



SUMMARY REPORT
STAGE TWO CONSULTATION and
ANALYSIS
September 2016 to December 2017



SUMMARY REPORT OF STAGE TWO CONSULTATION FINDINGS September 2016 to December 2017

The aim of the Stage Two Consultation was

A) To continue the work done to identify the issues and aspirations of the local community which informed the development of the Vision and Objectives for Slyne with Hest's Parish Neighbourhood Plan Showing with the Vision and Objectives this was achieved by:

1. Reviewing all evidence from the Stage One Consultation
2. Producing a statement of the Vision and Objectives
3. Organising the printing of an A5 card with the Vision and Objectives
4. Hand delivering the card to every household in Slyne with Hest Civil Parish



Historic Village
SLYNE-WITH-HEST
neighbourhood plan

October 2016

Dear resident,

The Neighbourhood Plan group have listened to over 200 local people and prepared the following vision and objectives to guide land use in our Parish over the next 20-30 years. Items that fall outside of a neighbourhood plan's scope have been passed to the Parish Council for consideration and action. We will now begin work on expanding the vision and objectives to policies and a full Neighbourhood Plan. All residents will have the chance to vote on the final document in 2017.

VISION

The Historic village of Slyne-with-Hest is located on the shore of Morecambe Bay and enjoys spectacular panoramic views of the Lake District hills. The village bounded on three sides by fields, is a vibrant community, a place where people feel involved, safe and have traditionally put down roots. It is a great place to bring up a family, live, work and grow old.

The Parish Council will support measured, proportionate, timely and sustainable development to meet the requirements of existing and future residents. Our plan will protect the environment, its green spaces and wild life habitats for generations to come.

OBJECTIVES

- 1) To ensure any new development is sensitive to the character of the Parish, is of high quality, truly affordable, needs led and provides sufficient parking.
- 2) To ensure the scale of any development is proportional to the size of the existing village and does not compromise its geographic independence.
- 3) To ensure any business development is carefully sited and sensitively designed. New enterprises will reflect the character and meet the needs of the village.
- 4) To preserve, enhance and improve the natural environment and maintain access for all.
- 5) To preserve and protect our local heritage and conservation areas, including historic buildings and their settings, monuments, canal and shoreline with its unrivalled views.
- 6) To maintain and improve the communal and recreational facilities in the village ensuring they are appropriate to the needs and requirements of all who reside in or visit the Parish, and make the village a safer place to walk and cycle.

For more information visit:
www.slyne-with-hest.org.uk

Contact us by email at:
neighbourhood-plan@slyne-with-hest.org.uk

B) To continue to consult the widest number of individuals/groups of the Parish thus representing the diverse nature of the population. This was achieved by:-

- Carrying out a housing consultation activity at
 1. The Primary School May Fair in May 2017
 2. The Community coffee morning hosted by the Horticultural Society in July 2017



Housing consultation 'wall' exercise at the May Fair 2017.



- Organising a Village Information Day on 7th October 2017 where

1. Maps (provided by Lancaster City Council's planning department) were displayed of all identified possible development sites within the Parish (excluding the strategic development site South of The Bay Gateway)
2. Pens and post-it notes were available to enable all attendees to express their views on the pros and cons of each site
3. Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group were on hand to discuss the sites and listen to attendees

C) To continue to raise awareness within the community of the consultation process at a local level. This was achieved by:-

- Word of mouth by Steering Group Members
- Advertising Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meetings in the Community News section of The Lancaster Guardian and on noticeboards around Slyne with Hest inviting all who live or work within the parish to attend
- Articles written by members of the Steering group for the Slyne with Hest quarterly newsletter with a print run of 350
- Encouraging residents to contact the Steering group via a dedicated email address swhneighbourhoodplan@gmail.com and ensuring all emails were acknowledged and answered
- Posting feedback from the Information Day on the Neighbourhood Plan page of the Slyne with Hest webpage



The following is a collated list of all comments received as part of our information gathering process.

Feedback at Events- this feedback was produced by members of the community as written comments.

Email- comments received via email from people who wished to comment but were unable to attend the event.

Anecdotal Comments are comments made verbally to steering group members at various consultation events

The comments have been extrapolated from emails to fit where possible into the same framework .

October Information Day

Pros	Cons	Objections
<p>Plot 1 Sea View Drive. Land available Green Belt</p>		
<p>Good Site for small bungalows</p> <p>Agree should be bungalows</p> <p>Bungalows only.</p> <p>Suitable for bungalows only so views are not lost for residents.</p> <p>Must be bungalows</p> <p>Bungalows only – if we have to have housing</p> <p>Bungalows only</p> <p>Bungalows only</p> <p>Suitable for small development of bungalows, access needs careful consideration and also views of the canal.</p>	<p>Mostly good ground but small flooded area needs draining</p> <p>Access point needs considering</p> <p>Field gets very boggy</p> <p>Buildings could affect other properties, where will the water go?</p> <p>Close to an area of Scientific Interest.</p> <p>This land is wet and boggy with bad access and will spoil the lives of many people.</p> <p>This would be out of the way but it floods and what about views from existing bungalows/housing</p> <p>Rather boggy will require more networks</p> <p>Very boggy ground with inadequate access</p>	<p>Should be Kept as green Belt</p> <p>Should be kept as green belt, ground floods, facilities will not carry more houses</p> <p>We are against development on this site, there are open views beyond the canal, also part of the green belt</p>
<p>Anecdotal Evidence</p> <p>Land has a 999 year covenant for no building</p> <p>Current sewage /waste water system is already overloaded- this information was given by builder with experience of drainage work in the area</p>		

<p>Sewage is already an issue</p> <p>* Conflicting information about ownership not Fish Estates but Richard Hogarth.</p>		
Pro	Con	Objection
Plot 2 awaiting feedback from land owner not green belt		
<p>Good site for affordable houses close to village centre, needs some drainage.</p> <p>Ideal spot for affordable homes or homes for the over 55's</p> <p>Central Village Site, could be suitable for houses</p> <p>Good site for small houses, maybe starter homes or for those wishing to down size</p>	<p>It's nice to have a green field in the middle of the village, often has horses on.</p> <p>Drainage has been a problem for houses south of this site. Not suitable for building.</p> <p>Low lying and boggy ground therefore not suitable for building</p>	
Anecdotal Evidence		
Pro	Con	Objection
Plot 3. Land between A6 and Hest Bank Lane. Land was identified in SHLAA 2015 as being availed at their last call for sites. Not sure if still available. Green belt		
Pro	<p>Cons</p> <p>Prone to severe flooding which would be aggravated by more building.</p> <p>This land is prone to flooding, why make it</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>No go for building</p> <p>. I am strongly opposed to any development here</p>

	<p>worse and cause misery to householders.</p> <p>This field flooded significantly at Christmas 2015 with water from the Bottomdale Valley. This was after the drainage works were completed in Hest Bank Lane.</p> <p>Flooding Risk will be increased.</p> <p>Totally unsuitable for anything other than a water Park!</p> <p>Flooding, School already full to bursting.</p> <p>Despite County Councils efforts still subject to flooding.</p> <p>What about flooding</p> <p>Already proven flood risk December 2015</p> <p>Flooding must be sorted out before considered suitable for building.</p> <p>Access on to A6, speed of traffic ignoring speed limit</p> <p>Flood risk</p> <p>Surface water can't drain away from the field after prolonged rain, totally unsuitable for development</p> <p>This land floods and sewage has to be pumped up hill to Bolton le sands, not suitable for building</p>	
Anecdotal Evidence		

Pro	Con	Objection
<p>Plot 4. Land West of Hest Bank Lane. Land was identified in SHLAA 2015 as being availed at their last call for sites. Not sure if still available. Green belt</p>		
<p>Pro</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>Developers should find the drains for the area</p> <p>This is a flood area</p> <p>Subject to flooding even with the work already done</p> <p>A stream runs across this area. Enough people and children in the village</p> <p>This is on a flood plain, Will increase more flooding for the areas houses</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>Flood risk even after the drainage works where completed on Hest Bank Lane</p> <p>A stream runs across this field</p> <p>Whole area overwhelmed by the rainfall Dec 15. The drainage works completed prior to this did little to alleviate the issue</p> <p>This land floods despite new surface water drains, not suitable for building</p>	<p>Objections</p>
<p>Anecdotal Evidence</p>		

Pro	Con	Objection
<p>Plot 5. Land east of Kirklands Previous planning permission withdrawn. Objections from Highway Dept.</p> <p>Not Green Belt</p>		
Pro	Cons	Objections
	<p>Drainage/flooding Water run-off will need to drain into existing culverts and sewers, which already have difficulty in draining the area.</p> <p>The topography ensures that all run off would only exacerbate this.</p> <p>Access- No safe access for traffic</p> <p>Worry for children, The wreck and huge amount of traffic onto a small lane, potential death trap.</p> <p>More children- school already full</p> <p>Only one shop- pressure on this business bought as a going concern.</p> <p>Other Brown sites are available.</p> <p>Listen to local people.</p> <p>Difficult access</p> <p>Access issues</p> <p>I live on Hatlex Lane (adjacent to this site) in Dec 2015 I lost the whole of my downstairs due to flooding. July 2017. Lost it all again due to failure of</p>	<p>No Building on this site</p> <p>Please No! Possible impact on flooding.</p> <p>No Buildings flooding</p>

	<p>sewage and drains my house was full of sewage and all this water has to come our way</p> <p>No safe Access, would come out onto bus stop, lots of children coming and going, opposite (hall)</p> <p>Low lying area, prone to flooding</p> <p>Again flooding</p> <p>Area flood. Parking</p> <p>Too narrow entrancehas a history of flooding</p> <p>In our opinion not suitable for development</p>	
Anecdotal Evidence		
Pro	Con	Objection
<p>Plot 6. Land behind Manor Farm. Land was identified in SHLAA 2015 as being availed at their last call for sites. Not sure if still available. Green belt</p>		
<p>Pro</p> <p>This site would be more palatable than GB4 as a whole and offers a reasonably sized plot for the development of a mix of houses.</p> <p>This area has possibilities I would not object to sensitively</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>Superb views across the bay would ensure only 'executive' style housing with price tags to match.</p> <p>No chance of affordable housing for the vast majority. Run off of rainwater etc. would</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>Keep as green belt land should not be developed</p> <p>Object! Part of GB4 and significant area of green belt land to keep between Slyne with Bolton le sands (repeat)</p> <p>Keep a green space between Slyne and</p>

<p>designed buildings on this site.</p> <p>An infill area extending to greenbelt</p> <p>Acceptable for sympathetic designed properties</p>	<p>overwhelm existing drains lower in the village.</p>	<p>Bolton le sands (repeated)</p>
<p>Belongs to Mr Craddock? Covenant on Land for no building on site. Was not park of GB4</p>		
<p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection</p>
<p>Plot 7. Land North of Manor Lane. Part of former GB4. Green belt. Land available</p>		
	<p>Cattle buried on this site from foot and mouth</p> <p>Any development needs to take into account the need to increase the drainage. New drainage should not go into existing sewers</p> <p>Also known as a foot and mouth grave yard</p> <p>Traffic access onto Manor Lane</p> <p>Listen to local people</p> <p>Foot and mouth carcasses buried here</p> <p>We would lose the village feel people value.</p> <p>Drainage.</p> <p>Spoil the look of the village. Too close to joining the villages</p> <p>Valuable green belt.</p>	<p>Too big a site</p> <p>No building will spoil separation and encourage further infilling</p> <p>No Building on this site x 3</p> <p>Green belt, no houses please, flooding</p> <p>Don't put houses here!</p> <p>No building on this site</p> <p>We don't want ribbon development.</p> <p>Too big massive impact on the area traffic. Must be green belt</p> <p>This plot should be retained as green belt land in over view. If built</p>

	<p>Lack of school places doctors</p> <p>Buried foot and mouth cows on this site do not disturb</p> <p>Foot and Mouth.</p>	<p>on it will spread to Bolton le sands. Leave a gap</p> <p>Green belt No! Bad access on to busy A6 will cause a traffic jam.</p> <p>Object! Part of GB4 and very important greenbelt section between Slyne and Bolton le sands (repeat)</p> <p>Green belt access bad GB4 No Buildings</p> <p>Totally unsuitable. Need to keep clear space between the villages. Village ????? is precious</p> <p>Please no This plot is green belt. There are other brownfield sites available.</p> <p>A petition was already signed against this with over 1100 signatures.</p> <p>Keep as green belt should not be developed (repeated)</p> <p>This is totally unsuitable for every reason</p> <p>No! Green belt. Foot and mouth cattle buried here, School full to bursting. Enough people and children in this village.</p> <p>Protect the green belt. We don't want Hest Bank and Bolton le</p>
--	---	---

		<p>sands to be connected by development</p> <p>Protect the green belt. We don't want Hest Bank and Bolton le sands to be connected by development.</p> <p>Keep GB4 land as green belt between Slyne with Hest and Bolton le sands.</p> <p>Please NO! This will kill the character of the village and ruin its beauty. It is not ecological</p> <p>There are other brown field site available</p> <p>We agree with LCC that this area should be protected from development. It is green belt, separates Slyne with Hest and Bolton le sands and precious views over to Morecambe Bay and beyond</p> <p>I would love this land to remain green belt. The pressure for main drains and sewage would literally flood the village before long, ask me!!</p> <p>Should not be built on- would merge Slyne with Bolton le sands.</p> <p>Keep as green belt. Increased traffic risks</p>
--	--	--

		<p>This would comprise geographical independence.</p> <p>Too large, Traffic problems.</p> <p>Ribbon development is a mistake spoils open wide views from the A6</p>
Anecdotal Evidence		
Pro	Con	Objection
Plot 8 Land at corner of Bottomdale Road and A6. Available not green belt, in conservation area.		
<p>Pro</p> <p>Must be in keeping with houses opposite</p> <p>No objections, quiet area not overlooking anyone.</p> <p>Easy access onto A6 not as conspicuous to rest of village.</p> <p>Ideal for small house or retirement type development (flats)</p> <p>Good location due to being with and opposite existing houses and minimal impact on other properties</p> <p>Good idea must be in keeping</p> <p>Logical use of derelict land (This post it was the wrong colour for Plot 8</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>How many houses is it worth financially</p> <p>Access to A6 would be difficult as well as site is adjacent to busy junction</p>	<p>Objections</p> <p>Not a good idea</p> <p>Part of conservation area should not be developed</p> <p>Not suitable access to A6 and Bottomdale Road, dangerous, conservation area bordering greenbelt.</p> <p>Retain as green belt x 2</p> <p>Retain as green belt x 2 (These post its where the wrong colour but on Plot 8)</p>

<p>but was on plot 8, could refer to plot 9)</p> <p>Good site Build houses like those opposite</p> <p>Good site</p> <p>Perfect extension of the village, new build opposite a good example</p> <p>No objection to a row of terraced houses</p> <p>This site could possibly be suitable for building</p>		
<p>Anecdotal Evidence</p>		
<p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection</p>
<p>Plot 9 Land next to Christadelphian Church. Available not green belt, in conservation area.</p>		
<p>Ideal for small houses</p> <p>Good idea if in keeping</p> <p>Suitable plot for houses as within existing buildings and little impact on other properties.</p> <p>Excellent potential site for small stone faced houses like the ones newly built ones North of the Manor House. Small developments like this most suitable in a village like ours.</p> <p>This plot could possibly be built on, however the closeness to the A6 and being within the conservation area are</p>		

important factors to be considered.		
Anecdotal Evidence		
Pro	Con	Objection
Plot 10. Land on the shore. Available.		
	<p>Railway crossing a pain</p> <p>Rising see levels due to climate change make this totally unsuitable</p> <p>There are much better sites available.</p> <p>No starter due to location and past planning refusals</p> <p>Any developer must provide flood defences both initially and in the short term.</p> <p>Problems with past planning?????</p>	<p>Please no</p> <p>We are totally opposed to any building on the coastal strip</p>
Anecdotal Evidence		

Email Feedback- the following comments were received via email from people who wished to comment but were unable to attend an event.

The comments have been extrapolated from emails to fit where possible into the same framework as used for comments on the information day.

Plot 1 Sea View Drive		
<p>Pros</p> <p>I have lived on Sea View Drive for 40 years so have seen the area develop and change to what it is now. Forty years ago there were very few families living on Sea View and its associated</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>Vehicular Access :-</p> <p>The entrance to Sea View Drive from Hest Bank Lane is very tight. Even though the entrance could be widened slightly it would still be narrow and joins Hest Bank Lane at a</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>As this land is greenbelt and important to wildlife in the surrounding area of the canal we would state our objection to the proposed</p>

<p>roads, most homes had one or exceptionally two vehicles. I would estimate the home occupancy averaged not much above two. As years have ticked by things have steadily changed, largely for the better. There are now many families on the Drive a number of whom have significantly enlarged their properties creating good family homes. This is positive as the properties were built in the early sixties and are at an age where some level of improvement is required.</p> <p>Changes over the years have had the following affects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased the number of people, particularly children, on the Drive and surrounding area. • An increase in the number of vehicles using the Drive and parking curb side. • Congestion on the drive and at the entrance from Hest Bank Lane. 	<p>point where it is particularly narrow and busy. Next to the entrance is a bus stop, this area is particularly busy at school start/finish times with many parents and children mingling with the normal traffic.</p> <p>Access to the possible site will presumably be via Old Bobs Lane and the adjacent strip of land. This can be easily seen on Google Earth. This will only impact upon the entrance to Sea View Drive and The Knoll. This is however a public bridleway that is used by a large amount of walkers, farm vehicles and others enjoying the outdoors.</p> <p>If the plan was to gain vehicular access via Sea View Close this would be very problematic as the Close is narrow and is currently very congested. It could be seen as good footpath access as this would benefit all concerned giving access to Hest Bank Lane via Sea View Drive and the existing footpath at the NE corner of Sea View Drive.</p> <p>If the plan was to access the proposed site via Sunningdale Crescent (adjacent to Sea View Drive at the Northern end) this would be problematic as the end of Sunningdale Crescent is very restricted. This would again make useful footpath only access.</p> <p>Traffic Volume :-</p>	<p>development of 35 properties.</p> <p>I would like to submit my following objections</p> <p>Sea View Drive is a narrow access road with four ninety degree bends. Because of the amount of cars parked on the road, drivers frequently have to approach these bends on the wrong side of the road without the benefit of being able to see whether there is any oncoming traffic. This is extremely dangerous and any increase in traffic as a result of new development would only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>2. Because of the narrowness of the road and the amount of on street car parking, large delivery vehicles often have difficulty in manoeuvring around other vehicles.</p> <p>3. The road at the entrance to Sea View Drive (immediately off Hest Bank Lane) is used for car parking whilst parents drop off and collect their children from school. Dog walkers also park their cars there whilst</p>
---	---	--

	<p>Hest Bank Lane is getting increasingly busy due to general increase in use and people accessing the new link road (which is a great success). The Annual Daily Traffic figures for 2015 show an increase of 23%. An increase in the number of vehicles entering Hest Bank Lane from Sea View Drive would increase the hazardous nature of this area. It cannot be stressed enough that this area is particularly busy with children under 10 years old due to the proximity of the Village school.</p> <p>Examining the respective areas I estimate the proposed area to be about 50% of the current Sea View Drive and Raikes Hill area, by extrapolation developing this area could increase traffic flow by 50%.</p> <p>Sea View Drive is now busy and congested compared to when it was designed. Many vehicles are parked on the road and the narrow nature of the road particularly at the northern end of the Drive causes restriction and means vehicles have to drive on the wrong side of the road at a point where site lines are impaired, any increase in traffic volume would make this area dangerous.</p> <p>Because the area is a residential area designed 60 years ago and fit for purpose for the number of people for this road at this time, a</p>	<p>they exercise their dogs on the field at the back of Sea View. Therefore, more often than not, drivers have to drive on the wrong side of the road as they enter Sea View Drive (and there is a ninety degree bend shortly after - so you take your life in your own hands!).</p> <p>4. The field in question is a natural habitat for many wild animals, some of which are quite rare. An environmental impact audit must therefore be undertaken in advance of any consideration to develop the land.</p> <p>5. Holiday makers frequently moor their boats on the canal by this land because it is such an attractive and tranquil site. If the land is developed, this would no longer be the case and local businesses would loose much needed holiday trade (especially the Hest Bank Hotel!). I hope that you will take our comments into account when considering the potential development sites.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>significant increase in people/traffic volume would be a recipe for problems. E.g. Refuse vehicles access</p> <p>Infra structure :-</p> <p>The drainage system in place in this area is now sixty years old and is coping with the increase in people living on Sea View Drive . As the canal forms one edge of the development all waste from the proposed development would impact on the current drainage system. There is also the question of additional rainwater drainage and the impact on land drainage.</p> <p>Other questions that require resolution regarding infrastructure that affect all developments are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Schools • Impact on Doctors surgeries • Travel (bus etc.) • Impact on services eg Refuse collection given the increased congestion. 	
<p>Plot 2 The Paddock</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>The Tree Preservation Orders on this site are an important consideration.</p>	<p>Objection</p>
<p>Plot 3 Land between A6 and Hest Bank Lane</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection</p>

<p>Plot 4 Land West of Hest Bank Lane</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection</p>
<p>Plot 5 Land East of Kirklands</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p> <p>Flooding remains a major issue in Section 704 despite extensive work on the Recreation Ground. This is a major concern locally since any development will inevitably require drainage from this sloping location, and such drainage will need to find a way under the canal; this is a significant rate limiting feature for this area and despite the works, and despite having had further land drains installed in my own garden which is close to and at approximately the same level as the Recreation Ground, flooding continues to occur after any heavy rainfall, and I am able to monitor this in my own garden by watching the water level rise and cover my lawn! Any new development will add to this problem and unless the canal can be bypassed or channelled under (which I imagine would be a costly endeavour) matters will only worsen. In addition to the rainwater overflow there is the issue of sewage contamination because the current sewer system cannot cope with additional input, nor with the flood waters.</p> <p>The area's infrastructure remains inadequate in terms</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>We would give our backing to the opposition already stated to development on this land.</p>

	<p>of school capacity and provision of general medical services. I was a GP covering this area for 30 years and I am well aware of the strain under which the services are operating; they will not be able to satisfactorily meet the needs of a major increase in population in these Sections.</p> <p>In addition to the rainwater overflow there is the issue of sewage contamination because the current sewer system cannot cope with additional input, nor with the flood waters.</p>	
<p>Plot 6 Land behind Manor Farm</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection.</p> <p>Sites listed as 6 & 7 are of the greatest concern to us: Site 6 especially because it is part of GB4 and we sent letters to Lancaster Council in November 2015 detailing our objections to the proposal to build on this land. All of those objections still stand no matter the size of the development proposed.</p> <p>As a resident of Manor Drive I'm opposed to any developments in the</p>

		<p>surrounding greenbelt land. I moved to this area precisely because of the open aspect and village feel to the area and would not wish to see an increase in the number of residents or levels of traffic (vehicles and people) through the village. Crime is very low, life is quiet and sedate in this area - there is no way of determining the effect a large increase in population will have on the village.</p> <p>I wish to register my strong opposition to any move to build further housing on green belt land. Slyne-Hest, like Bolton le Sands, has had to cope with enough extra housing over the last few years.</p> <p>I would like to make an objection against the planning application for the GB4 site on the grounds that it is going to spoil two villages, i.e., Slyne with Hest and Bolton-le-Sands and, more importantly, the infrastructure is not</p>
--	--	--

		<p>in place to deal with this influx of families. There is one doctor's surgery that is bursting at the seams and the schools are full. This has just not been thought out properly. The field that is being considered for this development was the site of a burial pit for the last foot and mouth disease outbreak. On health reasons alone, it should not be considered for housing for many more years.</p>
--	--	---

Plot 1 Sea View Drive		
<p>Pro</p> <p>I have lived on Sea View Drive for 40 years so have seen the area develop and change to what it is now. Forty years ago there were very few families living on Sea View and its associated roads, most homes had one or exceptionally two vehicles. I would estimate the home occupancy</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>Vehicular Access :- The entrance to Sea View Drive from Hest Bank Lane is very tight. Even though the entrance could be widened slightly it would still be narrow and joins Hest Bank Lane at a point where it is particularly narrow and busy. Next to the entrance is a bus stop, this area is particularly busy at</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>As this land is greenbelt and important to wildlife in the surrounding area of the canal we would state our objection to the proposed development of 35 properties.</p>

<p>averaged not much above two. As years have ticked by things have steadily changed, largely for the better. There are now many families on the Drive a number of whom have significantly enlarged their properties creating good family homes. This is positive as the properties were built in the early sixties and are at an age where some level of improvement is required.</p> <p>Changes over the years have had the following affects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased the number of people, particularly children, on the Drive and surrounding area. • An increase in the number of vehicles using the Drive and parking curb side. • Congestion on the drive and at the entrance from Hest Bank Lane. 	<p>school start/finish times with many parents and children mingling with the normal traffic.</p> <p>Access to the possible site will presumably be via Old Bobs Lane and the adjacent strip of land. This can be easily seen on Google Earth. This will only impact upon the entrance to Sea View Drive and The Knoll. This is however a public bridleway that is used by a large amount of walkers, farm vehicles and others enjoying the outdoors.</p> <p>If the plan was to gain vehicular access via Sea View Close this would be very problematic as the Close is narrow and is currently very congested. It could be seen as good footpath access as this would benefit all concerned giving access to Hest Bank Lane via Sea View Drive and the existing footpath at the NE corner of Sea View Drive.</p> <p>If the plan was to access the proposed site via Sunningdale Crescent (adjacent to Sea View Drive at the Northern end) this would be problematic as the end of Sunningdale Crescent is very restricted. This would again make useful footpath only access.</p> <p>Traffic Volume :-</p> <p>Hest Bank Lane is getting increasingly busy due to general increase in use and people accessing the new link</p>	<p>I would like to submit my following objections</p> <p>Sea View Drive is a narrow access road with four ninety degree bends. Because of the amount of cars parked on the road, drivers frequently have to approach these bends on the wrong side of the road without the benefit of being able to see whether there is any oncoming traffic. This is extremely dangerous and any increase in traffic as a result of new development would only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>2. Because of the narrowness of the road and the amount of on street car parking, large delivery vehicles often have difficulty in manoeuvring around other vehicles.</p> <p>3. The road at the entrance to Sea View Drive (immediately off Hest Bank Lane) is used for car parking whilst parents drop off and collect their children from school. Dog walkers also park their cars there whilst they exercise their dogs on the field at the back of Sea</p>
--	---	--

	<p>road (which is a great success). The Annual Daily Traffic figures for 2015 show an increase of 23%. An increase in the number of vehicles entering HBL from Sea View Drive would increase the hazardous nature of this area. It cannot be stressed enough that this area is particularly busy with children under 10 years old due to the proximity of the Village school.</p> <p>Examining the respective areas I estimate the proposed area to be about 50% of the current Sea View Drive and Raikes Hill area, by extrapolation developing this area could increase traffic flow by 50%.</p> <p>Sea View Drive is now busy and congested compared to when it was designed. Many vehicles are parked on the road and the narrow nature of the road particularly at the northern end of the Drive causes restriction and means vehicles have to drive on the wrong side of the road at a point where site lines are impaired, any increase in traffic volume would make this area dangerous.</p> <p>Because the area is a residential area designed 60 years ago and fit for purpose for the number of people for this road at this time, a significant increase in people/traffic volume would be</p>	<p>View. Therefore, more often than not, drivers have to drive on the wrong side of the road as they enter Sea View Drive (and there is a ninety degree bend shortly after - so you take your life in your own hands!).</p> <p>4. The field in question is a natural habitat for many wild animals, some of which are quite rare. An environmental impact audit must therefore be undertaken in advance of any consideration to develop the land.</p> <p>5. Holiday makers frequently moor their boats on the canal by this land because it is such an attractive and tranquil site. If the land is developed, this would no longer be the case and local businesses would lose much needed holiday trade (especially the Hest Bank Hotel!). I hope that you will take our comments into account when considering the potential development sites.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>a recipe for problems. Eg. Refuse vehicles access</p> <p>Infra structure :-</p> <p>The drainage system in place in this area is now sixty years old and is coping with the increase in people living on Sea View Drive. As the canal forms one edge of the development all waste from the proposed development would impact on the current drainage system. There is also the question of additional rainwater drainage and the impact on land drainage.</p> <p>Other questions that require resolution regarding infrastructure that affect all developments are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on Schools • Impact on Doctors surgeries • Travel (bus etc) • Impact on services eg Refuse collection given the increased congestion. 	
<p>Plot 2 The Paddock</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Cons</p> <p>The Tree Preservation Orders on this site are an important consideration.</p>	<p>Objection</p>
<p>Plot 3 Land between A6 and Hest Bank Lane</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection</p>

<p>Plot 4 Land West of Hest Bank Lane</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection</p>
<p>Plot 5 Land East of Kirklands</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p> <p>Flooding remains a major issue in Section 704 despite extensive work on the Recreation Ground. This is a major concern locally since any development will inevitably require drainage from this sloping location, and such drainage will need to find a way under the canal; this is a significant rate limiting feature for this area and despite the works, and despite having had further land drains installed in my own garden which is close to and at approximately the same level as the Recreation Ground, flooding continues to occur after any heavy rainfall, and I am able to monitor this in my own garden by watching the water level rise and cover my lawn! Any new development will add to this problem and unless the canal can be bypassed or channelled under (which I imagine would be a costly endeavour) matters will only worsen. In addition to the rainwater overflow there is the issue of sewage contamination because the current sewer system cannot cope with additional input, nor with the flood waters.</p> <p>The area's infrastructure remains inadequate in terms</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>We would give our backing to the opposition already stated to development on this land.</p>

	<p>of school capacity and provision of general medical services. I was a GP covering this area for 30 years and I am well aware of the strain under which the services are operating; they will not be able to satisfactorily meet the needs of a major increase in population in these Sections.</p> <p>In addition to the rainwater overflow there is the issue of sewage contamination because the current sewer system cannot cope with additional input, nor with the flood waters.</p>	
<p>Plot 6 Land behind Manor Farm</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p>	<p>Objection.</p> <p>Sites listed as 6 & 7 are of the greatest concern to us: Site 6 especially because it is part of GB4 and we sent letters to Lancaster Council in November 2015 detailing our objections to the proposal to build on this land. All of those objections still stand no matter the size of the development proposed.</p> <p>As a resident of Manor Drive I'm opposed to any developments in the surrounding greenbelt land. I</p>

		<p>moved to this area precisely because of the open aspect and village feel to the area and would not wish to see an increase in the number of residents or levels of traffic (vehicles and people) through the village. Crime is very low, life is quiet and sedate in this area - there is no way of determining the effect a large increase in population will have on the village.</p> <p>I wish to register my strong opposition to any move to build further housing on green belt land. Slyne-Hest, like Bolton le Sands, has had to cope with enough extra housing over the last few years.</p> <p>I would like to make an objection against the planning application for the GB4 site on the grounds that it is going to spoil two villages, i.e., Slyne with Hest and Bolton-le-Sands and, more importantly, the infrastructure is not in place to deal with this influx of families.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>There is one doctor's surgery that is bursting at the seams and the schools are full. This has just not been thought out properly. The field that is being considered for this development was the site of a burial pit for the last foot and mouth disease outbreak. On health reasons alone, it should not be considered for housing for many more years.</p>
<p>Plot 7 Land North of Manor Lane</p> <p>Pro</p>	<p>Con</p> <p>Infrastructure has not been improved to keep pace and the character of the villages is being threatened.</p> <p>There is other land available to build on in the areas of the Kelleths and Overton/ Middleton that would not substantially alter the character of these villages yet it seems there is an intention to reduce the green belt land in Slyne and compromise the identity of the villages by allowing new building to join them together.</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>I object to any building on this site (GB4). Our village needs preserving and does not need any extra housing.</p> <p>Any reduction in the green belt between us and Bolton le Sands would be completely wrong.</p> <p>I feel strongly that the proposed development would amount to ribbon development and</p>

		<p>would fuse the two villages of Hest Bank and Bolton le Sands making one large amorphous urban area and destroying the important individual characters of the communities</p> <p>The Sections 711 and 704 contain land which is not only Green Belt, but also has land within the Slyne Conservation Area. It is vital that this land is preserved. Any development of these Sections resulting in the production of a continuous band of building along this stretch of the A6 would be very much against the spirit of planning since the Second World War, and would be against both the spirit and letter of the Green Belt legislation.</p> <p>Whilst Site 7 was not part of GB4 we would ask if it is greenbelt land, and if it is then the arguments against development on GB4 would apply here also</p>
--	--	--

Plot 8 Land corner of Bottomdale Road Pro	Cons Sites 8 & 9: Development here would be detrimental to the attractive wooded aspect of this area of the A6, any building would have to be in character with surrounding properties	Objection
Plot 9 Land adjacent to Christodelphian		
Plot 10 Land on the shore		

COMMENTS FROM THE MAY FAIR AND COFFEE MORNING

Keep the green spaces for generations to come	Starter homes and accommodation for the over 55s
Reasonably priced homes for young families and over 55s	Not knocking older properties down
Starter homes, play space for children, rented homes, affordable homes open land for recreation	Houses for young families that are affordable
Affordable homes for local people. Halton style playgroup	Affordable houses for younger residents
More homes for retirement (Mccarthy homes type)	Bungalows either for detached or semi for the over 50s and others
Happy with the size of the village as it is and the green space	No large detached, less expensive houses needed for young family
The Parish need and eclectic mix, bur, rent etc	No large scale development, small developments and preserve the views
For young families to rent or buy, affordable, no big houses	No more houses in the village. It will alter the demographics south of gateway ok

Detached with room for extension	More true bungalows for disabled and retired people
Starter home	Affordable homes for young people Families to be encouraged, School to be increased in size
Not too big 3/4 bedrooms to buy and rent	Shared ownership to help get on the housing ladder
No empty houses and no second homes	Too many extensions taking away small bungalows
No large estates with lots of houses, very small development if anything	Keep the green spaces, limited development for affordable homes
No more houses, happy with Parish as it is	I don't agree with building on green belt when other opportunities exist
I want a large house with 4 bedrooms and multiple bathrooms	Semi-detached family homes, affordable
Affordable homes for local people	None
A sheltered housing development for older people.	
Keep front gardens green and not block paving or tarmac	I don't agree with affordable housing, depends on the area

Other general comments

It would seem that a number of the sites do have problems of flooding, and this is only going to become more of a problem with climate change.

Since we have lived here - 30 years now - we have seen an increase in flooding in fields and on roads, including the A6.

I do not consider that we need any new housing in our village. There are plenty of both family sized and smaller sized homes for sale already to suit a variety of budgets.

The green belt should not be touched and should be the factor that your plan most seeks to prevent being eroded.

We all have to face up to the fact that new homes are required somewhere and the "not in my backyard" is not the best approach. If we can achieve limited development that does not overburden or change the nature of the village that would be a good outcome.

Analysis of comments and information provided by members of the Community

Feedback from Initial Consultations 2016/17.

The following information is provided to identify where the most common themes raised during the consultation process will be taken forward in the Neighbourhood Plan.

References to two other key documents are also given, these relate to Strategic Plans

- Lancaster District Local Plan 2018 (submission version)

As the Lancaster District Plan is not yet complete the given references may have changed and are for **guidance only**, the full document must be consulted for updated, additional information and accuracy at time of reading.

- Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted 2008) 2008.

Stage One

Parking Outside School and other areas of the village	Referred to Parish Council as not within the remit of Neighbourhood Planning.
Parking for new developments	Lancaster District Local Plan DM 61 Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 E2 Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2, 3 and 6
Speeding traffic, safety of pedestrians and concern re narrow bridges	Lancaster District Local Plan DM 61 Neighbourhood Plan, Policy 13.
Concerns re Public Transport	Not within the remit of Neighbourhood Planning, concerns passed to Parish Council.
Footpaths and cycling	Lancaster District Local Plan DM 60 Lancaster Core Strategy 2008 ER6 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 10
Provision of affordable homes	Lancaster District Local Plan Policy DM 3 Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 SC3 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 1

Concerns of about style/design of new homes	Lancaster District Local Plan Policy DM 29 Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 SC5 Neighbourhood Plan Policies 1, 2 and 3
Concerns about number of new homes	Local District Plan DM1 Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 SC4 Neighbourhood Plan Policies 1, 2 and 3
Concerns about possible linking up to other settlements	Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2 and 3
Concerns about the protection of the shore	Lancaster District Local Plan DM26, 36, 42, 45 and others Lancaster District Core Strategy E1 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 5,6, 7 and 8
Concerns about the loss of greenbelt	Lancaster District Local Plan DM43 Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 SC8 Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2 and 3
Email from resident concerns about the impact on local Biological Heritage Sites	Neighbourhood Plan Appendix SEA and HRA Reports Lancaster District Local Plan Policy DM 38, 43, 44, 45 and others Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2,5,6 and 7
Concerns about loss of trees	The strategic document provide good protection. Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 E1 Lancaster District Local Plan DM 34 Lancaster District Tree Protection Policy https://www.lancaster.gov.uk/planning/trees/tree-policy
Concerns about possible impact on Conservation area	Lancaster District Core Strategy SC1 Lancaster District Local Plan Policy DM 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 Areas Neighbourhood Plan Policy 9

Concerns about loss of long distance views	Lancaster District Local Plan DM92 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 7
Concerns about where new homes would be built	Lancaster District Core Strategy SC4 Lancaster District Local Plan DM4 Neighbourhood Plan Policies 2 and 3
Development of recreation facilities	Lancaster District Core Strategy SC8 Lancaster District Local Plan DM26 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11 and 12
Support for local business	Lancaster District Core Strategy ER3 Lancaster District Local Plan DM18 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 6
Faster Broadband in village	High speed broadband is now available in village
Development of Amenities	Lancaster District Core Strategy SC8 Lancaster District Local Plan DM55 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11 and 12
Stage Two	
Concerns raised about identifying land for development	Lancaster District Local Plan Chapter 5 Lancaster District Core Strategy SC4 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2 and 3
Concerns about flooding (and in stage one consultation)	Lancaster District Local Plan Policy Policy DM 33 and 34 Lancaster District Core Strategy SC7 Neighbourhood Plan Policy 5

Next steps

The steering group feels it now has sufficient information to write detailed policies for the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan.