that villages retain their individual identity and character, particularly the villages on the fringes of urban areas. The land around the A6 to the north of Lancaster are noted to be in particular danger of becoming an uninterrupted residential area between Skerton and Carnforth.</p> <p>Believe that a review of the Green Belt is necessary and that if undertaken this should be used as an opportunity to endorse the retention of open green spaces and increase the influence of the Green Belt over the areas it protects and strengthen its borders between the rural settlements and urban areas. This is noted to be particularly relevant for Slyne with Hest which will experience increased pressure for development along the M6/Heysham by-pass corridor.</p>

				State that the Parish Council would accept a small level of development in each of the villages rather than significant expansion of a few rural settlements. Recommend that the level of expansion should be limited to 5% of the current number of houses.
Bob Bailey	13.08.14	E-mail	Heaton with Oxcliffe Parish Council	Welcome the opportunity to comment on the document. Recognise that all options have merit but identify option 3 as the preferred response.
Tim Sarney	18.08.14	E-mail	Halton with Aughton Parish Council	<p>Believe that the only realistic option for the district is option 1 noting that all other options would result in overloading of existing infrastructure and long disruptions through large parts of the district where improvements are attempted.</p> <p>Question the findings of the Turley Report and request that the study is subject to independent review.</p> <p>Note particular concerns with options 2 and 5, noting impacts on tourism, rural communities and rural life.</p> <p>Specific comments are then provided in relation to sites identified in the SHLAA – sites SHLAA_163 and SHLAA_167. Concerned that no additional consultation has taken place in relation to these sites.</p> <p>Request that these sites are removed from the SHLAA and that any new development in Halton is restricted to the west of the M6. It is also requested that a new Green Belt is provided to maintain Halton's separation from Lancaster.</p>
Michael Watson	08.08.14	Letter	Nether Kellet Parish Council	Query the basis on which the housing figures have been calculated. State that if a need for additional housing does exist this should be directed to South Lancaster, Heysham or Morecambe. Note that additional growth in the villages would result in more traffic.
Jane Wareing	19.08.14	E-mail	Member of the public	<p>Express concern regarding option 1 and the impact that this would have on Galgate. Notes that this option would reduce the gap between Lancaster and Galgate and that like other options it would also potentially negatively impact on the character and heritage of the village. Impacts on biodiversity are also noted as is the lack of gas mains and sewers running along the A6 between Galgate and Scotforth.</p> <p>Suggests land around Grab Lane as the most appropriate location for an urban extension and highlights the possibility of a new motorway junction here, near Wyresdale Road.</p>

				Supports the development of a new motorway junction to the north of Galgate.
Peter Williamson	26.08.14	E-mail	Councillor	<p>Expresses concern regarding the level of housing proposed. Recommends a lower housing figure be adopted and that none of the options are pursued.</p> <p>Specific comments are provided for each of the options.</p> <p>Option 1: states that this option is essentially urban sprawl and raises concerns over the development of greenfield land, infrastructure costs and loss of green corridors on the entrance into Lancaster.</p> <p>Option 2: notes that this option impinges onto green belt and also raises environmental concerns and infrastructure constraints.</p> <p>Option 3: notes impacts on green belt, conservation impacts and potential urban sprawl.</p> <p>Option 4: notes that the impact on the villages identified would be significant, substantially altering their character and the character of the surrounding area. Infrastructure impacts are also noted.</p> <p>Option 5: considers this option to be the least satisfactory of all the options presented noting environmental impacts, infrastructure costs, poor public transport provision and limited employment opportunities.</p>
Catherine Newton	29.08.14	E-mail	BellIngram Design (on behalf of Essar Oil (UK) Ltd	Note the need to consider the presence of their clients pipeline when considering proposal for growth in the district.