

SLDC Local Development Framework – Land Allocations

Public Meeting 23rd February 2011

This document is a record of the meeting held at the Athenaeum, and attended by over 100 members of the public.

Numbers of New Houses

There are proposals for three housing sites in Heversham - accomodating 99 dwellings using the SLDC formula. In addition, infill and rounding off would be allowed as we are a “smaller village or hamlet”.

It was agreed unanimously that a figure of 99 houses was felt to be too large for a village of our size and limited facilities. It would totally change the nature of the village.

The majority felt comfortable with the provision of up to 20 additional dwellings by infill and rounding off. A few were in favour of an increase over and above a total of 20.

Other points raised were:-

- (i) What determined the figure of 99? It seems to be based on options emerging rather than need. Other villages with more amenities seem to have lower figures – eg Beetham.
- (ii) What is the definition of “infill” and “rounding off”? None of the emerging sites in Heversham are put forward as 100% affordable housing – see Core Strategy Policy CS6.4.
- (iii) Where is the evidence that so many houses are needed? Where will the people come from, and where are they going to work?
- (iv) What is sustainable about building many homes in the countryside? How will people be able to travel other than by car?
- (v) Heversham has narrow roads. Will the infrastructure be able to cope?
- (vi) Can we ensure that affordable houses are for local people? Could all affordable housing come under section 106 legislation?
- (vii) Can the number of second homes be reduced?
- (viii) The number of children of primary school age is dropping. We need some homes for young families.

Comments on Specific Sites.

- 1. Employment site E15. There was little opposition to the employment site being expanded. Those living nearby would like it to be in its original position along the A6 so that the green space behind their dwellings is maintained.**

2. Housing Sites.

R14 (Above Bowling Green). The note of the Public Meeting in February 2009 recorded that “The majority would support this site for building provided that it is done in a sensitive manner. There is believed to be a sewer pipe through the site and an existing TPO.” **Development of this site was not supported at this meeting.**

R445 (Dallam School Car Park). **There was no support for this site being used as an employment site. It was felt to be completely inappropriate for the position of the site.**

The majority supported housing use provided that the school provides adequate car parking in the main school campus. The definition of R445 includes only the hard standing, but some of the grassed area may also be usable for housing with the exception of the ‘South’ triangle which was planted years ago in order to provide a green amenity space for the entrance to the village.

A minority expressed a preference for retaining the car park. There was a concern about loss of social amenity (bottom pitch) if the car park moves across the road.

R41 (Between A6 and Conservation Area). The following points were made:-

- (i) The Fact File suggests that access would have to be from the north end (Moss Lane) but the only the south end of the site is suitable for development (views of church). Does this make the site unviable?
- (ii) It would be difficult to construct a safe access so close to the A6, and onto a bend in the A6? No pavement on Moss Lane.
- (iii) Heversham is currently a village set back from the main road – as stated in Fact File.
- (iv) How could a development fit in with the Conservation Area.
- (v) A6 noise impact on any new houses.
- (vi) It is believed that a previous planning application for the Bowling Green was refused on the grounds of access.
- (vii) The site has drainage problems.

RN118M (Behind Dugg Hill/Parkhouse Drive). The following points were made:-

- (i) It was noted that site R168E may now be available.
- (ii) The site has drainage problems.
- (iii) The roads in Dugg Hill/Parkhouse Drive are inadequate for extra traffic.
- (iv) A planning application in 1990 for housing on this site was rejected by SLDC, and an inspector who heard the appeal.
- (v) Need to preserve scale and character of the village.
- (vi) Is the land unstable?
- (vii) Is Radon a problem? It may be easy to solve any problems.

R48M (Between Dugg Hill and A6). The following points were made:-

- (i) The Fact File suggests that access would be from the existing hammerhead in Dugg Hill. All traffic would need to travel whole length of Dugg Hill. Are the roads adequate to cope with extra traffic?
- (ii) Is flooding information in Fact File correct? South East corner below road level.
- (iii) Sewerage would need pumping.
- (iv) Heversham is currently a village set back from the main road – as stated in Fact File.
- (v) Public Footpath crosses site.
- (vi) Houses would obscure view of “Tidal Reaches” (included in the ‘Pevsner’ guide).

Conclusions

There was no consensus of opinion as to which of the three emerging option sites was viewed by the audience as preferable.

No alternative sites were suggested, although a suggestion was made that the small strip to the north of Parkhouse Drive which forms part of RN118M could be made wider, if R168 is available, and some houses put there.