

## Appendix 6a – Summary of responses to Issues and Options and Extra Sites Consultations

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
001	Mrs Phillipa Ashton		Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detrimental impact on the landscape from development</li> <li>• No need for more housing in Warton</li> <li>• Infrastructure cannot cope with additional population. Risks of flooding, drainage and traffic problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. No contrary evidence provided</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site W83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Crag. Water run-off onto Main Street. Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W83 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site W84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorrect boundary. Flood risk Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site W85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On flood plain. Existing houses add to run-off flooding on Main Street Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation because it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</b></li> </ul>
			Site W86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On flood plain, flood risk Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W86 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk to properties on Main Street Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W87 is not suitable for development.</b></li> <li>• <b>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site W90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage problems. Will ruin views from school and cause safeguarding issues Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W90 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Keer. Flood risk to properties on Gardner Road Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site W94	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Warton Crag Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W94 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (14/00499/OUT).</b></li> </ul>
			Site W95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood risk on the Keer Greenfield site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W95 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
002	Mr George Askew		Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invest in roads infrastructure to carry additional traffic.</li> <li>• Develop brownfield sites, including Lundsfield Quarry at Carnforth.</li> <li>• Object to housebuilding in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> <li>• Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Sites in Carnforth are not covered by this DPD</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
003	Mrs Ellen Bernfield		Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with Arnside Parish Council and Arnside Parish Plan Trust responses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of small, brownfield sites. Oppose development of large sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Site sizes will be very carefully considered against best practice for development in protected landscapes</li> </ul>
			Sites A1/3/4/10/13/15/20/21/23/30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These sites are being retained as Open Spaces (Sites A1, A3, A4, A10 and A20) or Key Settlement Landscapes (A15, A21, A23 and A30) or are otherwise to be left undeveloped (A13 and A30). They are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A2/11/12/17/18/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object, retain as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A2, A17, A18 and A19 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Sites A5/7/24/26/97/106/107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A26 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>Sites A5, A7, A24, A97, A106 and A107 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A6/14/25/28/29/105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A6 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>Sites A14 and A28 are not available.</li> <li>Sites A29 and A105 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support low density development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support car park development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support partial development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
004	Mr Christopher Bisco		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with 0.5ha/10 dwelling definition for major development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Propose that brownfield sites are remediated/developed regardless of size (eg former Travis Perkins site)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that housing requirements should be identified, in stages after initial demand/backlog taken up. Base target on affordable housing needs and repeat surveys every 5 years. Market housing OK exceptionally on brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Noted comments about repeat surveys. Viability assessments will be undertaken for all potential development sites</li> </ul>
005	Mr Christopher Bisco		Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: bigger than threshold for major sites. Should remain as Open Space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
006	Mr P Brindle		Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport infrastructure problems (road capacity and car parks)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan site development is against ethos of AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious drainage infrastructure problems in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of development proposed in AONB is against character and purpose of AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a "Call for Sites" process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> </ul>
			Sites S43/50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Big sites (more than 10 dwellings) not appropriate for AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites withdrawn</li> </ul>
007	Mr Roger Cartwright		Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government planning policies are damaging to landscape and society.</li> <li>Sites search will make it more difficult to protect AONB from unsuitable development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a "Call for Sites" process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> </ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB will benefit having a design guide</li> </ul>	

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community should prepare a list of assets of community value and a neighbourhood development plan</li> <li>• Draft Sustainability Appraisal is designed to confuse the public</li> <li>• NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development will undermine any AONB policies prepared by this plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> <li>• Assets of Community Value lists may be prepared at any time. The Councils are preparing a detailed and focused DPD for a small area, which will be akin to an NP in some respects e.g. being for a small area with shared characteristics</li> <li>• Draft Sustainability Appraisal is written to a standard technical format. It designed to help assess and improve overall sustainability of the DPD</li> <li>• Aspects of the presumption in favour of sustainable development are qualified by other policies which restrict development in the AONB</li> </ul>
008	Mr Roger Cartwright		Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.8: agree with management plan aims</li> <li>• 2.9: sceptical that private sector will provide necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• 2.10 Clarify "most sustainable sites"</li> <li>• Plan needs to take account of physical suitability of land for development, especially in respect of drainage</li> <li>• Limited capacity of village schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Site assessment process will do this, considering a wide range of variables, based around the impacts of the proposed developments and the proximity to services</li> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> <li>• School capacities will be assessed against any development proposals, and other factors (such as their admissions policies)</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major development should be judged in relation to scale of area under consideration: no precise definition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
009	Mr Roger Cartwright		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to identify a housing requirement: apply management plan objective 10</li> <li>• Prioritise speculative development outside the AONB, and develop new country parks on urban fringes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that it is not necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Objective 10 will be taken into account in preparing the DPD</li> <li>• Agree with the preference to locate most speculative development outside the AONB.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					Country parks designation would be subject to resources and in relation to district-wide planning
010	Mr Roger Cartwright		Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Vision and Objectives. Concern about resources, implementation and standards of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
011	Mr Roger Cartwright		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable houses should be the only types allowed, no market houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map submitted proposing large areas of countryside around Warton as being suitable for Open Space designation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map received. Open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site W34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development could be sustainable here for low cost housing, close to services and not contrary to AONB policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This site has full planning permission, which includes an identified number of affordable houses</li> </ul>
			Sites W84/85/86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be suitable for well-designed development as part of a larger improvement scheme for seasonal wetland restoration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn.</li> <li>W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT).</li> <li>Site W86 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89/92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not suitable for development: contrary to AONB policies. Re-classify as open space linked to Warton Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W92/93 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
012	Mr Roger Cartwright		Q18/19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all important spaces identified and suggests an alternative method of identifying them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preference for option (i)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many sites are too large for the AONB and have serious landscape and environmental problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The whole of the AONB is special and has a boundary: further development boundaries are not necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although the development boundary question concerned settlements within the AONB, not the AONB itself</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small farms have disappeared and the land split from the steading, meaning that land cannot be managed sustainably.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site S41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not suitable for housing development: re-classify as open space/woodland. Suitable for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S41 is not available for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				continued use as rural business/tree nursery or part of a smallholding/amenity woodland	
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable for 2-3 houses</li> <li>• Classify Institute Field as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site developed</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important green space vital to landscape character: classify as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Sites S44/52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclassify as open space with carefully limited well designed development for casual recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S44 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>• Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable for well-designed development keeping significant trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S45 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclassify as open space with very limited built development. Nursery to continue as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S46 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reclassify as open space (TPO), excluding existing permission for one house</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S47 has consent for residential development (13/00085/FUL)</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodland in multiple ownerships and no vehicular access. Re-classify as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential development site to improve village centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S50/53/54/55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not suitable for development: contrary to AONB policies. Re-classify as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S50 withdrawn.</li> <li>• Sites S50, S54 and S55 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>• Site S53 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some scope for a terrace of affordable houses. Re-classify as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S51 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not suitable for development: contrary to AONB policies. Re-classify as open space, with purchase by NT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible scope for a small terrace of affordable houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seasonal flooding and septic tank soakaway. Not suitable for development: contrary to AONB policies. Re-classify as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Sites S59/60/ 61/62/63/64/ 65/66/67/68/69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support designations but extend to linked open space (as shown on attached map)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust land – open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for small scale development – affordable housing?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not suitable for development: contrary to AONB policies. Re-classify as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
013	Mr & Mrs K Conlon		Sites B73/74/ 75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites not suitable for development: poor road access, no street lighting, no sewerage/drainage, no public transport, no local services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B73, B74, B75 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
014	Mr R R Davies		Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site not suitable for development: serious sewerage and drainage problems, major access and traffic problems, use brownfield sites first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of this Site S56.</li> </ul>
015	Mr Peter Duxbury		Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure cannot accommodate doubling size of caravan site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is a toxic waste dump and unsuitable for development. Road and sewerage infrastructure inadequate for more housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roads inadequate to serve more housing. No sewer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Common Land: no sewer and busy road junction. Could be a car park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large site relative to the size of the village. Road capacity limitations</li> <li>Unsafe road access, no sewerage, partly on limestone pavement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large relative to existing village and amount of services. Road system already struggling to cope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of Site B109 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Other issues raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan site visitors already add to pressure on infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to protect qualities of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>
016	Mr Alan Ferguson		Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity and protecting non-designated species rich areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Species rich features exist on sites A2, A7, A97, B31, B33, B40, B73, B74, B76, B114, B116, S44, S52, S98 – if developed will break wildlife connectivity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential development sites will be subject to ecological assessment to consider wildlife connectivity</li> </ul>
017	Mrs Elaine Fishwick		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing should be phased so that they benefit local people and so that the market is not over-supplied at any given time (need is spread over time not all needed at once)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop employment sites where evidence of companies wishing to relocate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft employment site allocations will relate to relocations and other factors including demand for employment for local residents</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites do not reflect AONB sensitivity or infrastructure constraints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a “Call for Sites” process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments. Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road and transport constraints in AONB, and car dependence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
018	Mrs Elaine Fishwick		Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site would be visually intrusive and require tree felling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on important open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be suitable for up to 2 dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S51 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very poor access to this site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land prone to flooding. Traffic problems on Cove Road. Damage open landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site undeliverable</li> </ul>
			Sites S55/57/98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable because of access and visual impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S55 and S98 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for larger affordable houses for families, shared ownership and property sub-divisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Need Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Other issues raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-build and eco homes supported</li> <li>Larger dwellings should be converted into smaller houses or flats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both points agreed, subject to evidence, need and suitability of any proposal</li> </ul>
019	Mr Tom Forshaw		Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledges cuts to public sector budgets, services and resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
020	Mr Tom Forshaw		Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about potential to develop lots of market housing: suggest that some should be provided outside the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a “Call for Sites” process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set housing requirements for five years and review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD is unlikely to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Phasing will be considered for the 15 year plan period, subject to the assessment of relevant evidence</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about infrastructure resourcing, and in validity of flood risk assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
021	Mr Tom Forshaw		Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives generally worded. Need to be more specific to protect AONB, where development is an exception</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will review the scope to make the DPD objectives more specific</li> </ul>
022	Mr Tom Forshaw		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing proportion should be set nearer 80%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, AONB development should be limited to meeting local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong planning policies, high % for affordable housing and good design standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, prioritise brownfield development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Silverdale Golf Club or the RSPB (by agreement)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presumption against new caravan sites, extensions or increases in seasonal occupation periods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferences noted. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing should be focused around existing urban settlements leaving AONB to meet local needs only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Agree with the need to locate most speculative development outside the AONB</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable because of heavily wooded site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
023	Mr Bill Gamble		Site A12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development that would take away a spectacular view across the estuary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
024	Mrs Lyn Gamble		Site A12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to major development that would take away a spectacular view across the estuary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
025	Mr Keith Gaydon		Sites W84/85/86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious concern about flood risk to any development on these sites, and implications for neighbouring houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn.</li> <li>Sites W84 and W86 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT).</li> </ul>
026	Mr John Hammond		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favours a case by case assessment, informed by James Maurici QC quote</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. This is the most up to date interpretation of major development</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements should be identified for the AONB but need not be met within the boundaries of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence relating to groundwater and sewerage disposal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valid and comprehensive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Taking into account the qualities of AONB, to avoid development of market housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with the preference to locate most speculative development outside the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, restrict where possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply Lancaster's Policy DM41</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments. Important that policy is consistent throughout the whole AONB</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, set brownfield target</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, density on case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, where there is local need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HS broadband and better mobile phone signal/coverage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large scale inappropriate, but small scale should be encouraged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need better parking at stations and in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locations noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further applications for caravan development require closest scrutiny</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments.</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites S56 and 58, which have distinctive local topography</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis on AONB qualities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By limiting development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That development will be severely limited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing policies are adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPD should deter alien design features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DPD is likely to contain design policies</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option (v), combined with meeting some development needs outside the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing through 3 x 5 year periods to avoid over-provision and in-migration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period.</li> </ul>
			Sites S56/58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excluded sites using criteria set out in para 6.17: landscape, drainage and highways concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</b></li> <li>• <b>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
027	Dr Chris Holroyd		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major development should not exceed NPPF para 116 criteria, and be defined case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed, see also response to rep 26</li> </ul>
028	Dr Chris Holroyd		Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing must be carefully defined, guaranteed in perpetuity, and restricted to specific defined groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to link development to local needs: no need for more expensive properties. Unclear how affordable housing needs were identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AONB Housing Need Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
029	Dr Chris Holroyd		Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision OK, but development to be kept to a minimum to protect the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Vision will be reviewed in advance of the publication of the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives about right</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
030	Dr Chris Holroyd		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply higher affordable housing % than 30/35% in the AONB.</li> <li>Increase council tax on second homes to fund affordable house building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> <li>Councils already collect maximum allowable council tax (100%) for second homes</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, where possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, especially for elderly, but not at the expense of affordable development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to consider optional housing standards and how to apply any of them in AONB</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes but without spoiling the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes prioritise brownfield land and deal with contamination. Encourage development of Arnside boatyard building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside needs station car park. Support Station Yard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support employment development at B39, B81, A97</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small scale energy schemes should be encouraged, including solar, biomass and ground-source heat pumps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support parking near Arnside station. Charge non-residents to park in the promenade – states “station yard is an obvious location”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept need for control but recognise economic benefits. Suggest limiting growth and screening to minimise impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add criteria in relation to rainfall/water attenuation and potential to generate more parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – will consider these aspects</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support The Common as open space (Site A15/16). Station Field (Site A23/24) and Briery Bank (Sites A11/12/14)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes [!!]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(does not answer question)</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use sewage as resource for generating electricity, and clean run-off (greywater collection) for toilet flushing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities under consideration to inform draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes [!!]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(does not answer question)</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes [!!]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(does not answer question)</li> </ul>
031	Dr Chris Holroyd		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer option (iv) but concern about over-urbanising settlements. Avoid allocation in the open countryside. Ensure smaller settlements can continue to support their services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We intend to focus small scale development close to existing services and facilities and that settlement character will be a consideration</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of development sites is disproportionate to local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a 'Call for Sites' process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail required is only known by owners and so prevents people from putting sites forward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site suggestions can be put forward by anyone, but are usually submitted by someone who has an interest in the land, using evidence to complete details sought on the site suggestion form to show it to be suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside, Silverdale, Beetham, Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Settlements noted</li> </ul>
032	Dr Chris Holroyd		Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase in 5-year periods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period.</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical of consultation process</li> <li>Almost all green space in Arnside is designated for building</li> <li>Limited jobs – do not match housebuilding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation process involved writing to all residential addresses in the AONB, full information available in libraries and on the Council and AONB websites, together with holding several stakeholder events, six public drop-in events and the opportunity to discuss matters with officers over a six week period. Suggestions on how we could do better would be welcome. Full details of how we have engaged people are set out in the Consultation Report</li> <li>Nowhere is designated for building at this stage</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are considering some allocations for local employment but large scale employment is likely to be inappropriate for the AONB</li> </ul>
033	Mr Chris Hunter		Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development and support designation as open space: important part of landscape character; development will worsen road congestion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A11/12/13/14/22/23/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development. Support designation as open space. Concern about traffic congestion and local services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> <li>Sites A13, A22, A23 and A24 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site A14 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
034	Mrs Elspeth Jones		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review case by case: options in para 2.18 could have a dramatic effect on a small places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed, see also response to rep 26</li> </ul>
035	Mrs Elspeth Jones		Q2/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing requirements should account for survey response rates; market prices and relative demand; time taken to sell houses; whether it meets local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broadly agree that policy should be informed by evidence, but that it is not necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement</li> </ul>
036	Mrs Elspeth Jones		Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, but add: "preserves residents' connectedness with the landscape character around them enhancing their well-being."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vision will be reviewed in advance of the publication of the draft DPD</li> </ul>
037	Mrs Elspeth Jones		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support protection in the AONB, with higher % threshold for affordable housing. Support small self-build</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Self-build support noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council should build council houses that do not have a right to buy. Maximum rents linked to CPI</li> <li>Consideration should be given to building bungalows to help support landscape objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – will consider these aspects, subject to evidence, resources and national policy guidance</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permit temporary consent for estate based workers, with high eco-credentials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – will consider this aspect</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer dwellings per hectare to ensure compatibility with current neighbourhoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: broadly consistent with NPPF para 47</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider barns, outhouses and pubs, live-work and community-led ventures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We will consider policies that will help facilitate new uses for old buildings where appropriate</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care with visual impact. Ensure new-builds are connected to any existing high-speed broadband service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more caravan sites: traffic problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key elements already identified. Importance of open space for bird flight-paths near Yealands</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider capacity for services when siting new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Materials should blend with landscape; external lighting minimised/lighting impact of buildings considered in design; strict height restrictions; use of renewable energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: all are relevant considerations</li> </ul>
038	Mrs Elspeth Jones		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (iii), compatible with local needs housing. Brownfield only on secondary settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yealand sites involve developing fields or gardens, harming the landscape character and adding light pollution.</li> <li>No sewerage for these sites. Focus on brownfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD. The site suggestions are the result of a 'Call for Sites' process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use New Inn in at Yealand Conyers for mixed use/ live-work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We understand the pub has recently been sold to a Community Benefit Society which may include these uses in any proposed redevelopment</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boundaries required for primary and secondary settlements to protect landscape and historical village context</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
039	Miss Jane Lambert		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build only affordable houses in the AONB, on brownfield sites only. Consider converting larger properties into flats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing offered to locals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict solar panels on houses – adverse visual impact. Invest in solar panels located elsewhere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: detailed design matter to be considered</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce excess highways signage. All villages should have a 20mph limit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: requires liaison with county councils as highways authorities</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more caravan sites: adverse impact on roads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about lack of proper sewerage in Silverdale to accommodate any new housing. Need for space for soakaways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan should protect the AONB designation and not use greenfield sites - land is a finite resource</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
040	Miss Jane Lambert		Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several sites in Silverdale not suitable for building, including one in a SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a 'Call for Sites' process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council should press government to find different types of affordable housing, including flat conversions with incentives for developers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Councils regularly put their case to government about the need to make proper provision for affordable housing</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
041	Ms Laura Middleton [see also rep.no.213]		Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about flooding, drainage and transport infrastructure in Silverdale</li> <li>Plan should include County Councils in respect of service cuts</li> <li>Reference to a report by Parkins &amp; Partners commissioned by LCC on bedrock porosity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Important matter that is under investigation</li> </ul>
042	Ms Dorothy Mitchell		Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strict guidelines to prevent piecemeal development. Favour brownfield first and protection of AONB qualities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support criteria in paras 6.17 and 6.18</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside, Silverdale, Sandside/Storth, Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites A1/4/8/17/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: poorly related to settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact, poorly related to settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A11/12/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support open space, object to development: prominent in the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site A12 is not being taken forward due to exclusion criteria applying.</li> <li>A15 is not being taken forward due to significant landscape impacts that cannot be mitigated.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support widening a lay-by to provide station parking only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact and drainage problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A25/26/27/106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development – flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: unsustainable location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: prominent in local landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A107 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
043	Dr Richard Neary		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about lack of jobs, housing and infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More needs to be said/done about developing open space or enhancing the AONB, eg in respect of disused quarries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: multiple landowners, difficult access, visible from Eaves Wood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: prime farmland, overlooked and visible from Eaves Wood, wildlife destruction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: on steep slope with no access and adjoins Eaves Wood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S51 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
044	Mr Peter Oakley		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply definition in SI 2010 no.2184 (para 2.18)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority should be affordable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
045	Mr Peter Oakley		Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict affordable housing to people living or working in the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordables, housing for older people to move into as needed (when downsizing etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: valid points for consideration</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sports facilities in Silverdale including tennis, skate park and MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community infrastructure proposals will be considered prior to publication of draft DPD, and will be subject to deliverability</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB should restrict to small scale, eg roof mounted solar panels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problems on Arnside Promenade, Emesgate Lane in Silverdale and at Warton. Favour car parks at both stations (station yard sites)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain existing council caravan policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate all farm land, wood and moss, esp Warton Crag, Leighton Hall Park, Leighton Moss and Gait Barrows NNR</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate Institute Field in Silverdale</li> </ul>	
046	Mr Peter Oakley		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favours option (v)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: would harm view</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in open area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A12/17/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> <li>Sites A17 and A18 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some development appropriate if it includes car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object, retain as nature reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site already developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged</li> </ul>
			Sites S44/52/98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in remote place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S44 and S98 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Sites S46/48/50/54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to major development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S50 withdrawn</li> <li>Site S46 is not available for development.</li> <li>Sites S48 and S54 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites S56/58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to major development but acknowledge this site is less obtrusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use part of this land for sports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust Land – Open Countryside – protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of a car park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
047	Mr Peter Oakley		Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should define meaning of sustainable development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are guided by the definitions and text contained in the <i>Introduction</i> and <i>Achieving Sustainable Development</i> sections of the NPPF</li> </ul>
048	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess major development case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. See also rep26</li> </ul>
049	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify housing needs in the AONB in line with national criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
050	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broadly agree with objectives, but consideration required for different settlements within Silverdale, eg Silverdale Green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlikely that the plan will contain this level of detail about a small settlement</li> </ul>
051	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, apply national guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: both Councils already have district-wide affordable housing policies, based on national guidelines</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design standards must embrace modern materials and technologies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
052	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, apply national guidelines [repeats part of rep. no. 51]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above rep 51</li> </ul>
053	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option (v)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
054	Mrs Anne Palmer		Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No settlement boundaries should be identified for any settlement: very difficult to do in Silverdale. Assess case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
055	Mr Wallace Park		Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to comply with EA advice for 3 stage treatment of discharges for new development in Silverdale: modern treatment plant; UV sterilisation; tertiary polishing/ finishing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. We will consider incorporating the EA advice into the policy wording</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to major development. Concern about sewerage capacity, drainage and flood risk, notes recently flooded</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A small amount of residential development is proposed on part of Site S56.</b></li> </ul>
056	Mr Colin Patrick		Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: not in keeping with ribbon form of Beetham, will damage views out from church, poor access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
057	Mr Colin Patrick		Site B109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: not in keeping with ribbon form of Beetham. Poor access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Part of Site B109 is being taken forward for residential development.</b></li> </ul>
058	Mr Colin Patrick		Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of a contaminated site. Concern about methods of containment and toxic nature of tipped material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
059	Dr Colin Peacock		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definition to be more nuanced to meet demonstrable local need in some cases</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish rolling needs based on 5 year phasing, subject to monitoring and review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period.</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider impacts on AONB from development close by, eg wind farms and tourism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understood, although some developments are required on the edge of the AONB which do help protect the landscape within</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				Development outside AONB to fund links for bridleways, public transport	
			Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support vision and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support high or total affordability on housing sites: all as exception sites. Favour rented, selective higher density too</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Density to reflect NPPF para 47. Note government policy intention to shift towards more starter homes.</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, local need with lasting restrictions. Support more low cost rented property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure downsizing needs can be met</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely to be rare because of AONB size</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree brownfield priority. Need to ensure that restricted to development footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, see Q6 above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need small workshops, with space for ancillary use e.g. vehicle storage, support for homeworking. Avoid CoU from shops to housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed subject to the scope and powers of the planning system. PD rights affect the control the DPD can have over some changes of use</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small scale and local use. Favour relaxation of solar panels on buildings, and woodland management for fuel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more tourist accommodation in open countryside: existing ones to be less car dependent. Max 40mph throughout with more 20mph zones on roads. Bridleways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Speed limits require liaison with county councils as highways authorities</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better to manage speeds and encouraging alternatives. Link Silverdale station to RSPB car park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD will encourage alternatives, but acknowledge that most journeys will be done by car. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more touring caravan site: road safety difficulties. OK for more permanent pitches inside existing sites, subject to design and impact controls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Touring/static points noted. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No map for sites in Warton. Some proposed development sites are important open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				and should be designated: W84, W87, W88, W89 and W90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support pro-forma criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, whole purpose of the AONB DPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need care not to exacerbate run-off, some caused by local geology and landform</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q24/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs AONB design guide, recognising range of styles in each community</li> <li>Hidden features should be protected including archaeology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development at W86, W92 and W93: sites relatively remote/unsustainable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W86, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roods play area could be developed for sheltered and older persons housing</li> <li>At the end of Well Lane and Borwick Close scope for 10-15 houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, to avoid ribbon development. Set at Warton, Yealand Conyers, Yealand Redmayne and Storrs, Beetham, Slackhead and Arnside. Not Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although some places may suit additional ribbon development, rather than infilling</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Q2 above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
060	Mr Ian Pearse		Sites Y101/102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: loss of views. Better to develop closer to Well Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites Y101 and Y102 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope for some development here, must include footpath on Footeran Lane and protection of Open space to the east</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
061	Mrs Shirley Pyznuik		Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: drainage and sewerage capacity concerns, overlooking and road safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of residential development is proposed on part of this Site A8.</li> </ul>
062	Mr Keith Reed		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No rigid definition of Major Development, detailed quote from James Maurici QC. Suggested policy wording proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
063	Mr Keith Reed		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing requirement should be based on OAN for the HMA covering the AONB, but take into account other factors. Should not be over-reliance on local housing needs survey, should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement</li> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				not allocate a pro-rata amount from the SHMA studies. Should consider local characteristics and capacity to accommodate needs nearby outside AONB	the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity to accommodate development requiring private sewerage treatment; future provision of local bus services; other community facilities such as schools, libraries, parks etc; scope to improve specific cycle access; relationship between housing development and viability of local services; plans for wider high speed broadband coverage, and associated release of telephone exchange buildings for redevelopment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
064	Mr Keith Reed		Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support vision and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
065	Mr Keith Reed		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should identify the % of affordable housing developed, setting a level over 50%, with some 100% sites to meet affordable needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should consider, especially in most sustainable locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but will need to be supported by relevant evidence</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site specific policies to ensure appropriate mix conforms with housing needs and fits setting. Apply Lancaster's DM41/SC4. Should genuinely address local need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Housing Needs Survey identified needs including by type/size of property. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. The DPD is likely to contain design policies</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield but setting a target is inappropriate. Consider also later phases of the plan where circumstances may change (Silverdale Exchange), or sites where there has been a previous use (part of Kayes Nursery not protruding into open countryside)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period.</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density should relate to site characteristics rather than be imposed. Could do on a site specific basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, from Village Plans and in relation to local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but implementation will be subject to resources</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support home working and high speed broadband. Site S70 suitable for employment uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed (including S70 preference). Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large scale projects unsuitable and against NPPF para 116. Small scale domestic renewables policies should clarify what is appropriate in AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus services should be supported through CIL/s106. Road safety/parking issues at specific roads and time, eg Shore Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service support will be investigated. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extra parking required at Silverdale station, connected with Site S70. Scope for more parking in Silverdale centre, supported by CIL/s106</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support application of existing council policies. Could support with policies to control impact of caravan development, eg to control colours, enforced through s106s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest also a consideration of the extent that a site is under development pressure. Also the extent to which the site contributes to the qualities of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome these points</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NT sites could be protected by general countryside policies. Danger of "second class" level of protection if not allocated. Needs wider or more selective approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree: open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested list of sites to be considered for protection if a wider approach is adopted. If narrower, include The Institute Field, Cove Road Playground and Cove Road Bowling Green</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect all views from public rights of way, and green corridors adjoining settlements. Protect landscape and countryside for its own sake</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: landscape assessments are being undertaken for site suggestions which include these considerations</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to enhance biodiversity value of land within or adjacent a site to be developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted for consideration</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict development to avoid harm to groundwater or SSSI/SPA in Morecambe Bay. Requires specific policy in the DPD, especially and all site allocations tested against it before being confirmed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Detailed evidence about groundwater required to support this. HRA/AA – will ensure plan does not negatively affect SSSI/SAC/SPA etc</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing policies may be adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid suburbanisation. DPD should define the crucial elements of design which contribute to the built character of the AONB – basis of design guidance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful points. The DPD is likely to contain design policies</li> </ul>
066	Mr Keith Reed		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support option (v). Some development may be appropriate in secondary settlements and from windfalls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites S41/44/51/52/55/58/98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites not suitable for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S41 is not available for development.</li> <li>Sites S44, S51, S52, S55, S58 and S98 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site already developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owner does not want site developed: drainage problematic. Scope to consider frontage development on Cove Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Sites S45/57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible for some development on part(s) of these site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S45 and S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SE section only, suitable for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Site S46 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites S47/54/70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites suitable for development, subject to drainage caveats; S70 for employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> <li>Site S54 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only central section suitable for development. Some drainage issues, and N and S ends not available. Woodland should be retained, but part capable of being developed subject to access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for development of a larger site which could improve village centre, but not currently available. Possible long term allocation (10-15 years)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential to develop frontage on St.John's Avenue and ensure no future extension onto the larger site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site suitable for development, including land to west and north, subject to drainage caveats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S53 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development site, unlikely to be justified by NPPF116. Potential for very small area of development confined to the north of the site, to ensure no extension to the south. Drainage field required on southern portion of site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Telephone Exchange (10yrs)</li> <li>12-14 Emesgate Lane, inc S49 (10yrs)</li> <li>S and SE of Clarence House, Silverdale</li> <li>N of Hillcrest, Spring Bank</li> <li>W of Bradshawgate (? Via S45)</li> <li>W of 29 Emesgate Lane/Green Arbour/ Bleasedale School</li> <li>W of 31 Emesgate Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, at least for Arnside, Silverdale, Storth/Sandside and Beetham but supported by scope for exceptions sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted for consideration</li> </ul>
067	Mr Keith Reed		Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should phase in 3 x 5year bands, as set out in the NPPF (para 47). Would avoid early stages over-supply</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period.</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
068	Mr Keith Reed		Site assessment table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By separate email, included in responses received separately in comment 066 above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
069	Mr Chris Robinson		Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impossible to build on greenbelt land in the AONB. No more development required once Warton Grange Farm developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AONB does not contain any green belt land</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop brownfield land at Millhead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within (nb Millhead is outside the AONB and outside the scope of the DPD)</li> </ul>
070	Mr Chris Robinson		Site W84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious flood risk and drainage issues; valued open space; additional traffic, noise and inconvenience; harm landscape character and visual amenity. Development would deprive me of light and views. Decent pavement required between Warton and Millhead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
071	Mrs Karen Robinson		Sites Y99/100/101/102/103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, prefer to develop brownfield sites first: will worsen traffic and road safety on narrow lanes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for outbuildings and amended vehicular access (13/00798/FUL) for Site Y99. Any amendments to this consent could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> <li>Site Y100 withdrawn.</li> <li>Sites Y101, 102 and 103 are not suitable for development</li> </ul>
072	Mr Ian Service		Sites A12/14/18/22/23/24/26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites critical to the setting and views into/ out of the settlement. A22 floods.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> <li>Sites A14, A18, A22, A23 and A24 are not suitable for development</li> <li>Sites A14 and A28 are not available for development.</li> <li>Sites A22, A23 and A24 are being protected as Key Settlement Landscapes.</li> <li>Site A26 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A28/29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A28 is not available for development.</li> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
073	Professor Nigel Simmonds		Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to ribbon development which would join YC and YR, close to listed buildings at south of YR. Concern about traffic and character of Footeran Lane, and loss of productive agricultural land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Other issues raised	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern over interplay/conflict between additional restrictions on historic buildings and allowing new, inappropriate developments nearby</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The qualities and significances of historic buildings will be taken into account in any assessment of development</li> </ul>
074	Mr Philip Spencer		Site W90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: proximity to school, road congestion and lack of facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W90 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
075	Mr Roger Spooner		Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to any more caravan sites or expansion of existing ones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Sites S44/52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development at remote site adjoining nature reserve. Site S52 would be better as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S44 is not suitable for development</li> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: visual impact on the landscape, and limited road access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on fine biological site, home to rare Spring Sandwort</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: unsuitable site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: surrounded on all sides by green areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: poor access, biodiversity value. Better left as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: harm woodland and worsen existing eyesore</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: former landfill site, gases, biodiversity value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
076	Miss Lorraine Stobbart		Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict housing to main residences, no holiday homes. Not just limited to locals but priority to young people brought up locally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited development should be allowed if it avoids spoiling the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield including adjacent land to minimise impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid high density and so prevent damage to local setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support live-work development, especially of old or derelict buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, subject to location. We will consider policies that will help facilitate new uses for old buildings where appropriate</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services and good highway access should be key criteria to assessing development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q20/Site Y100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Y100 as open space, object to housing development: poor access, narrow roads, danger to children using playground. Y99, 101 and 103 are more favourable than Y100</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> <li>Site Y100 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very limited development in Yealand and Beetham in order to protect their identities and the local landscapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Site Y102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: disruption and distress to existing residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y102 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
077	Mr John Sumner		Section 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements for Warton are to avoid making traffic/parking any worse; avoid encroachment towards Warton Crag SSSI; maintain character of conservation area; provide appropriate affordable housing</li> <li>Object to the development of larger houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Agree with the need to protect the character of the conservation area</li> <li>AONB Housing Need Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements, including by size</li> </ul>
078	Mrs Wendy Thompson		Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site assessments unavailable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These have not yet been published. The Councils decided to seek public views on all the site suggestions and incorporate these into the assessments before finalising them</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
079	Mrs Wendy Thompson		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider housing land availability across wider area, including Carnforth, with better service provision and transport accessibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of services in Silverdale and likely further cuts. Difficult to walk to station, need more off-road walking/cycle routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
080	Mrs Wendy Thompson		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify affordable % in wider area, including Carnforth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Both Councils already have adopted district-wide affordable housing policies</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No restriction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted (no evidence to support)</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, allow market forces, but set high standards of design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree. Local Planning Authorities are required to plan to meet local needs. Some people's needs are not met through the open market</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but set a higher figure than 28%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guide density across whole area, not just within the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47. DPD only applies to AONB so cannot affect densities outwith AONB</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect Silverdale Institute as open space. More off-road footpaths and cycle paths</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted.</li> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Target empty shops for new development. Improve internet speeds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful point, but very few empty shops in the AONB. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD (internet speeds not within the control of the planning process)</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solar panels and other domestic technology required in new building, but not appropriate on older properties. No large wind or solar schemes in the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, especially concerning new buildings</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More off-road walking and cycle paths</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More space for car parking in central Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted (although scope for providing space in central Silverdale is very limited)</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain coastal views and minimise impact of recreational developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted importance of views. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include specific elements identified in Landscape and Seascape Assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not understand why part of S67 and S69 have been identified as open space?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These sites have been put forward by their owners, the National Trust, who do not wish to see any development on them. Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S56 and S58 suit open space criteria, and important drainage soakaway. Valuable wildlife habitats</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment against AONB Landscape and Seascape Characteristics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield only development. Avoid flood-risk areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Agree need to avoid flood-risk areas</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognise relationship between development and water soakaways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree: research/evidence required. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High design expectations and use of local materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understood, The DPD is likely to contain design policies</li> </ul>
081	Mrs Wendy Thompson		Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify vision to emphasise priority to develop brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
082	Mrs Wendy Thompson		Sites S46/70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of these brownfield sites with good transport links</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S46 is not available for development</li> <li>Site 70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site S47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too steep for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S47 has consent for residential development (13/00085/FUL)</li> </ul>
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of this site, which could open up further, adjoining land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: valuable landscape, impinges into open country</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of residential development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: valuable landscape and drainage soakaway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			S67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some scope for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S67 is National Trust land – open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			S69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No open space value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This land is NT owned and declared inalienable, and so has no potential for development. It's designation as open space will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of this brownfield site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support settlement boundaries. Want to see more of the Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment incorporated into the plan, and for greater protection of views from the Bay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Landscape and Seascape assessment consideration understood</li> </ul>
083	Mrs Wendy Thompson		Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rolling plan, reviewed every 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed, subject to plan being for 15 years</li> </ul>
084	Mrs E Threlfall		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should define major development as being no more than 4 houses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to take into account anticipated reductions in public transport, and lack of mains drainage in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict new housing to local people and for sole/main occupancy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, will need evidence to support. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new dwellings of over 3 bedrooms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements (including the type and sizes needed). No contrary evidence provided We will consider this point</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield, no greenfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density considerations should preserve character of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would lessen overall development density and preserve tranquillity of dark skies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of Site S58; support allocation as open space, to conserve tranquillity and dark skies. Site also subject to flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to preserve land in Silverdale to provide drainage and take run-off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree: research/evidence required</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New building should have some limestone facing materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (iv) for all localities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: major development and unsuitable in AONB. Surface water drainage problem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
085	Dr Stephen Ward		Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: directly on the coast, potential to damage to views and biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A3/4/10/20/21/23/30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All sites are unsuitable for development.</li> <li>Site A21 is National Trust land – open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			Sites A22/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: open land with important views and aspect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 and 24 are not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Sites A25/26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, but support use of some of it for car parking for rail users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25 and A26 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A27/29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of these sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A27 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
086	Dr Stephen Ward		Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support provision of additional car parking for rail users on land at the station (A27)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasise importance of non-statutory wildlife sites and ancient trees (ref to Ancient Tree Forum advice)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for development will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment prior to allocation</li> </ul>
087	Dr Stephen Ward		Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development sites should include good pedestrian and cycle access, and should not be allocated on local biodiversity sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration. Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> </ul>
088	Mr & Mrs Harry Warner		Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of this site because it will worsen congestion and parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to loss of open space by developing this site, which has poor pedestrian access</li> <li>Site of special environmental interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of this site, which is an orchard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site not listed as priority habitat 'traditional orchard' on the 'Nature on the Map' website: site scrubby and overgrown on our visit (May 2015)</li> </ul>
			Site A25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crossing the line is a problem for disabled rail users</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A25 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
089	Mr Matthew Whittaker		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour no threshold for major development. 5 could be too many in Warton because of flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Survey under-counted people who moved away from AONB because they cannot afford local price</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. No contrary evidence provided</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use historical maps to identify brownfield sites. More research required into infrastructure, roads and drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support vision and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of affordable housing should be defined as more than district-wide figures: important in low wage economy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing in new developments should be primary residences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasis on truly affordable homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements, and contains standard definitions of affordable housing</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit to workers with agricultural ties only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed (woodland too)</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield first, but more detailed investigation required into brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should guide density to ensure diversity of buildings and provide gardens</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Warton needs a shop, better parking and a better footpath to Millhead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope for biogas and small scale windpower using helicoidal blades</li> <li>Require all new houses to be Passivhaus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – which locations?</li> <li>Construction and insulation standards are dealt with by Building Regulations and are outside the scope of the DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for more parking in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – any specific locations?</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to any more tourist caravan sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree correct elements identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reverting flooded fields to nature would have ecological/economic/cultural benefits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subject-specific knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Educate land managers about flood-risk and implications of vegetation removal</li> <li>Revert fields between Millhead and Warton to wetland in extension of RSPB reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about impact of climate change on water table and on flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conserve, preserve and enhance historic environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Passive standards, high quality design, high resilience, using local materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. May mean Passivhaus not 'passive'</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favours option (v) but suggests focus where there is existing infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N of Sand Lane proposals impact on Crag. S of Sand Lane affected by flooding. All could harm views in the AONB and beyond</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New site suggestion on Sand Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site suggestion received (W128) and subject to consultation</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree boundaries for primary settlements, to exclude sites on edge of Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Exclusion of sites on the edge of Warton would benefit the development of W128, as proposed by this consultee</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 x 5 year phases, with emphasis on affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Warton's flood problems relate to bottleneck at Keer Bridge. Traffic could use disused railway bridge to lower congestion: coupled with TDG development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although this idea could be difficult to resource</li> </ul>
090	Mr Michael Redman		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for a better balance between demand for housing and the environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More recognition/research into car parking, traffic volumes and narrow road network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledge that these are problems at times and in parts of the AONB</li> </ul>
091	Mr Michael Redman		Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unconvinced about how balance is struck between development and protection of the character of the AONB (ref 4.4(3))</li> <li>Drainage issue in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a key issue in the AONB. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
092	Mr Michael Redman		Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs clear view on AONB housing requirement, and 15 year requirement for affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing needs to be at 40%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support new housing for local people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need balance between brownfield and new sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support additional car parking but not at the expense of losing valuable amenity land such as along Station Road, Arnside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites A2/7/8/12/14/15//17/18/19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development. Support retention as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> <li>Sites A2, A7, A15, A16, A17, A18 and A19 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>A small amount of residential development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> <li>Site A14 is not available.</li> </ul>
			Site A11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife value – return to open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A22/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to car park development – would damage character of the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A22 and A24 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A97/105/106/107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development. Support retention as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A97, A106 and A107 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site A105 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
093	Mr & Mrs M Simpson		Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to conserve and enhance AONB, prioritising low value land for development. Exclude productive agricultural land. Retain boundaries of Beetham, Storth and Arnside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
094	Mr Andrew Hunton	Cumbria Constabulary	Delivery of Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important that all new development is “Secured by Design”, resistant to crime and anti-social activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
095	Mr Neil Harnott	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB DPD should define major development, based on SI 2010 No.2184</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. See rep 26</li> </ul>
096	Mr Neil Harnott	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should reference the County Wildlife Sites GIS layer for Cumbria and Lancashire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. All suggested sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> </ul>
097	Mr Neil Harnott	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support vision and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
098	Mr Neil Harnott	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not assume all brownfield sites have no wildlife interest or importance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Wildlife Sites should be designated as Open Space where access is available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD. However, open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside and LWS are protected by virtue of their designation</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presumption against development that would impact negatively on Local Wildlife Sites. "No Net loss" of habitat in AONB. Up-to-date surveys needed for all LWS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> </ul>
099	Mr Neil Harnott	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Q27 and Sites A2/4/7/13/17/21/30/97/B31/33/36/37/38/39/40/73/74/75/76/77/104/S44/52/59/60/62/63/64/65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exclude these sites because "development would harm named species, a site designated for its biodiversity importance or an area of priority habitat or would compromise habitat connectivity." Other sites might also require site specific biodiversity assessment by ecologists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> </ul>
100	Mr Neil Harnott	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should require home owners to make provision for birds and bats when undertaking repairs or renovations</li> <li>New development should make provision for species and habitat conservation, including landscape permeability and design features to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. There is scope for policy advice on these matters</li> <li>Noted. There is scope for policy advice on these matters, and they will be considered in the site assessments</li> </ul>

## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				support specific species' conservation e.g. swifts, bats, barn owls etc	
101	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should not define major development, but will identify the sites that will accommodate new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. See also rep 26</li> </ul>
102	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. SLDC part should be 216 dwellings, plus any identified by Lancaster. Challenge how SLDC calculated 123 dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
103	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend fourth bullet point in the Vision to read "and heritage assets"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
104	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No affordable housing on sites of 10 dwelling or fewer, and 25% applied on sites of over 10 dwellings, subject to viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on evidence/experience in SLDC, local occupancy policies have not been successful and should not be proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will be guided by evidence on this matter</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPPF requires DPD should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes (para 55). For the applicant to determine the size of property within the context of choice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should not plan for these uses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should not prioritise brownfield land over greenfield, or set a target, but should encourage the effective use of brownfield. Accessibility to services is more important than greenfield or brownfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No density restrictions should be set: AONB landscape sensitivity might encourage lower density developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, providing the landowner has confirmed willingness to develop community infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside is the only settlement in the AONB with a railway station - is therefore suited to a larger proportion of housing growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although the second point does not necessarily follow the first within a protected landscape</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside railway station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second bullet point should delete "Is the open space prominent in the street scene?" and read: "Is the open space visible from publicly accessible points in the wider surrounding area?"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: this point will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A8: Hollins Lane is enclosed by development on all sides, suitable for a modest housing scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of residential development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not allocating sensitive sites unless mitigation is achievable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed (subject to all other considerations)</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of a scheme as part of a planning application. No specific policy wording</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
105	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option (ii), but placing Arnside in a category of its own as the only settlement with a railway station in the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside. Silverdale, Sandside/Storth and Warton only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsustainable location poorly related to any settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prominent; landscape impact; detached from the settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for residential development. LVIA indicates no significant harm. Close to public transport. Willing landowner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of residential development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> </ul>
			Sites A11/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prominent in the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor access and not well related to settlement. No pedestrian access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to be reviewed: depends on A22/23</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A18 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depends on A18 coming forward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A19 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential railway station car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage issues; steep and prominent site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site 25/26/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood risk problems: car parking only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsustainable location, poorly related to services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liable to flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
106	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No phasing: should allow housebuilders to bring forward sites at the earliest opportunity, in appropriate locations. Note SLDC and Lancaster do not have a 5 year land supply</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Needs assessed will arise over time, flooding the market all at once will not adequately address local needs – i.e. some people in need are not in need now but have expressed that they will be in x no. of years when they leave home, have another child etc</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be a separate consideration of the distance of a site from a railway station. Walking distance from a station should be 1km</li> <li>Should be no presumption that brownfield land in unsustainable locations is more suitable than greenfield land in sustainable locations – would be contrary to NPPF</li> <li>What is an “identified area of open green space”?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: will be considered</li> <li>Noted and agreed</li> <li>Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. All evidence and suggestions will be considered, including PPG17 survey sites, but unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
107	Mr Christopher Garner	Cumbria Home Builders Group	Draft Sustainability Appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix A does not refer to SLDC’s Core Strategy and Land Allocations documents</li> <li>Table 5.1 does not include “sustainable locations”</li> <li>Table 5.1 and Appendix B: affordability is skewed in areas of many retirees</li> <li>No clarification of housing requirements in Issues and Options paper</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All comments noted and will be considered in next SA iteration</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 6.1 table not amended to state: "To encourage development of brownfield land in sustainable locations."</li> <li>Appendix B 1.16 housing allocations are not just to meet affordable housing needs, they are to meet general needs</li> </ul>	
108	Mr Brian Jones	Ramblers' Association, Lancaster Group	Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, for affordable housing: existing stock will satisfy market needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Existing stock does not meet all market needs</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More information on locally important heritage assets and the impact of the few, large attractions and events</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both Councils are working on identifying locally important heritage assets</li> </ul>
109	Mr Brian Jones	Ramblers' Association, Lancaster Group	Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add "appropriate" to design in the first bullet point of the vision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, we will consider this amendment</li> </ul>
110	Mr Brian Jones	Ramblers' Association, Lancaster Group	Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The absolute number of affordable houses, rather than the proportion, should be specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the question, we were seeking ideas about the proportion of affordable housing that developments should be required to deliver on each site. Agree that it is not necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, if possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be a policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, density should be high for starter and affordable homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area suited to high-tec firms with little impact on the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed, subject to scale and broadband speeds</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discourage energy uses with severe impacts on the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presumption against major new infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More parking at recreational points: Yealand Stoops, Yealand Conyers village, Jenny Brown's, Sandside promenade, Beetham village esp Heron Theatre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted, some of which are sensitive and lack space for car parking</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uphold the local authority positions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uphold present policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy to map and protect limestone pavement and other limestone features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Limestone Pavement Orders are already mapped and identified as a development constraint</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local list, with widened historic landscape survey to include older features such as enclosures and historic routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. The Councils are working together to prepare a Local List for the area</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB design guide for new build, extensions and protection of existing structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> </ul>
111	Mr Brian Jones	Ramblers' Association, Lancaster Group	Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer options (i) to (iii)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites A2/7/97/106/B31/36/40/73/74/104/S44/48/50/52/55/58/62/64/98/W86/87/88/89/85/Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: important in the landscape, have good recreational potential or are on isolated rural sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A2, A7, B31, B40, S44, S48, S50, S55, S58, B73, B74, W86, W87, A97, S98, Y103 and Y106 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Sites S50 and B36 were withdrawn</li> <li>S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> <li>Sites S62 and 64 are National Trust land – open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</li> <li>Parts of W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site B104 would more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
112	Mr Peter Moreton	Swift Conservation Project	Site B113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will require purchase of garages</li> <li>Access will be via a narrow entrance</li> <li>Underground spring leaves area wet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B113 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
113	Mr Peter Moreton	Swift Conservation Project	Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted importance of swift population in the AONB and suggested ways of protecting them, in respect of construction and maintenance (detailed advice/building design features to support conservation of swifts)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. It should be possible to incorporate this advice, and similar advice to protect and enhance the habitats of other species</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
	B113		Sustainability Appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.2 (a): need to reference biodiversity in urban areas</li> <li>5.3 (b): consider urban biodiversity;</li> <li>5.3 (c): refer to survey of swifts</li> <li>5.3 (d): response should include swift conservation in the AONB</li> <li>Table 6.1, section 10 should also refer to enhancement of urban biodiversity</li> <li>Appendix (b) section 1.9 should mention baseline data for nesting swifts and opportunities to enhance swift populations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All comments noted and will be considered in next SA iteration</li> </ul>
114	Mr Peter Moreton	Swift Conservation Project	Site B80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of valuable woodland on steeply sloping site that also provides wildlife connectivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B80 is being protected as Open Space.</li> </ul>
115	Mrs Val Stevens	Silverdale Sustainability Group	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with principles of conservation/enhancement of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should define meaning of “sustainable sites” and “principles of sustainable development”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are guided by the definitions and text contained in the <i>Introduction</i> and <i>Achieving Sustainable Development</i> sections of the NPPF</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with AONB Vision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree in general with AONB Objectives.</li> <li>“Sustainable Communities” should be defined using the Global Footprint Network. Support “sustainable transport network”, but concern about loss of services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Sustainable Communities point noted. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing should be 60%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New housing for local people as main residence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing for ecological targets and local needs only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density should be quite high, terraced more heat conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour more allotments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New building should incorporate high heat insulation and low carbon technologies for heat and power</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Energy efficiency of new building is covered by Building Regulations</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More parking at Silverdale station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Absence of mains sewerage in Silverdale must limit development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High energy efficiency, using natural and local building materials (detailed advice: Passivhaus/Eco Co-Housing). Commend affordable housing at Dunsop Bridge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Energy efficiency of new building is covered by Building Regulations</li> <li>Dunsop Bridge housing is well known and very good, but requires landowner initiative</li> </ul>
116	Prof M and Mrs V Stevens		Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: includes popular footpath; colonised naturally by trees over pavement, and is a rich woodland habitat</li> <li>Part-ownership – not available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
117	M J Fletcher		Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain all identified open space sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
118	Mr Robert Matthews		Sites A22/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about flood-risk and surface water on these sites; archaeological significance of “salt pans”; concern about overlooking from/to Ashleigh Court, loss of light and impact on elderly residents; pleasant open field aspect</li> <li>Need to address parking issues on Station Road due to congestion and dangerous access - alternative car park location would be on the foreshore, supported by flood defence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A22 and A24 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes - Improved parking facilities in Arnside (small strip of Station Field to provide parking bay for 30-40 cars) and facilities for older children in the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
119	Ms Janet Bowers		Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, for a small number, in perpetuity and no second homes. No need for urbanisation of the AONB – Carnforth more appropriate for starter homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. Starter homes are a specific housing type, the definition of which is not yet confirmed by government</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, small starter homes or older people's one-level dwellings scattered in small numbers and on small plots, not large executive homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Starter homes are a specific housing type, the definition of which is not yet confirmed by government</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development constrained by no mains drainage in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
120	CM Greenwood		B109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, site floods, greenfield land, good agricultural land. Existing drainage problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of Site B109 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
121	Dr NJC Martin		Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing for working people / young people. Need to avoid creating second homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. .</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, site has local wildlife significance, no public transport</li> <li>Concern about ability of infrastructure to accommodate growth. Avoid second homes. Priority to develop brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
122	Dr NJC Martin		Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable for development: poor access, adjoins wildlife areas, dangerous rock faces, wildlife qualities, no local services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
123	Mr Anthony John Rees		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development in an AONB should be much smaller than defined in the NPPG – suggests no more than half the various sizes quoted in para. 2.18</li> <li>Need to ensure smaller developments do not cumulatively form major sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> <li>Noted and understood</li> </ul>
124	Mr Anthony John Rees		Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan site expansions only if local access roads are designated/improved at the expense of the applicants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
125	Mr Anthony John Rees		Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: contrary to paras 2.13 and 2.14 of the Discussion Paper. Narrow, no parking. Should be left natural</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
126	Mr Anthony John Rees		Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: visible from Arnside Knott – will set a bad precedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
127	Mr Anthony John Rees		Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: contrary to paras 2.10 to 2.19 of Discussion Paper. Site bounded by footpath and should be open space, feeding ground for local wildlife. Development would</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				create road, light pollution and drainage problems	
128	Ms Valerie Cookson		Site Y100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: new owner has no plans for development. No rights of access to develop land from Silverdale Road (covenant issue): access would be through The Meadows. Major development contrary to NPPF para 116; significant infrastructure improvements would be required; adverse impact on landscape. No mains drainage, flood-risk concerns, lack of local services, pedestrian safety issues</li> <li>Land contains a Klargester Bio-disc treatment plant serving 48 properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y100 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
129	Ms Jean Clarke & Mr Stuart Graves		Sites B24/31/73/74/75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, which would increase traffic; roads poorly maintained.</li> <li>Electricity, water supply, drainage infrastructure issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These sites are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
130	Ms Diane Shield		Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water/electricity supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities or buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
131	Ms Diane Shield		Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water/electricity supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities or buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
132	Ms Diane Shield		Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water/electricity supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
133	Ms Diane Shield		Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water/electricity supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
134	Ms Dianne Davidson		Site B79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in heart of village: links with playing field to the south; open space, concerns about flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B79 is not suitable for development. It is being taken forward as a Key Settlement Landscape.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
135	Mrs Jean Holden		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports major development definition in AONB, to avoid challenge at appeal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should not provide for needs outside the AONB</li> <li>Differentiate housing need from wants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> <li>Noted. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local surveys required to assess demand for public transport and health services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with vision: stress need to pass AONB on to future generations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about disruption from implementing 4.4 (4) and (5)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Resource limitations may help avoid severe disruption</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB should decide affordable housing %</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority to local people and those who work in AONB. No second homes or holiday lets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. More evidence is needed about local occupancy/second homes in market housing sector</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build flats for a range of needs, including at Sandside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage re-using existing buildings for rural workers' homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will consider policies that will help facilitate new uses for old buildings where appropriate</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield sites, including Sandside industrial area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid new housing being packed tightly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, including land for car parking, playing fields, health facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Live/work homes on Quarry Lane (B81)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Control energy related developments; no fracking or tidal booms; prefer small scale energy generation – local enterprises</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Assume reference to tidal power (tidal booms relate to oil spillages)</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about traffic on narrow roads. Favours better use of railways</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside needs more car parking, especially near the station. Coach parking too</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to new or expanded caravan parks: traffic impact. Improved facilities on existing sites OK with careful monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All should remain open</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect woodland and green spaces, especially if marked for development, including Sites A7/8/15/17/18/19/22/23/24 although small part of A22/23/24 could be used for disabled only car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development unless forced by the government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Local Planning Authorities are required to plan to meet the housing needs of their areas.</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs holistic approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mains drainage has implications for groundwater purity. Scope for reed bed sewerage and drainage systems</li> <li>Irresponsible to allow further development without proper drainage and sewerage facilities provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Train, educate, encourage and enjoy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need continuity in landscape, along with modern technology. No large housing estates. Let unique architecture inform modern design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option (iii) – better road connections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restricted car park for disabled and rail travellers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: retain as green space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A23 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A25/26/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential parking for local and visitor use, and for coaches</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B35/36/39/81/116/117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential development sites subject to good design and flood proofing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B35, B39, B116 and B117 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>B39 is not being taken forward due to status as a priority habitat.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B81 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B78/113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: access limited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B78 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site B113 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult access- object to development - retain as woodland</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B80 is being protected as Open Space</li> </ul>
			Site B114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: no access and no infrastructure. Valuable wildlife</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site B115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: traffic concern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B115 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development boundaries may reduce sprawl and veto unsuitable developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support phased development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid spoiling AONB with careless development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the purpose of preparing a dedicated AONB DPD is to ensure its special character is properly considered in planning for new development</li> </ul>
136	Mr Paul Brownsett		Site W82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development – not available: part is garden to 182a Main Street and part is garden of Chapel Walk Cottages. Rest is “The Cedars”. Need to arrange and enforce passing places on Main Street, with off-street replacement places</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
137	Miss A Robinson		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, affordable housing for young people, especially locals. Oppose second homes and holiday let</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise urban brownfield sites - existing empty homes in Lancaster and Morecambe and brownfield sites in urban areas should be used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need shop and health facilities in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services`</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need improved bus, train services and car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to more caravan and 'lodge' development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious flood risk concern on land close to the Keer in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood risk concerns noted and understood. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
138	Mr J Martin Perris		Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD must uphold principles of the Management Plan as set out in para 1.6. Value in diversity of spaces including within settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of the management plan acknowledged. DPD is related but has additional responsibilities which include shaping development in the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support definition of major development sites; must avoid cumulative impact of several smaller developments. Brownfield sites such as Travis Perkins an exception</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support restriction of new housing to local people, including local workers. Concern about numbers of market houses required to fund affordables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict development to brownfield sites – survey all brownfield sites and see how many houses could be built on them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support car park on site A22</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to further caravan site development (whether new or extension)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Sites B79/116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, should be designated as open space green channel. Poor access and little scope for more traffic. Drainage/flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B79 and B116 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v), but only for brownfield. Consider sites in Carnforth and Milnthorpe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
139	Mr & Mrs Banks		Site B114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owners of site B114, and do not want it included in any development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
140	MF & JD Rhodes		Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: remote, poor access; need to import soil; unsafe rock faces; impact on habitats; no services; no sewerage treatment; adverse impact on natural beauty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This representation assumes that the site has been proposed for housing, when in fact the owners' proposal is for an unspecified recreational use. With a less intensive use, some, but not all of the points made fall away</li> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
141	MF & JD Rhodes		Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: see refusal to application 10/1075/OUT for erection of log cabin for live/work unit. Local wildlife site and visible from surrounding area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
142	Mrs Ann Bond		Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about capacity to accommodate more sewerage discharge in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to development: open coastline; cliff-top with no infrastructure; poor access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land part of historic Gillian's (Gillion's) Farm on Elmslack Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S43 withdrawn</li> </ul>
143	Mr Scambler		Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development; subject to flooding and on a busy road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideal for parking: not suitable for housing because it floods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development in principle, but road access problematic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A18 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
144	Mr N Shield		Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
145	Mr N Shield		Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
146	Mr N Shield		Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
147	Mr N Shield		Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield sites: narrow access roads; water supply and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities	
148	Mr AR Goodland		Sites B75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: narrow roads; water supply and drainage infrastructure deficiencies; no amenities, street lighting or public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B75 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
149	Dr David Shreeve		Sites S41/46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These are large sites</li> <li>S46 waterlogged, poor drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large site, part waterlogged, poor drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Q6-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing should be 100% and for local people, 2 bed houses. Needs clarity in numbers (72 or 21 over 5 years)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for 72 dwellings over five years (the DPD period is 15 years) but not all housing needs have to be met within AONB. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict local employment: limited location for rural industry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are considering some allocations for local employment but large scale employment is likely to be inappropriate for the AONB</li> </ul>
			Table 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about reductions in public transport in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Site S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjoins open space. Needs to be reduced in area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site undeliverable</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would restrict recreation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development for car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
150	Rev Bernard Loveland		Sites B73/74/75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Slackhead, because of narrow access and road safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B73, B74, B75 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
151	Mr & Mrs D Marland		Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, avoid holiday homes or incomers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise the limited number of AONB brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside station yard (=A25/26/27)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These sites are already under consideration</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support parking on site A22, landscaped with trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more new caravan sites or expansions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree to protect private open spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts on landscape or seascape, protect views</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case by case with local participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option (iv)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, for all settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should be spread over 15 year period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus services are limited. Trains only to Barrow/Lancaster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support replacing house with more sheltered housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A5 is currently being dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to housing development but support car parking. Flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development. Sump for water draining from the Knott, receives little sunlight. Support retaining open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: open space between two protected ownerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
152	Ms I Bashforth		Site A12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development. Support open space designation and its accessibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
153	Ms Kathleen Dodd		Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: access road is narrow and cannot take more traffic; no mains drainage; low water pressure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
154	Mr David Clarke		Site B108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be suitable for development – less interference with other properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B108 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large site; would compromise views of the church. Concern about traffic on Mill Lane (locals maintain the road). Recent floods at Parsonage Fold</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no Site R43 so we have assumed your comments relate to Site B32, which is adjacent Parsonage Fold</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
155	Mrs A Robinson		Sites 108/109/110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development, unless just one house is built on B110. Difficult access: valued views from path</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B108 and part of Site B109 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site B110 is being taken forward for residential development as part of B108.</li> </ul>
			Site B112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development could be possible: good for school and public transport. Access may be an issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B112 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in the heart of the village. Flood risk. Harm to significance and tranquillity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree important to retain open spaces. Housing should be developed in urban areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest Travis Perkins site at Sandside and Quarry Lane, Storth.</li> <li>Arnside rail station and Milnthorpe should be developed as rural hubs</li> <li>Housing needs evidence based on poor response to survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Disagree. Response was above typical level for this type of survey and is sufficient to help inform policy</li> </ul>
156	Mr MEH Robinson		Sites 108/109/110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: blocks path to Fairy Steps. Road too narrow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B108 and part of Site B109 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site B110 is being taken forward for residential development as part of B108.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: inadequate access; views spoiled</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B112 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locate housing in cheaper areas near jobs, with better infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
157	Mr & Mrs A Hindhe		Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about development proposals in Warton: narrow roads, traffic, flood-risk. Develop brownfield sites first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood-risk problem understood. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
158	Mr WE Crackle		Sites Y101/102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: Yealand lacks facilities; proposals are not to meet local needs. Important views out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites Y101 and 102 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
159	BJ and E Elkington		Sites W87/88/ 89/92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: should remain as open space. Infrastructure and services shortages, traffic problems; flood-risk; narrow footpath to Carnforth. Brownfield sites available in Carnforth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Sites W87, W92, W93 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
160	Mrs Sioban Emery {same points as rep. no. 208}		Sites Y101/ 102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: concerns for traffic and road safety; unsustainable locations; remote from infrastructure; urbanising impact on landscape</li> <li>Impact on gap between Yealand Redmayne and Yealand Storrs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Sites Y101 and 102 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
161	Ms Barbara Norton		Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure poor: no continuous footpath on Silverdale Road south of Briery Bank. Concern about reduced bus services</li> <li>Retaining biodiversity connectivity is important.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites A13/17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify development proposal: is it open space or cemetery extension?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. A13 assessed as open space</li> <li>Sites A13/17 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
162	Ms Audrey Nelson		Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: protect flora and fauna; no work or shops in the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
163	Mr Nigel Dyson [same points as reps.no.200 and 204]		Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on important woodland and habitat; traffic impact; narrow roads; low water pressure</li> <li>No more caravan developments – harm to landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of landfill site unsuitable for building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow road; low water pressure; no services/facilities; no public transport; no footpath to Beetham; woodland and wildlife habitats; no mains drainage; housing too expensive for locals; landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development</li> </ul>
			Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: former quarry; traffic, low water pressure, no services/facilities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				housing too expensive for locals; woodland and wildlife habitats, no mains drainage	
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow road; low water pressure; no services/facilities; impact on wood, wildlife and limestone pavement; houses too expensive for local people, landscape impact, restricted access, no mains drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
164	Mr & Mrs Graham		Sites W92/93/95/88 and all other greenfield sites in Warton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow roads; no local jobs; service cuts; protect valued countryside; crime increase; develop brownfield sites first; development against principle of AONB designation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>W92/93/95 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
165	Mr Malcolm Knight		Site B78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: steep damp site with groundwater run-off; valuable for wildlife. Possible to solve run-off if road was improved and adopted. Concern about access because of ownership of access land (ransoms); extra traffic a problem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Site S78 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: garages are in use and owned by local residents. Flood-risk from collapsed drain under land, public footpath crosses land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B113 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
166	PE & KE Sedgwick		Q1/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with major sites definition, an average density of 30dw/ha would make most sites over 0.3ha 'major development', would expect a little leeway but this should rule out sites over 0.5ha i.e. many suggested sites should be ruled out unless there are exceptional circumstances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Substantial site surrounded by open land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about standard of access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A9.</li> </ul>
			Site A12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for development along road only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Site A106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact of railway may reduce attraction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depends on balance of development to open space but is a very large site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A18 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has potential but there are access and infrastructure concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A19 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large site with salt marsh protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is not salt marsh and is not protected as such</li> </ul>
			Site A16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some argument for infill but would be major development, currently open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A16 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development in small village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B74/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major developments on sites with no services or public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B74 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transport access poor, no amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Sites B77/79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very large sites, with difficult access, no mains drainage or public transport and limited services. Flood risk to B79</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B77 and B79 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large brownfield site which should justify exceptional circumstances and meet most of local housing needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B81 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A5/28/29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of these sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A5 is currently being dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> <li>Site A28 is not available for development.</li> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
167	Mr JW Ball	Warton Parish Council	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should define major development along lines in NPPF to provide low cost housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements based on AONB housing needs survey. Low cost housing restricted to limited infill in settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to protect character of AONB's settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vague</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but no alternative wording offered</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set a target covering the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doubt if local restrictions could be applied</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such restrictions can be applied as evidenced by recent neighbourhood plan decisions but would need to be founded on local evidence. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Councils and AONB need to identify most appropriate housing types required and restrict other types</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The Housing Needs Survey identified needs including by type/size of property</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No suitable sites to build estates in Warton so needs to be smaller developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote Graveson site at Millhead financial support should be provided to help remediate brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leave density to developers/site details</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to Warton-Millhead footway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Potential to include this in Infrastructure Plan</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited employment sites, need control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to large wind turbines or solar panels in AONB. Promote high speed broadband</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highways capacity concerns: improvements to be funded by developers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Car parking problems along Main Street</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict expansion of existing and development of new caravan sites in and adjoining AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to Parish Council submissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support designations as submitted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See map provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resist developments outside boundaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resist developments outside boundaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood-risk is high in parts of AONB, especially Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood-risk concerns noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental qualities already known: control development in respect of these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standards to fit in with existing features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only primary settlements suitable for development: Warton does not fit criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under investigation by Parish Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with defining boundaries including for Warton, to maintain its identity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can identify developments for 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but DPD is required to plan for 15 years</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key issues identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites W83/84/86/87/88/89/90/92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: visual impact and flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W83, W86, W87, W90, W92, W93 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site W84 withdrawn</li> <li>Parts of W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site W84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: flood-risk and part owned by Warton Parish Council (no owner's consent)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
168	Mr HC & Mrs JH Clarke		Sites B73/74/75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on land at Slackhead: narrow roads; traffic; no mains drainage/sewage, no facilities or public transport. B76 Limestone Pavement Order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B73, B74, B75 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
169	Mrs ME Warner		Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for disabled parking spaces at doctor's and dentist's surgery in Arnside, and at Arnside railway station (north and south bound)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
170	Mr K & Mrs A Kitchen		Site A12 (without A11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: important open space and estuary views. Favours protection as open space. Road safety concerns for access on Briery Bank</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Site A11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider on its own merits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
171	Mr P & Mrs J Barnes		Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. Concern about lack of jobs, infrastructure and services in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about safety of boundary wall between own property and site suggestion, and of overlooking, privacy, peaceful enjoyment of home. Reference to Article 1 of First Protocol: Protection of Property</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, boundary wall matter would be capable of resolution if the site were allocated for development.</li> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
172	Mr P & Mrs J Barnes		Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: narrow road; traffic; ecological qualities; no services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services.</li> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
173	Mrs Josie Barnes		Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: use sites for open space and recreation, with parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
174	Ms Philippa Bullen	Equality & Human Rights Commission		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No resources to respond</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
175	Ms Steph Rhodes	Lancashire County Council	Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure schools provision matches housing development and includes developer contributions</li> <li>Planning obligations will be sought where Lancashire Primary Schools within 2 miles and/or Lancashire secondary schools within 3 miles are: already oversubscribed, projected to become over-subscribed within 5 years or if one of the challenges in providing new places is a lack of current school sites capable of supporting an extension</li> <li>In cases where developments are over 150 dwellings or where aggregated developments results in a need, then new schools may be required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>School capacities will be assessed against any development proposals, and other factors (such as their admissions policies)</li> <li>Unlikely to be the case in the AONB</li> </ul>
176	Mr P & Mrs J Barnes		Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Duplicates rep 172</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See rep 172</li> </ul>
177		The Marine Management Organisation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
178	Ms Alison Chippendale	Health & Safety Executive	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No representation because land does not encroach on the consultation zones of major hazard establishments or major accident</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				hazard pipelines (MAHPs). If no encroachment, FSE does not need to be informed of the next stages in the adoption of the DPD	
179	Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England	Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should include description and assessment of historic environment and should include heritage information in the evidence base (detailed advice)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst useful and important advice is included in the Historic England response, no attempt has been made to engage in the consultation process, and no specific responses made to the questions or site suggestions</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advice on evaluation of impact in developing site allocations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
180	Ms Sarah Oak		Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour development of small number of suitable dwellings with agricultural restrictions to support rural workers</li> <li>Focus should be on development to meet the specific needs of rural workers – larger developments will harm AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
181	Mr Richard Watts		Sites S41/46/47/56/58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would change village character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S47 has planning consent for residential development (13/00085/FUL).</li> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development.</li> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of site S56.</li> </ul>
			S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site developed</li> </ul>
			S44/52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow access, drainage problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S44 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult access, woodland site, would footpath be retained?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield site. Owner opposes development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious flooding problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site undeliverable</li> </ul>
			S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful car parking site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about second homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB lacks 2/3 bed properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about road capacity and traffic impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about drainage and flooding in Silverdale and Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage and flood-risk points noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Other issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdevelopment and traffic concerns for Silverdale. Missed opportunities to provide smaller properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
182	Mr DG Wood		Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that any new housing in Silverdale must provide safe treatment and disposal of sewage. Secondary treatment in drainage fields</li> <li>Inadequate control of existing treatment plants</li> <li>Detailed advice on Building Regulations for sewage treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Noted, but control of existing treatment plants is outside the planning system</li> <li>Noted and welcomed</li> </ul>
183	Ms Carol Robinson		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Question demand for housing in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No shops in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for few jobs in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We are considering some allocations for local employment but large scale employment is likely to be inappropriate for the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow roads and bridges. Need wider footpath to Carnforth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope for footpath widening noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New building will require sewerage updates in Warton. Big flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood-risk concerns noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
184	Ms Sylvia Woodhead	Cumbria Geo-Conservation	Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mention the Local Geological Sites (LGS) in the AONB, including Limestone Pavement Orders. LGS and LPO to be exclusion criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. These were used as exclusion criteria in the site assessment exercise</li> </ul>
185	Mr W John Webb		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with definition in para 2.18 of major development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
186	Mr W John Webb		Sites S43/44/46/50/52/56/58/98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of major sites, would have significant landscape impact. Sites 44/52 are on SSSI. Photograph of S58 to show site prone to flooding. All except 43 are beyond village boundary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S44, S58 and S98 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> <li>Sites S43 and S50 withdrawn</li> <li>Site S46 is not available for development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 54 loss of agricultural land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site undeliverable</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 48 loss of woodland and pavement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 55 beyond village boundary, loss of agricultural land, visually obtrusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S55 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
187	Mr W John Webb		Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: inappropriate coastline site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development site. Development should relate to conditions when quarrying ceased. Site should remain peaceful. Access difficulties. Wildlife significance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
188	Mr W John Webb		Q2/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that Housing Needs survey responses may have overstated actual affordable demand. Retain flexible response based on actual demands</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
189	Mr W John Webb		Sites S41/46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some overlap. Question brownfield status of greenhouses on site S41 where only part of site was used in this way. Concern about potential to link with S56 and S58</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
190	Mr W John Webb		Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, recreation facilities for young people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current policies should control further caravan expansion, but needs careful monitoring/ implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All existing open space should be preserved. S98 should be developed as open space/nature reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tension between biodiversity and access. Information boards on key species, disturbance, at car parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood</li> </ul>
191	Mr W John Webb		Sites 48/54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of 186 – see above</li> <li>Beyond village boundary, deliverability issues, landscape/visual amenity harm, loss of woodland, limestone pavement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S48 and S54 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
192	Ms Rachael A Bust	The Coal Authority		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
193	Miss Sylvia M Read		Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is in Beetham Conservation Area, including character of Parsonage Fold (owners responsible for Mill Lane maintenance) and Beetham as a whole. Narrow access, extra traffic hazardous. Flood-risk and drainage concerns. Parsonage Fold forms a natural boundary to the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
194	Mr Robert & Mrs Julia Griffin			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of land in Silverdale for housing: lack of infrastructure (roads, drainage; not on mains sewerage); concern about loss of rural character; only affordable should be built not luxury homes, sites nearer main towns should be developed first, already a range of properties types and prices on the market</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments</li> </ul>
195	Mr Malcolm and Mrs Susan Brown		Sites W87/88/89/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to building on southern slopes of the Crag. Would harm character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W84/85/86/90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent worsening of flood-risk on low ground. Open ground provides soakaway for buildings. Roads and parking infrastructure concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT).</li> <li>Sites W86 and W90 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
196	Ms S Harrison	Yealand Conyers Parish Council	Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to develop and maintain public services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CIL is not in use in Lancaster district</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with DPD objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No second homes: new property needs to be easily adaptable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support housing needs survey for small developments of affordable housing (fewer than 10 dwellings) , and service protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All existing public open spaces should be retained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support eco-friendly development with design and materials in keeping with local area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			Site Y99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adjacent to a narrow road with poor access. No mains drainage or water/electricity capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Consent granted for outbuildings and amended vehicular access (13/00798/FUL) for Site Y99. Any amendments to this consent could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process</b></li> </ul>
197	Mr E W Craker		Introduction 1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support brownfield prioritisation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This paragraph reports the principles of the management plan. This needs to be developed in the DPD, and is the subject of discussion in para 5.6 and Q10. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB should not be seen as an island</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would have been better to examine the AONB first, because it has more constraints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This rep focuses on the constraints of the AONB to identify capacity rather than saying “we want to build x number of house here, where can we put them”. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
			1.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compare with para 2.6 which indicates a figure of 123 dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 2.6 relates to the figure applied by SLDC at the Land Allocations DPD examination. See also paras 3.2 and 5.6</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development on greenfield sites, but if allowed then limit of 9 dwellings. Counterproductive to limit brownfield sites - judge on a site by site basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – an interesting idea. The plan will certainly consider sites on a site-by-site basis</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should find sites on brownfield land, including in Carnforth and Milnthorpe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Some housing needs may be met</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 4.4(2): can facilitate thriving local economy by developing nearby</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB and places nearby should encourage affordable housing in a flexible way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should restrict new housing to sole occupancy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. Further evidence will be required to apply restrictions to market housing</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should promote defined housing types by advice to developers and planning conditions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield land. If it runs out in the AONB, seek it in adjacent areas before using greenfield sites in AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim for 30dw/ha but emphasis on good quality – some relaxation may be appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within. Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove allocation for employment land on Quarry Lane (greenfield land): road sub-standard, and junction is poor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This land remains allocated in SLDC's 'old' Local Plan until superseded by AONB DPD. However, points noted for assessment consideration</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect and conserve by not developing greenfield sites and by developing brownfield sites in a way that enhances biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support use of septic tanks and treatment works if ground conditions allow for soakaway</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Beetham as a Primary Settlement and Sandside/Storth as Secondary. Support Option (vi)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Sites B35/81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support use of sites for housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B35 and B81 are being taken forward for business or mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support use for housing, joining with B81</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B38 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B79/116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: greenfield with access difficulties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B79 and 116 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site B117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object, but acknowledge that northern part may be brownfield and therefore suitable with B38. Or could be open space alongside development of B81</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B117 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sandside Quarry, due to close in 2020. Suitable for employment along with B39</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Not put forward by owners</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development boundaries: more flexible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support phased approach: better to deal with sites that are not immediately available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't treat AONB as an island – allow development needs from within to be met outside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. The other way of looking at this is to say that the district as a whole should meet the district needs, leaving the AONB to be assessed primarily in relation to protecting its landscape character and other qualities</li> </ul>
198	Dr Peter Fielden		Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development. Main concern relates to maintenance liabilities on Mill Lane which are met by residents of Parsonage Fold. Also concerned about loss of open views</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
199	Dr Carol Allen & Dr John Glaister		Sites W84/85/86/90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: serious flood concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</li> <li>Sites W86 and W90 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: beneath Warton Crag and would have visual impact; carry water from upland and if developed would increase flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>W87/W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government policy for no building in AONBs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not true. The Councils are guided by the wording of the NPPF to guide their approach to development in the AONB. Several recent appeals that have allowed large developments in AONBs.</li> </ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green belt building for affordable housing/no green belt boundary alterations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no designated Green Belt in the AONB</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parish Council assert that housing needs met by planning applications under consideration: question need for further housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. The DPD must plan for 15 years, not just the immediate future</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serious concerns about traffic congestion in Warton. Inadequate footpath between Warton and Carnforth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Scope for wider footpath</li> </ul>
200	Mr HW & Mrs A Parrott [same points as reps.no.163 and 204]		Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on important woodland and habitat; traffic impact; narrow roads; low water pressure</li> <li>No more caravan developments – harm to landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of landfill site unsuitable for building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow road; low water pressure; no services/facilities; no public transport; no footpath to Beetham; woodland and wildlife habitats; no mains drainage; housing too expensive for locals; landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 s not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: former quarry; traffic, low water pressure, no services/facilities; housing too expensive for locals; woodland and wildlife habitats, no mains drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow road; low water pressure; no services/facilities; impact on wood, wildlife and limestone pavement; houses too expensive for local people, landscape impact, restricted access, no mains drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
201	Mrs Ann Kitchen	Bittern Countryside Community Interest Company	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, 10 dwellings or 1 acre - and main need is for affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, affordable housing for workers and those who need to down-size</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Pleased that AONB will not just receive a “share” of district housing requirements: that it will be based on proven affordable need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add that increases in caravan site sizes will risk harming the qualities that visitors come for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but not an appropriate amendment for the objectives</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social rented housing (20%), affordable rented housing (20%), starter homes (20%), market housing (40%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Starter homes are a specific type of housing that has not yet been defined by the Government. We need to know what starter homes are before we can decide how starter homes will relate to this DPD</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most should be for local occupancy and affordable, <b>but consider LDNP approach</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, including reference to LDNP. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All development to be energy efficient and include solar panels and wood-burning stoves</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB small enough to meet within villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield and infill sites. Use infill: avoid greenfield sites outside villages, but consider village extensions if appropriate in landscape terms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. No more than 10 dwellings: no more than 40% of plot developed. Need safe road access and parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider alongside development shouldn't develop if necessary community infrastructure not present. Car parking at Arnside station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, including site preference</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several brownfield sites including Travis Perkins [B81] and Sandside Quarry after quarrying ends. Favour small workshops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services should underground. Concern about mobile signal coverage (mast-sharing?). Wind and solar should be limited to single properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow roads full of cars in summer; could provide more passing places and improved sightlines. Need better bus system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside station: favour A22. Silverdale too</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new or expanded caravan sites in AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2: important habitat for wildlife</li> <li>Site A7: development would be a blot on the landscape</li> <li>Site A12 (excluding A11): spectacular views</li> <li>Site A17: on village edge with no footpaths</li> <li>Part of Site A26: permissive path to Carr Bank, should not be developed</li> <li>Should add Dobshall Wood and Crossfield Wood as open space</li> <li>Site S43: potential for open space alongside bowling green and play area</li> <li>Site S44: avoid impact on tarn and landscape</li> <li>Site S50: major development site and landscape impact if developed</li> <li>Site S52: popular footpath across open grazing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S43 and S50 withdrawn</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development permitted that impacts on landscape, seascape, coastal features, wildlife corridors etc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although this may be moderated by the extent to which impacts may be mitigated</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight SSSIs and encourage protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discourage development in areas not on mains sewerage unless own sewage treatment facility provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support further designation and management of conservation areas, would like to see management of Arnside Tower and Beetham Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fit with existing buildings and landscape; use renewable energy and energy conservation. Social housing should have play areas, outside drying areas, storage and car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site S47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steeply sloping, attractive break in frontage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problematic access and impact on NT land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of development is too large: could support smaller scheme is case for low cost housing is proven</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of large, attractive open site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour flexible approach, but could use “development edges” where it is determined there is a clear edge that should not be breached as at St John’s Avenue in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour three 5-year horizons to manage development appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote plan as a Neighbourhood Plan by the AONB Joint Parish Committee. This would enable greater participation of local people and would save money</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been considered. The AONB DPD is in scale very similar to a Neighbourhood Plan, but is being prepared by the two councils who have resolved to lead the process. Public participation has been extremely high for this type of plan</li> <li>APPT had considered doing a NP but favoured this approach once it was agreed to do an AONB plan</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
202	Mr KE & Mrs A Kitchen		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development more than 8 dwellings/1 acre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, affordable housing for workers and those who need easy access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add that increases in caravan site sizes will risk harming the qualities that visitors come for. Second homes remove stock of starter homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equal proportions of social rented, affordable rented, starter homes and more expensive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most should be for local occupancy and affordable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. More evidence is needed about local occupancy/second homes in the market housing sector</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All development to be energy efficient and include solar panels and woodburning stoves</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB small enough to meet within villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield and infill sites. Use infill: avoid greenfield sites outside villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. No more than 8 dwellings: no more than 40% of plot developed, retaining rest as open. Private gardens or communal play areas should be provided. Need safe road access and parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider alongside development shouldn't develop if necessary community infrastructure not present. Car parking at Arnside station, pavement on Silverdale Rd</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop sites A25/27 but not all of A26</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services should underground. Concern about mobile signal coverage (mast-sharing?). No large wind turbines, but favour solar panels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow roads full of cars in summer. Need better bus system and airport connectivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Arnside station: favour A22. Silverdale too</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new or expanded caravan sites in AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2: important habitat for wildlife</li> <li>Site A7: development would be a blot on the landscape</li> <li>Site A12 (excluding A11): spectacular views</li> <li>Site A17: on village edge with no footpaths; part may be suitable for cemetery</li> <li>Part of Site A26: avoid development on permissive path to Carr Bank and retain access from Sandside Road</li> <li>Should add Dobshall Wood and Crossfield Wood as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A2, A7 and A17 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development permitted that impacts on landscape, seascape, coastal features, wildlife corridors etc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The Site assessment considers these impacts, policies in DPD will do same for windfall developments</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight SSSIs and encourage protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development without mains drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reason for Arnside to be a development area: sufficient protection already</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We assume this comment relates to the proposed conservation area for Arnside. A consultation on the proposal to designate Arnside as a conservation area is being held in May / June 2016</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fit with existing buildings and landscape; use renewable energy and energy conservation. Social housing should have play areas, outside drying areas, storage and car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop A11 for easy access retirement bungalows, not social housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This site will be subject to assessments for development (because it has been put forward) and for open space (because it is currently designated as such)</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
203	Mr KE & Mrs A Kitchen		Sites A13/17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodland. Part could be suitable for cemetery extension. Not suitable for building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A13 and A17 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
204	Drs J & K Edwards [same points as rep. nos. 163 and 200]		Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on important woodland and habitat; traffic impact; narrow roads; low water pressure</li> <li>No more caravan developments – harm to landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of landfill site unsuitable for building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow road; low water pressure; no services/facilities; no public transport; no footpath to Beetham; woodland and wildlife habitats; no mains drainage; housing too expensive for locals; landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: former quarry; traffic, low water pressure, no services/facilities; housing too expensive for locals; woodland and wildlife habitats, no mains drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: increased traffic on narrow road; low water pressure; no services/facilities; impact on wood, wildlife and limestone pavement; houses too expensive for local people, landscape impact, restricted access, no mains drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
205	Mr Chris Saxon		Sites W87/88/89/92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: loss of views and setting; more traffic; harm to wildlife</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Sites W87/92/93/95 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
206	Mr David Alexander		Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan should indicate how climate change will impact on land management “climate proofing”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some scope for this in the DPD and the Sustainability Appraisal</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide guidance on major development, but that impacts can differ according to character areas and criteria in para 1.3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map housing needs and brownfield land to inform development policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing needs are expressed quantitatively not spatially. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schedule of infrastructure requirements and costs: relate to evidence of development trends</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support vision, but consider including “communities of interest” from supportive visitors. New development should <u>enhance</u> not just protect landscape character. Need to support services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will consider these suggestions</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, working with parish councils and others</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes but depends on scale and nature of problem with second homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: evidence required</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accommodate a more mixed community profile – building more homes aimed at the elderly might reinforce the imbalance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draw up a hierarchy of sites for needed development within the brownfield register</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development, although few in number within the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield priority using brownfield register</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop density guidelines, which may vary throughout AONB and depending in dwelling type</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set out local authority powers and controls over key infrastructure features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although more and more infrastructure is being taken out of government or local government control</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support re-use of existing buildings (e.g. B36)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will consider policies that will help facilitate new uses for old buildings where appropriate</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support faster mobile connections, and small scale renewable / low carbon schemes. No fracking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote development hubs to reduce need to travel; promote Furness Line, with better services and parking at both stations. Access RSPB by rail</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, including site suggestion. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extra car parking at both stations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depends on existing sites and distribution, but general presumption against more caravans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes: DPD must strengthen protection and enhancement of open spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summerhouse Hill, Leighton Hall</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess against landscape criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close collaboration with key organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep development away from flood-risk areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective implementation and enforcement. Supports compilation of local list and conservation area work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commend recent NT publication on AONBs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support planning for necessary development on the right sites: sustainability principles suggested against which development should be judged. Also develop nearby at Carnforth/Milnthorpe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We are guided by the definitions and text contained in the <i>Introduction</i> and <i>Achieving Sustainable Development</i> sections of the NPPF. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Sandside	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites, but flooding issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isolated site should remain open</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A21/23/59/60/61/62/63/64/65/66/67/68/69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important open sites, should remain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A22/25/26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A22 should only be used for railway car park failing an opportunity to include one in A25/26. Otherwise it should remain as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain open land between Yealand Conyers and Yealand Redmayne</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B73/74/75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsustainable location, focus instead on Beetham</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B73, B74, B75 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important part of local settlement pattern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop as station car park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Useful to have guidance on development boundaries but no substitute for detailed boundaries on a plot by plot basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support phasing and monitoring every 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
207	Mr W Burrow	Ms Sarah Fishwick	Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter from owner withdrawing site S50 from consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
208	Mr A & Mrs ME Gregory [same points as rep.no.160]		Sites Y101/102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: concerns for traffic and road safety; unsustainable locations; remote from infrastructure; urbanising impact on landscape</li> <li>Impact on gap between Yealand Redmayne and Yealand Storrs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites Y101 and Y102 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
209	Mr Alan Riseborough		Sites W87/88/89/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on green field sites. Develop brownfield first infrastructure and service problems; flood-risk, new houses standing empty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
210	Mr Robin Higgens		Sites Y99/100/101/102/103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Yealands: narrow road; loss of character; expensive local building materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for outbuildings and amended vehicular access (13/00798/FUL) for Site Y99. Any amendments to this consent could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> <li>Site Y100 withdrawn.</li> <li>Sites Y101, 102 and 103 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
211	Mr Michael & Mrs Dianne Henderson		Sites W87/ 88/89/90/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Warton: traffic and road safety concerns; harm to rural life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W90, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
212	Ms Susan Hadden		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demand for recent affordable housing in Silverdale was limited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about/objection to development sites in Silverdale: visual impact; harm to views; impact on footpaths; effect on adjoining homes, lack of jobs locally meaning more travel (table of observations supplied) – small clusters of discreet, well-hidden homes might be appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All these factors will be considered in assessing site suggestions</li> </ul>
			Sites S54/56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of these sites as discreet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S54 is unsuitable for development</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
213	Ms Laura Middleton [see also rep.no. 41]		Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of bedrock porosity around Cove Road and Bleasdale School (Parkins &amp; Partners Report: Steve Williamson at LCC).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
214	Ms Patricia Wilkinson		Sites W87/88/ 89/90/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Warton: traffic and road safety concerns; serious flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W90, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Part of Sites W88/W89 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
215	Ms Brenda Collins		Site Y100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: new owner has no plans for development. No rights of access to develop land from Silverdale Road (covenant issue): access would be through The Meadows. Adverse impact on landscape and ecology (hay meadows). No mains drainage: flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awaiting confirmation of owner's intentions (but will assume not available if no reply)</li> <li>Site Y100 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
216	Mr David Player		Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development before mains drainage provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
217	Mr MP & Mrs SC Lawson		Sites W87/88/ 89/90/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Warton: traffic and road safety concerns; prioritise brownfield sites; housing available locally for sale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W90, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
218	Mr Joel Hockey		Sites W87/ 88/ 89/90/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Warton: harm to environment and rural life</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W90, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
219	Ms Charlotte Pinder		Sites W87/88/ 89/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Warton: traffic and road safety concerns; serious flood-risk; impact on environment; services shortcomings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
220	Mr John & Mrs Sue Mellor		Site B79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: narrow road and road safety concerns; flooding; valued open space. Better to develop a smaller site from Quarry Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B79 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
221	Mr Pete Mc Sweeney	Arnside Parish Plan Trust/ Arnside Parish Council	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, broadly support definition. Exceptions could be made on larger brownfield sites, such as Travis Perkins. Avoid piecemeal development of larger sites – how can development creep be prevented i.e. someone building one development of 0.5 ha and then applying to build another next to it?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26. Cumulative development point noted</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, acknowledging backlog. Market housing may be suitable on brownfield sites to bring forward affordable properties. New housing survey every 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within. Acknowledge re-survey point</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes: develop and encourage sustainable transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All development should be for affordable housing and local occupation. Case by case approach, not a fixed ratio</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define 'affordable'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable Housing definitions contained in <b>NPPF Glossary (see also local definition in SLDC Core Strategy)</b></li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider local occupancy housing only but may need to say "a high proportion" of housing should be for local people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caution that 'a high proportion' will leave open to interpretation as to what constitutes 'high'. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small well insulated units that are cheap to run</li> <li>Concentrate on housing need survey results and affordables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites and converted outbuildings</li> <li>Existing farm buildings could be converted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, prioritise but not appropriate to set a target. Councils should use CPO powers to deliver</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, maximum 50% development of each plot: space for off-road parking 1.5 spaces per unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Are local parking standards required?</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More space required in Arnside and Silverdale and more parking space required in Arnside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sure what they mean by 'more space'</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crossfield Boat Yard for employment;</li> <li>Telephone Exchange mixed use; Station Yard car parking, commercial and housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Solar panels, triple glazing, cavity wall insulation, loft insulation. No large wind turbines or solar farms impacting on views</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development only if existing infrastructure can support it. Extra health and bus services. Maintain train services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, Arnside station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new sites: minor extensions within footprint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dobshall Wood, owned by Woodland Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted, but open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take AONB Unit views into account, together with policies and guidance in the DPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to take advice from AONB Unit, set appropriate policies in DPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Septic tanks seem to work in Silverdale. Bedrock issues; manage overflows</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – some in Silverdale would dispute the effectiveness of their septic tanks</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use HER and listed building protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take AONB Unit views into account: use local materials. Create Design Guide or appoint a Design Panel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Design guide could be referenced in the draft DPD and drawn up subsequently, subject to resource availability</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(iv) and (vi)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, all AONB settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>33% every 5 years. Go to next phase only after previous one fully occupied and if need still exists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although it is unlikely that the progress from one phase to the next can be as precise as this</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better public transport between Arnside and Silverdale; limitations in health service provision in Arnside; funding for public WCs in Arnside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Funding noted to be a concern</li> </ul>
			Sites A1/3/4/10/20/21/23/30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All except Site A21 are being protected as Open Space of Key Settlement Landscape.</li> <li>Site A21 is National Trust land – open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			Sites A2/7/18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: favour open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A2, A17, A18 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development on upper level only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A5 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of brownfield site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A6 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A7/107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A7 and A107 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support possible low density development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Sites A11/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of A11 only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Site A13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support open space or cemetery extension</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A13 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			A14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support but only for 2-3 units</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A14 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>APPT: Object to development: favour open space</li> <li>APC: Scope for small development on part of site adjoining Parkside Drive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: favour open space or cemetery extension</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: no access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S19 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of a car park only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could support partial development, subject to the details proposed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A25/26/27/28/29/105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>Site A28 is not available for development.</li> <li>Sites A29 and 105 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for recreation/tourism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not yet: possible long term site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
222	Ms Angela Simpson	Hanover Housing	Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to parking proposal: field floods regularly; noise impact on residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on neighbouring property. Flood-risk and impact on salt pans. No access available on Ashleigh Road - private</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
223	Mr JR Tyson		Sites W87/ 88/ 89/90/92/93/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Warton: traffic and road safety concerns; prioritise brownfield sites; serious flooding issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87, W90, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
224	Ms Kate Grimshaw	Lancashire County Council Estates	Site S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of the site will be required for school expansion; remainder could be made available for residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site undeliverable for housing development. May be scope for school expansion or playing field expansion, subject to details</li> </ul>
225	Mr JW Stokes		Sites Y101/102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: concern about extra traffic on narrow roads; impact on village looks. Y100 best option for the Yealands</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites Y101 and Y102 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
226	Mr Alan Hubbard	The National Trust	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support reasons for the DPD. These should be incorporated into final DPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include reference to the statutory purposes of the AONB as stated in the CROW Act 2000, and its statutory duties in respect of planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed (but see para 1.4 of the Issues &amp; Options Discussion Paper)</li> </ul>
			Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion Paper should include direct reference to the SLDC Planning Inspector's report (quoted), in respect of environmental considerations and smaller sites.</li> <li>Expect to see that plan is landscape character led: capacity of the landscape to accommodate new development.</li> <li>Argues that meeting OAN does not apply in AONBs (NPPF para 14, footnote 9): this confirms that needs based approach is not the appropriate starting point for the DPD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning Inspector's report is relevant to the process but need not be referred to in the DPD</li> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> <li>Agree that it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement, and that footnote 9 qualifies the need to meet the OAN in the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important that concept of major development is properly addressed, based on Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment and AONB special qualities: ref NPPF 116 and NPPG 005</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OAN does not need to be met in the AONB, could be met outside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely infrastructure requirements could confirm that OAN should not be met in the AONB. Also use Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment, AONB Special Qualities, Landscape Capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested re-wording of supplementary vision statement (text provided)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Revised wording will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested re-wording of Objective (3) (text provided)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Revised wording will be considered</li> </ul>
			Para 5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over-arching policy required in AONB Plan to deal with the approach to development: ref LDNPA and PDNPA Core Strategy Policies. Stress importance of AONB Management Plan.</li> <li>Reference to district-wide approach misleading</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This is already referenced in the Issues &amp; Options Discussion Paper (eg para 1.6 and 4.1/2)</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be informed by landscape capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB-specific approach required: expect % will be higher than elsewhere in either district</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. Need to review impact of holiday homes/second homes and whether policies should control conversion of new dwellings to second homes/holiday accommodation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Closely match priority needs to housing mix and sizes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs an AONB-specific approach, based on the special nature of the landscapes/seascapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield would provide better opportunities: prioritise brownfield sites within settlements, but with cross-reference to special qualities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Normal minimum density plus special qualities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12/13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only where need identified and where special qualities not compromised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Lancaster's DM19 approach, but more detail to relate to special qualities of the AONB</li> <li>Certain types/sizes would constitute major development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach based on reducing the need to travel: suitable parking at key locations including stations, and co-ordinated public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No particular locations. Suitable parking places including for bikes at transport hubs should be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bespoke solution relative to the special qualities of the AONB. Some scope for improved or essential ancillary facilities to enhance existing sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments. Enhancement of existing sites needs consideration</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes but should add coastal locations/seascape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further work required to identify other potential sites for designation as important open space – ensure existing green spaces identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to the publication of draft DPD. Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More specific approach required based on the AONB Management Plan. Policies should be prepared for each of the AONB special qualities that relate to biodiversity or geodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This may too detailed but will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about suitability of “hard” coastal defences in the AONB (detailed advice). Implications for drainage and special qualities – techniques to address issues need to be appropriate for AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helpful comments noted</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies need to relate to the special qualities of the AONB’s historic assets and distinctive settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Base policy on AONB character assessments, but also consider AONB specific design guide for new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This may be too detailed but will be considered. The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> </ul>
			Para 6.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Call for sites is the wrong starting point for assessment of development in the AONB. Should be landscape and capacity led. Stress</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				need to give greater weight to environmental considerations, small sites and to dismiss those questioned by the SLDC planning inspector	NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Call for sites is a necessary way of helping to discover available/achievable sites. Our job is to assess the suitability of those sites against a wide range of criteria led by landscape capacity. All sites under consideration against standard criteria
			A15 & S61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support open space designation at A15. Modify Open Space proposal at S61 to exclude Bank House Farm and NT office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, including proposed modification of site boundary.</li> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S61 is National Trust land – open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			Sites A2/5/6/7/12/17/18/19/24/97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of these SLDC sites: would have adverse impacts on AONB qualities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A2, A7, A17, A18, A19, A24 and A97 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site A5 is not being taken forward as the site is currently being dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> <li>Site A6 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Sites S41/43/44/45/46/47/48/50/52/53/54/55/58/98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of these Lancaster sites: would have adverse impacts on AONB qualities. Site A54 access not suitable within land shown – site not deliverable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development.</li> <li>Site S44, S48, S54, S55, S58, S98 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Sites S43 and S50 withdrawn</li> <li>S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> <li>Site S45 could be more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> <li>Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> <li>Site S53 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous assessment for a single dwelling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S51 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipate further open space suggestions/allocations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, more site suggestions made. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support settlement boundaries, based on response to Q26, but for primary and secondary settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support phased approach, with prioritisation of brown field sites. Need more information on infrastructure availability and provision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
227	Mr Warren Hilton	Highways England	Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed cross-boundary approach required for housing requirements, based on update of housing needs survey to cover plan period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, but housing requirement will not be calculated for the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DfT Circular 02/2013 should be considered and applied in preparation of AONB DPD. Infrastructure requirements to be included in the councils' IDPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports supplementary vision in AONB DPD, which should be supported by evidence including potential impacts on Strategic Route Network (SRN)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Scale and location of development in the AONB most unlikely to have a measurable impact on the SRN</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports objectives,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New transport policy required for AONB DPD as district approaches may not be appropriate, informed by evidence base impact of site development on the SRN</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree. Scale and location of development in the AONB most unlikely to have a measurable impact on the SRN</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking assessment required to identify need and demand for parking in the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some new evidence required in areas of high parking demand/restricted supply</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could (a) identify sites for development in three five-year periods, or (b) set criteria to be fulfilled before sites come forward for development. A blend of these approaches is likely to be appropriate, depending on evidence. IDPs should support spatial strategy for DPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
228	Ms Janet Baguley	Natural England	Para 1.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whole plan requires a HRA, not just sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed, draft plan will correct this</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Para 3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific advice on ecological networks to ensure land of least environmental value is chosen for development: reference to Local Nature Partnerships; Priority Habitats and Species; Local Biodiversity Action Plans; Morecambe Bay NIA and relevant Shoreline Management Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration. Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen vision by more emphasis on designated environmental assets, aiming for net gains in biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of the vision is already approved as part of the AONB Management Plan. May be scope to reflect this point in the DPD policies</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include protection and enhancement of designated sites, biodiversity and geodiversity. More detail of "special qualities" and reference to the coast</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This information is already contained in the AONB Management Plan</li> </ul>
			Q10/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid development in areas of high environmental value, evidenced through SA/HRA. Support use of brownfield provided it has been ecologically assessed as low value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include orchards and remnant orchards in criteria in para 5/29. Ensure open space is included in new developments to prevent extra recreational pressure on designated sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Designated orchards will be protected</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development proposals in AONB need to be accompanied by a LVIA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree. Site suggestions are also being assessed for their landscape qualities</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence should relate to priority species and habitats, including potential areas of enhancement. Key linkages and diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of rural sewerage is a major issue and a DPD priority: need for enforcement and better monitoring, and better design standards- bespoke solution may be needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examples of design for nature and landscape character: nest sites; use of appropriate local planting species in landscaping; use of local energy sources such as wood burners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Settlements should have internal viability and non-independent mobility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: directly adjoins Morecambe Bay SSSI/SAC/SPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Red Hills Pasture LWS and close to Arnside Knott SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Red Hills Wood LWS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: partly within Hagg Wood LWS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A26/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Morecambe Bay SSSI and potential pollution of watercourses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjoins Eaves Wood SSSI and Middlebarrow Wood LWS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: within Major Woods LWS and close to Marble Quarry SSSI (wooded pavement)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Hale Moss Caves SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B33 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B36/37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: within part of Crow Wood LWS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B36 has been withdrawn.</li> <li>Site B37 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: surrounded by Marble Quarry SSSI. Limestone pavement within site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Underlaid Wood SSSI and within Limestone Pavement Order site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: partly within LPO site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Haverbrook Bank LWS and LPO site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B81 is being taken forward for mixed- use development (business and car parking).</li> </ul>
			Site S44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: within Hawes Water SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S44 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: part within Woodwell BHS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: adjacent to Trowbarrow Quarry LPO site and BHS, and close to Hawes Water SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: within Sixteen Buoys BHS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site W83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: close to Warton Crag SSSI; next to Warton Crag BHS and LPO site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W83 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sustainability Appraisal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support recommended changes to the SA vision (para 2.1.1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
229	Mr Jeremy Sutton	RSPB	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should define major development using SI 2010 No 2184</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with vision and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note some brownfield sites benefit wildlife, including A97 (breeding peregrines). Surveys required before blanket designations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support mix of renewable energies to meet government renewable target of 15% by 2020.</li> <li>Large scale energy contrary to NPPF para116</li> <li>DPD should include policies for small scale renewables such as solar panels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All noted</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not understand why NT land is identified, because it already benefits from inalienable declarations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect NT land in open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Several potential development sites have a habitat linkage/green corridor role (see Q27 responses)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted (green corridors have wider role than just habitat connectivity)</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about site suggestions identified for development: many are vital greenspaces, some with statutory designations which should be exempt. Enhancement of biodiversity should be a requirement on all sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions are the result of a 'Call for Sites' process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: this will be done based on all available evidence, and relevant assessments. Any site considered potentially suitable for development will be subject to a biodiversity assessment.</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development in Silverdale could have impact on water quality and on water dependent habitats. <b>DPD should contain policies relating to drainage and groundwater quality: concern about septic tank leakage and maintenance. DPD should contain SuDS policies</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: SSSI/SAC/Ramsar/SPA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site A3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is proposed as open space</li> </ul>
			Site A4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is proposed as open space</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> </ul>
			Site A11/12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Site A13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: Hagg Wood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A13 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: Hagg Wood and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A18/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A18 and A19 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: Red Hills Pasture and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust Land – Open countryside, already protected by virtue of ownership.</li> </ul>
			Sites A22/23/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A30 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: LPO, Major Woods and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: Hale Moss and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B33 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B36/37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: Crow Wood and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B36 withdrawn.</li> <li>Site B37 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B39/40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B39 and B40 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: SAC/SSSI/LPO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: LPO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: LPO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites S41/43/46/47/48/54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: key green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development.</li> <li>Site S43 withdrawn.</li> <li>Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> <li>Sites S48 and S54 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: SAC/SSSI, priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S44 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Sites W84/85/86/90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn.</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT).</li> <li>Sites W86 and W90 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Importance of breeding swifts in AONB, need to make provision for nesting in new development through DPD requirement. Enhancements also for bats, swallows, barn owls: example of Exeter SPD. Suggested policy wording submitted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration. Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment. Policy wording will be considered</li> </ul>
230	Mr Philip Hardcastle		Site W92	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support residential development (used site suggestion form)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
231	Mr Andrew Tait	Steven Abbott Associates/ Russell Armer Ltd	Para 1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD will be used to aid delivery of policies and allocations in the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Para 1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principle of accommodating market housing need should be included, based on housing needs survey report for Arnside. Limited number of brownfield sites in AONB, so delivery of housing to meet need will need to go beyond brownfield availability. Need to develop housing for younger age groups to help maintain service viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Para 2.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that plan is introducing a local occupancy approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a discussion paper not a draft policy document: question 7 covers this point in a specific and transparent manner. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Para 2.17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SLDC do not have a 5 year housing land supply by the Sedgefield method and the AONB must be part of the 5 year supply of housing, one of the exceptional circumstances in NPPF 116</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115 (note also that para 116 applies to <i>planning applications</i> for major developments in designated areas). The AONB will be part of the</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					two Councils' Housing Land Supply, but on terms that relate to the capacity of the landscape, not general housing needs: these will be met elsewhere in the districts
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development should be considered case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing delivery must be for 15 years and include market housing to facilitate affordable and starter homes. Consult estate agents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Any market housing provision will derive from site viability assessments, and will not be the main driver of development</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek evidence from estate agents. Evidence of downsizing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support supplementary vision, but favour greater emphasis on sustainable community needs and population growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree that the AONB requires population growth. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Population growth will be directed to unconstrained sites outside the protected landscape.</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 3 should ensure development meets more than local needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing % already calculated in district-wide DPDs. Important that flexibility applied in respect of viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No: local occupancy policies have not worked in national parks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must consider open market housing to refresh the working age population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Housing Needs Survey has identified needs including those for working age families and younger people/first time buyers – affordable housing will be needs led</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No density guidance: already many constraints in the AONB. More important to aid flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: CIL in SLDC is already affecting viability of some sites, especially brownfield and conversions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing development plan policies suffice, but plans no longer require energy development from housing. Building Regs deal with energy efficiency ratings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any policy developed on this topic will relate to delivering renewable energy in an appropriate way and not placing requirements on new development to incorporate renewables or energy efficiency over and above building regulations</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owners of Site S22 willing to develop land for parking as part of a wider development of Sites A23/24</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q18-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commend site A15 as being more suitable for development than open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Case by case, based on DPD policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expect DPD to contain general policy on bio and geodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for any different approach to drainage technicalities in the AONB than elsewhere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply Core Strategy policies: unsure what design features would be protected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour options (i) or (ii)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer no development boundaries: on merits. Would allow development of brownfield sites outside development boundaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about brownfield first strategy, contrary to NPPF. No need to phase development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is open and sensitive, flooding concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficult to develop without removing existing buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A5 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing garage uses: access difficulties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A6 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owned by neighbour: unsure how much is actually deliverable for housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of this Site A8.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern edge is highly visible in the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site A14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited site configuration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is not available.</li> </ul>
			Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within settlement, suitable for development. Integrate with protection of A30</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compromise setting of cemetery as well as further expansion. Awkward access, poorly related to Arnside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A18/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hill site highly visible from the east, impact on AONB statutory purposes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A18 and 19 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustainable site close to Arnside, could enable car parking and landscaped open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support inclusion of sustainable site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood-risk, access concerns. Little developer interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			A27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for development, close to services and railway station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unaware that the telephone exchange is redundant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A28 is not available.</li> </ul>
			Site A29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small brownfield site, unlikely to deliver any affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape impact and beyond the defensible settlement boundary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
232	Mr David & Mrs Ann Shuttleworth		Sites W92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: inadequate local services; no local employment; houses for sale; flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Sites W92/93/95 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
233	Mr P Alderson & Ms L Stubbs		Sites W87/88/89/92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: devalue property and loss of view. Flood-risk, traffic problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Sites W87, W92, W93 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
234	Mr Jeremy Pickup	Environment Agency	Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private sewage treatment infrastructure is likely to be adequate for the scale of housing development envisaged in the AONB. However, for Silverdale the current requirement for higher than average standard sewage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				treatment (dated 28 April 2015) will need to be continued to mitigate against impacts on vulnerable groundwater. Standards should be incorporated into DPD policy (wording supplied)	
235	Mr P Barnes		Sites W85/86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable for development: flood-risk;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT).</li> <li>Site W86 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable for development: land absorbs water from higher ground</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W87 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W92/93 (see also reps 171, 172 and 173)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: soakaway sites; access difficult onto Sand Land. Traffic and road safety concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing Needs Assessment does not make case for development in Warton: of the 12 who specified affordable housing need, 33% said their preference is to leave the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>
236	Ms Lucy Barron	Arnside & Silverdale AONB Partnership	Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important that the DPD robustly protects the AONB special qualities; that the management plan is referenced throughout the DPD; that the DPD applies a landscape character focussed approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to NPPG para 005 "...will be a matter for the relevant decision taker..." important to define major in A&amp;S AONB context, starting with SI 2010 no.2184, but also taking into account landscape and special qualities (criteria examples offered). Possible exceptions for brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presumption in favour of sustainable development, and objectively assessed needs do not apply in AONBs (NPPF para 14, footnote 9). Therefore needs-based approach not applicable. Should instead be based on landscape character and/or special qualities,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree in part. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. NPPF footnote 9 qualifies the requirement for OAN in</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<p>indicating a low capacity overall. AONB does not have to satisfy all needs arising within its boundaries, especially if it would result in detrimental impact. Favour approach taken in LDNPA, requiring robust demonstration of local need. Oppose market housing provision</p>	<p>AONBs, but not the presumption in favour of sustainable development. However, even with this qualification, we recognise (a) that OANs are district-wide calculations, with no prescription for the % to be met in the AONB; and (b) that needs arising within the AONB do not have to be met in the AONB if there are sound reasons or constraints that require them to be met elsewhere in the relevant district</p>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AONB Landscape &amp; Seascape Character Assessment (2015), includes guidelines on landscape sensitivity and capacity</li> <li>• Settlement characterisations</li> <li>• Further work on key views into and out of settlements</li> <li>• Analysis of recent housing delivery over past 5 years</li> <li>• Audit of tourism and leisure development</li> <li>• Existing provision of affordable homes</li> <li>• Evidence of second home ownership</li> <li>• School rolls, including recent changes</li> <li>• Impact assessments of potential developments on road network</li> <li>• Survey of ancient, veteran and noble trees</li> <li>• Ecological surveys and research to help understand habitat connectivity and corridors</li> <li>• More research into local heritage lists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted. This is available</li> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration.</li> <li>• The Councils are preparing local lists of heritage assets</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision contains a contradiction concerning needs definition. Closer connection required with management plan, and with existing development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The supplementary vision is not unreasonable or contradictory. It speaks of meeting the needs of the communities which include those arising for the existing population even if there is no housing development: it does not say and should not imply that those needs have to all be met within the AONB. We will work with AONB to consider</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					revised wording if it would help reduce the chances of misunderstanding
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further work required on objectives to fully reflect the AONB management plan. Rewording required for objective 3. Objectives should mention special qualities, conserving settlement character, access and public enjoyment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives mention special qualities twice, landscape qualities/character twice and sustainability four times, protect and enhance once. Distinctive settlements are mentioned in the vision, access is the theme of the fifth objective. We will work with the AONB on revising the wording of the objectives, but these are objectives for a development plan document, which may in some cases may have a slightly different emphasis to the management plan</li> </ul>
			Policy Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special qualities of the AONB should be included; key issues should relate back to the purposes of the AONB and the AONB Management Plan, to show how special qualities will be conserved and enhanced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB specific policy on delivery of new housing required: reference to LDNPA approach. Market housing is not needed in the AONB and would cause significant harm to the landscape: it should not be allowed on developments over 3 houses and only on windfall sites. 100% affordable housing can be delivered working with registered providers and the community</li> <li>Concern with policy DM42 in Lancaster's DM DPD supporting proposals in Warton and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that an AONB specific housing policy is appropriate. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. After that, affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations: this may result in some market housing being provided in the AONB DPD. The fact it is market housing does not make it more harmful to the landscape, it is the fact that market housing will not meet local needs and thus more housing than is needed will have to be built in order to meet those needs. Not clear why a limit of 3 houses is defined for market housing and only on windfall sites: this will require evidence to support</li> <li>AONB DPD will require sound evidence to over-write these district-wide policies</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				Silverdale; and with designation of Arnside and Sandside/Storth as Local Service Centres	
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, to meet true local need; occupancy restrictions in perpetuity. No new housing for second homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. More evidence is needed about local occupancy/second homes in the market housing sector</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By restricting development types that do not meet evidenced local need. Developers to provide evidence of need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AONB-specific approach required, with strict criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield land should normally be prioritised over greenfield sites. Councils should work pro-actively to bring brownfield sites forward, especially where no harm to landscape character.</li> <li>• Some brownfield sites have significances that make development unacceptable: e.g. S97. This could make implementation of a target unworkable</li> <li>• 100% new housing on any greenfield sites should be affordable and for local occupancy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> <li>• Noted and understood</li> <li>• The proportion of affordable housing provided will always be subject to viability testing. More evidence is needed about local occupancy/ second homes in the market housing sector</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use sites to full potential, with space for trees, green space to retain settlement character</li> <li>• Propose a minimum and maximum density range with criteria to allow for variation as different density might be appropriate in different contexts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, provided no impact on special qualities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Car parking at Arnside on Old Station Yard (<b>not</b> Station Fields)</li> <li>- England Coast path</li> <li>- Pedestrian and cycle access (eg along Footeran Lane in Yealand and along road at Sandside)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites and features noted (for potential inclusion in the Infrastructure Development Plan, and potentially the CIL list in SLDC). Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Arnside viaduct foot and cycle path</li> <li>- AONB information centre redevelopment</li> <li>• Need policy to retain local services and funds to protect local environmental improvements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Site A26 for visitor hub</li> <li>• Support Site B36 for small scale business use; plan could support similar initiatives with policy</li> <li>• Support retention of local services and land management businesses</li> <li>• Policy similar to SLDC E10 on farm diversification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> <li>• Noted and agreed in principle</li> <li>• Noted (but see response to Q12)</li> <li>• Noted and understood</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AONB specific policy required focusing on landscape character and special qualities. Concern about scale and cumulative impact, including of the AONB setting. Suggested policy wording</li> <li>• Support for most micro-generation installations; underground powerlines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy wording noted</li> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage walking and cycling. Concern about traffic levels and types on narrow roads. Concern about maintaining bus and train services. Plan should propose small scale development to avoid further impact on road use and safety</li> <li>• Need careful management of rural lanes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, suggest Arnside Station Yard (Site A26)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bespoke strict policy approach to tourism and leisure development required: no need for further caravan development, caravans can be damaging to the landscape; also need to restrict intensification of existing sites. Avoid extending open seasons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments. Intensification and season extensions may not be possible to prevent through a restrictive policy</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed recommendations in respect of landscape character of the AONB (attached)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support open space as previously identified by SLDC. Most sites under pressure are largely within or on the edge of settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites in and around settlements that make a significant contribution to AONB landscape character, including school fields and allotments. Will work with Councils to identify</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB specific approach essential, beginning with a policy to conserve and enhance AONB (example of YDNPA policies). Importance of landscape character and special qualities, and regard to the AONB Management Plan</li> <li>Landscape character approach required to assessing any development proposals, relevance of visual amenity and AONB setting, cumulative impact</li> <li>Specific design guidance required for AONB</li> <li>List of important elements of the AONB landscape, including rural character, trees, hedgerows and woodland, biodiversity and geodiversity, settlement character, open green spaces, buildings, heritage and historic landscape and features, tranquillity/dark skies</li> <li>Importance of coastal landscapes</li> <li>Importance of LVIAs for certain developments which need to consider both landscape character and visual amenity. Identify key viewpoints. Specific advice on LVIAs</li> <li>Need to protect opportunities to enjoy the countryside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted and agreed</li> <li>The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted and agreed</li> <li>Noted and agreed (in respect of planning applications)</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB specific approach informed by management plan: ref to NPPF paras 109/114</li> <li>Details of exclusions from development including statutory designations, priority habitats and habitat connectivity. Policy should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<p>encourage creation or restoration of habitats, and improving water quality. Bespoke swifts policy, and in respect of noise and light pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognition of geology/geomorphology qualities, including undesignated features</li> <li>• Important to consider restoration of Sandside Quarry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robust policy on sewerage and sustainable surface water drainage (SuDS) for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bespoke AONB approach required, including protection of non-designated features (examples)</li> <li>• Support new conservation area in Arnside</li> <li>• Note value in protecting/enhancing orchards and historic designed landscapes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AONB-specific approach required: highest standards required using local materials and incorporating high sustainability credentials. Avoid urban-style developments. Favour design guide and management guidelines to give practical advice: AONB advice available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach must be based on special qualities: guided by SLDC planning inspector. One or more small-scale affordable housing developments in each settlement using brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites in Carnforth and Milnthorpe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support some development, or open space designation on A5/6/11/25/26/27/28/29/ 105, B35/36/38/39/81/104/108/110/109/112/113/115 S46/70, W82/96 Y99/100, subject to further assessment and no detrimental impact on the AONB (see detailed comments on each site)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boundaries can restrict sprawl but put pressure on valuable open spaces within dispersed settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support phasing over 15 year period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change, including impact on habitats and water management, small-scale renewable energy generation, water and energy efficiency</li> <li>Recreational facilities</li> <li>Setting of the AONB</li> <li>Policy required to cover new-build and conversion for self-catering accommodation beyond development boundaries</li> <li>Policy for advertisements and signs</li> <li>Policy regarding equestrian development</li> <li>Cross-referencing to DM policies</li> <li>Commend AONB plan tests as sponsored by NT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Scope for covering some of this within open space work, and in policy approach</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted. However DPD is for the AONB, and it may be better to deal with this through district-wide DPD</li> <li>Noted: derived from district-side approach</li> <li>Noted – may need to differentiate private from commercial scale</li> <li>Noted, especially if they differ in the two authorities</li> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity, delivery of England Coast Path, impact on road network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support sensitive renovation of house for older people, to ensure historic building retained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A5 is currently being dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site may be suitable for small scale development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A6 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, biodiversity, isolated from village. Designate important open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important open space in Arnside. Development should only be considered here if no alternative sites can be found. If accepted, should be very small scale, retaining and protecting most of the open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A8.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for some small scale development providing significant features retained. Potential for some orchard restoration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site A12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: significant detrimental impact on the landscape character and settlement character of Arnside. Should be designated important open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> </ul>
			Site A14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A14 is not available.</li> </ul>
			Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, well-used right-of-way, valued by local community. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, biodiversity and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact, impact on setting of grade II listed building. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A18 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A19 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to any development, including car parking. Flood-risk and landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact, impact on setting of a grade II listed building, historic salt pans on part of site. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A25/26/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity to achieve mixed development on mainly brownfield site: visitor hub, station car park, visitor facilities, small businesses and potentially some housing. Flood-risk would need to be resolved, access required to viaduct</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for development when available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A28 is not available.</li> </ul>
			Site A29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about what is proposed in respect of restoration conditions following quarrying. Biodiversity and access concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for small scale development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A105 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A107 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape and biodiversity impacts. No requirement for additional caravans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact, impact on Beetham Conservation Area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape and biodiversity impact, remote site, no need for additional caravans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B33 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site. Small scale development could be accommodated sensitively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B35 is being taken forward for business or mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope for sensitive restoration of historic buildings, not redevelopment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B36 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site B37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B37 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful consideration to avoid impact on historic limekilns. Access difficulties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B38 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to extension further into site: landscape impact and priority habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B39 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape and biodiversity impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B40 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B74/75/76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to developments: impacts on landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B74, B75 and B76 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B78 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and views. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B79 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important contribution to landscape and settlement character: green corridor</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B80 is being protected as Open Space</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site B81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site that could be improved through development provided no impact on special qualities of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B81 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isolated site in open countryside. Impact on special qualities, loss of agricultural buildings and business.</li> <li>Some sensitive renovation of existing buildings could be considered if high quality design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B104 would more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Sites 108/110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for small-scale development sensitive to the landscape and conservation area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B108 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site B110 is being taken forward for residential development as part of B108.</li> </ul>
			Site B109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: does not continue linear pattern of the village. Smaller scale may be more suited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of Site B109 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site B112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for small-scale development sensitive to the landscape and conservation area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B112 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site B113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for small-scale development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B113 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site B115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for small-scale development sensitive to the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B115 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site B116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B116 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B117 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Careful consideration required regarding local landscape and views</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S41 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site developed</li> </ul>
			Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and water quality impacts. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S44 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information required on heritage value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S45 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of site suitable for small-scale development. Concern about impact of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S46 is not available for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				developing western area on landscape and views	
			Site S47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valuable open space in dispersed settlement pattern</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and woodland habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
+-			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S51 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, biodiversity, water quality, geodiversity. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Sites S53/54/55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S53 is not available for development.</li> <li>Site S54 is undeliverable</li> <li>Site S55 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and biodiversity. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape including historic designed landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and biodiversity. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support sensitive design of small scale development or station car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W34/85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already approved to meet housing needs for Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed.</li> </ul>
			Site W82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support sensitive design of small scale development, subject to conservation area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site W83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape, priority habitat and conservation area. Consider open space between village and Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W83 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Sites W84/86/87/90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and biodiversity. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn.</li> <li>Sites W86, W87 and W90 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site W94	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape. Consider open space between village and Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W94 already has a current planning consent for the erection of 2 dwellings (14/00499/OUT).</li> </ul>
			Site W95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape. Consider open space between village and Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W95 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site W96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support principle of small scale development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site Y99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development would need to ensure no adverse impact on landscape, historic assets or right of way</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for outbuildings and amended vehicular access (13/00798/FUL) for Site Y99. Any amendments to this consent could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site Y100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support some small scale development, subject to landscape assessment and no adverse impacts on landscape or historic assets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y100 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Sites Y101/102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: impact on landscape and conservation area. Designate as open space. Green gap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites Y101 and Y102 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
237	Mr John Bennett	Silverdale Parish Council	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definition of major development should be fewer than 10 in smaller settlements in AONB: suggest 2-4, with policy to consider criteria for more, in relation to specific needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, with confidence for next 5 years, qualified projections for remaining 10 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special provision/policy in Silverdale to cover lack of access to public sewerage, and surface</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				water/flood-risk. Implications for development amounts/densities. Need to involve EA/UU	
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest amendment to point (5) to read: "reduce the need for private car travel..."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest 40% for major developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. See also response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market houses as principal homes: affordable houses for people living/working within 25 miles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield sites for affordable housing only. Market housing on brownfield sites only, or small 1-2 property infill sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use NPPF, emphasis on exceptional circumstances backed up by business plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and understood</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DPD should define brownfield land and identify on plans. Develop in preference over greenfield but may be scope to consider greater % of market housing on such sites to help deliver</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site by site consideration to avoid intrusive clashes in style or density. Important need for adjoining open space as drainage fields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed list of community infrastructure need supplied, for IDP consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. Sites and features noted (for potential inclusion in the Infrastructure Development Plan)</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development at Railway Yard at Silverdale Station (S70)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed (also has potential for car parking)</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage small scale low impact schemes to support individual or small groups of homes, with conditions, avoid high impact proposals, include scope for forthcoming technologies not yet known about</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need improvement to village centre parking, and support for public transport. Take opportunities to underground power cables. Careful planning of waste water and drainage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale village centre and railway station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include policies to resist further caravan development based on NPPF115. Concern about foul water treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distinguish general open space (e.g. NT land) from local open space (e.g. playing fields)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
			Q19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support protection of all land managed by charitable organisations. Will supply mapping of all Parish Council open space and other parcels of significance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Site suggestions received. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialist assessments for all major developments and all sensitive sites.</li> <li>Sewage treatment discharges close to shore – sewerage plants need to be managed appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted (this is being done for all site suggestions)</li> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD: subject to limitations in scope of planning system</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to qualified bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See responses to Q3/15/22. Requires specialist survey and analysis. Results should influence allocations and permissions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialist assessments and mitigation advice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPC is considering preparation of village design guide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide. Any design guide prepared by a parish council will need to be compatible with the DPD</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v)</li> </ul>	
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prefer hierarchy of (a) brownfield sites; (b) small infill sites and (c) identified and approved sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phased approach desirable, 3 x 5 year periods, with planned review of housing needs within / between these periods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
			Sites S41/46/47/56/58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S47 has consent for one dwelling. Southern part of S46 is brownfield and could be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				developed, but greenhouses section is not and contains limestone pavement. Drainage concerns about S56. Through road concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>• Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> <li>• A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site already developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site developed</li> </ul>
			Sites S43/57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be developed together as infill, but concern about landscape and visual impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S43 withdrawn</li> <li>• Site S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Sites S44/52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural use; narrow access lane; flooding and biodiversity concerns. Remote</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S44 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>• S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains limestone pavement and provides amenity. No road access. Adjoins NT land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield within Silverdale village centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large site, above housing needs, visual impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic garden containing TPO with limited access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S51 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would require access from private road in separate ownership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S53 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield. Susceptible to flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is undeliverable</li> </ul>
			Site S55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate from village. Visual impact concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S55 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield. Car parking or light commercial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steep, detached from village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolated, valuable amenity. Flood concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detached from village; narrow access, unsafe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
238	Andrew Tait	Steven Abbott Associates/ Holgates Caravan Parks	Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holgates' caravan sites are well screened by native planting; employ 100-130 people.</li> <li>• Suggest caravan policies are made consistent between the two Councils: commend Lancaster DM14. Favour inclusion of SLDC policy CS7.6 stressing improving quality of existing visitor accommodation and broadening range of accommodation provided. Developer favours</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Noted and agreed. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments (SLDC has a saved Local Plan policy that restricts extension of caravan sites – current policy is against them in principle)</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				principle of extensions to caravan sites, subject to appropriate assessment	
239	Mr Graham Baldwin		Sites W87/88/89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape impact on Warton Crag. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W87 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
240	Ms Rachel Shaw		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, a maximum area for developments should be specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Same proportion as the rest of the district</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield first where available; small infill where not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for a playground or public open space in Beetham, and good quality walking/cycling routes to Hale, Slackhead and Milnthorpe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations and features noted (for potential inclusion in the Infrastructure Development Plan)</li> </ul>
			Sites B35/36/37/38/39/40/81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites: support business use provided sensitive to adjoining residential uses and need to improve road access on Quarry Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B35 is being taken forward for business or mixed-use development.</li> <li>Site B36 withdrawn.</li> <li>Sites B37, B39 and B40 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Sites B38 and B81 are being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Former tip with leachate risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too big for Beetham and its services. Access via private lane jointly maintained by residents at Parsonage Fold. Additional traffic. Drainage and flood-risk concerns. Impact on conservation area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
241	Mr Andrew Boyd and Miss Laura Hirst		Sites W87/88/89/92/93/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: loss of farmland; increased run-off and flood-risk; increased urban sprawl; lack of affordable housing provision; increased traffic; access difficulties; shortage of local services; impact on biodiversity, including migratory birds. Designate sites as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. [comments incorrectly state that Site W84 has planning consent: it does not and no application has been submitted]</li> <li>Sites W87, W92, W93 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
242	Mr Simon Hones		Sites S43/54/57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: surface water, drainage, road safety, decreasing public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S43 withdrawn</li> <li>Site S54 is unavailable</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				transport, biodiversity and flood-risk concerns. Access difficulty into Site S54 (detailed points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about cuts to public transport and other facilities, distance to station, school full (detailed points)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q6/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build housing near employment. Concern that there is no demand for affordable housing in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
243	Mr Peter Bujakowski		Paras1.2/1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to any development for housing in the AONB, based on its national importance, contrary to NPPF para 115</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> </ul>
			Para 1.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about lack of services in Warton: not a sustainable settlement or suitable for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services. Lancaster's adopted DM DPD identifies Warton as one of 18 sustainable rural settlements (policy DM42)</li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: adverse impact on landscape and conservation area. Traffic and road safety concerns. Designate as open space (and Site W83)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W87 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W84/85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: flood-risk; traffic and road safety concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn. Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</li> </ul>
			Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: narrow road, traffic and road safety concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
244	Mr Peter Bujakowski		Para 2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of greenfield sites which will use agricultural land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On a case by case basis: 10 dwellings or fewer could have an adverse impact on the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
245	Mr Peter Bujakowski		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use sophisticated market research methods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
246	Mr Peter Bujakowski		Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important that the fourth bullet point in the vision should extend to future generations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not accept that the Housing Needs Survey demonstrates a need for housing, therefore do not agree with objective (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements (no alternative evidence or approach provided)</li> </ul>
247	Mr Peter Bujakowski		Q6/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept in theory but affordable housing quotas do not work in practice</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Use of affordable housing percentage requirements is widespread and is in force through district-wide policies across South Lakeland and Lancaster</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impractical to set criteria within the AONB (argument that policies in A&amp;S would apply to all AONBs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD under preparation is for the A&amp;S AONB only</li> </ul>
			Q9/11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On a site specific basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support prioritisation of brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development unless community infrastructure exists to support it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support renewable energy providing it does not adversely impact on the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary importance of highway safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about car parking hazards on Main Street, Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Sites W87/88/89 as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W87 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q21/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As set out in section 1 and 2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Septic tank and surface water drainage difficult in granite and limestone areas: flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
248	Mr Peter Bujakowski		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield and then sites with the least adverse impact on the landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>W84/85/87/88/89/92/93 are unsuitable</li> <li>Only sites in Arnside and Silverdale would pass tests of site assessments in appendix 1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Information on site assessments will be published when assessments complete</li> <li>Site W84 withdrawn</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</li> <li>Sites W87, W92 and W93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour development boundaries that include brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
249	Mr Mark and Mrs Sue Eccles		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, to meet affordable housing needs only, based on local housing needs survey findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes but just for the first 5 years, based on need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree in part. The local planning authorities must plan for 15 years for the DPD to be found sound. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None. Base plan on AONB special qualities and ensure that some needs are met in Milnthorpe and Carnforth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs strengthening to protect village settlement character. Important to plan for the whole AONB and its connectivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives are vague, using imprecise terms which are difficult to measure. Need to focus more on protecting and enhancing AONB special qualities, be specific to this AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will review the objectives</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilise SLDC and Lancaster policies. Affordable housing based on local need, some of which can be met outside the AONB. Open market housing not required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, but affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7/8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define affordable needs and limit to existing community as sole/main residence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction. More evidence is needed about local occupancy/second homes in the market housing sector</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence for such needs. No development in isolated locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield development, including in adjoining settlements. No need for greenfield development in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density should optimise use of sites, whilst being in keeping with surroundings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that extra infrastructure is aspirational and might grow settlements beyond sustainable limits, which would harm character. Better to focus on improving settlement connectivity to access services better</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small, low key; use redundant agricultural buildings and live-work, businesses with a low environmental impact that encourage diversification of employment should be supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will consider policies that will help facilitate new uses for old buildings where appropriate</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour principle of small-scale renewable developments. Need superfast broadband and mobile telecommunications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q15/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some existing rights of way need improvement to allow cycling and mobility-impaired access. Improve footway from Warton to Millhead, and provide cycle link across Arnside viaduct.</li> <li>Need comprehensive traffic/travel strategy and focus on sustainable travel options before providing more car parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites and features noted (for potential inclusion in the Infrastructure Development Plan)</li> <li>Scale and location of development in the AONB most unlikely to have a measurable impact on the</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					road network. Small scale parking initiatives will not require a traffic/travel strategy
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict growth of larger caravan sites because of landscape impact. High design standards required. Favour very small scale opportunities to aid diversification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual elements/questions are not distinct enough: reverse question to ask “why isn’t this an important open space”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No open space identified in Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site suggestions from Warton Parish Council are being clarified before being added</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W87 and W88 would qualify (detailed assessment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refuse all development proposals outside development boundaries. Promote brownfield and infill development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid inappropriate development. Promote brownfield and infill development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid development in flood-risk areas. Concern about ability to balance run-off and drainage with further development. Need high quality sewerage systems with strict policy and operational controls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. Flood risk is a key criteria in site assessments</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce conservation plans (or update where they already exist)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpret vernacular architecture and design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with simplistic approach to defining settlement type/hierarchy. Development will not guarantee that services will follow, but will devalue special qualities. Need to look at each settlement based on its housing need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: creeping sprawl; adverse impact on character of Warton; agricultural use; biodiversity; landscape impact; lack of services; traffic and road safety. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W87 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Sites W84/86/ 92/93/94/95	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: too large, flood-risk, beyond village boundary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn.</li> <li>Sites W86, W92, W93 and W95 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site W94 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (14/00499/OUT)</li> </ul>
			Sites W34/82/ 83/85/90/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential support for development within settlement boundary – although to develop all would be over double the need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W82 withdrawn.</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT).</li> <li>Site W90 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draw a line around current edge of built development and define maximum amount of development within it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Front load first 5 years, to match clarity of data. Modify sequential approach to prioritise brownfield, re-use and infill. Greenfield by exception only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation is not effective, next stages need to be more engaging</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation process involved writing to all residential addresses in the AONB, full information available in libraries and on the Council and AONB websites, together with holding several stakeholder events, six public drop-in events and the opportunity to discuss matters with officers over a six week period. Suggestions on how we could do better would be welcome. Full details of how we have engaged people are set out in the Consultation Report</li> </ul>
250	Mr John and Mrs Susan Bell		Site W90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: concern about increased traffic, lack of services in the village, flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W90 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
251	Ms Laura Fiske	Friends of the Lake District	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for a definition based on NPPF116 and NPPG which states that the matter rests with the decision taker. However, DPD should</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree. See response to rep 26</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				set out criteria to be considered, based on landscape and seascape character assessments, and potential impacts on the special qualities	
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support survey process by CRHT, but given purpose of AONB, not essential that needs are met within AONB, but at settlements outside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Essential to make use of landscape and seascape character assessments, to identify landscape capacity</li> <li>Apply biodiversity indicators within appendix 3 of the AONB management plan</li> <li>Conservation Area Appraisals and Local List historic assets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agree</li> <li>Noted. All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration. Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>Noted. The Councils are currently preparing Local Lists</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference vision back to the AONB Management Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree. Reference to the Management Plan already in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 (twice)</li> </ul>
			Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest relating objectives to the Management Plan core principles set out in page 13</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although this is a development plan document, and so objectives need to relate to development in the AONB as well as the management of the AONB</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying appropriate locations for affordable housing which will not have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area is a priority in the AONB. Justifiable to set a 100% affordable/local needs policy in the AONB, with market housing provided outwith</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes: need to mix skills and ages; key element in ensuring sustainable communities; retention of local services; reducing travelling distances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply priorities expressed in housing needs survey. Need for “whole life housing” and affordable to service and maintain</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apply exceptional circumstances tests, against special qualities/landscape and seascape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield within settlements, but no need for a target within the AONB: not all brownfield land is appropriate for development – assess case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider settlement character. Apply density according to special qualities of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, if specific need and within landscape character and special qualities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use brownfield land as a priority with no impact on landscape quality or character. Choose sustainable locations with public transport/ cycling/ walking access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed policy based on landscape character, capacity and special qualities with restrictions on major energy developments in line with NPPF 116. Identify unacceptable developments. Reference to AONB setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote alternatives to the car</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No locations. Provision for bicycles required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about scale of development: suggest audit of permissions and facilities to inform policy, which should focus on landscape character, tranquillity and AONB special qualities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments [Councils have full audited information on caravan sites in the AONB]</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support AONB Partnership response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should contain policy relating to all development which focusses on protecting and enhancing landscape character, seascape character, important coastal features, the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<p>distinctive settlement patters of the area and the special qualities of the AONB. This should be the basis of assessing development proposals in the AONB: no support for proposals that will have detrimental impact. Need work on landscape capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider need for LVIAs for certain developments, including identification of key viewpoints, together with requirements for specific viewpoints for individual applications</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed, for planning applications</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informed by AONB Management Plan. Policy required reflecting information within section 5.1c</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limiting factor in the ability to accommodate development: utilise EA information on drainage hotspots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: more information required</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy required that looks at the unique features of the AONB and seeks to enhance locally important historic assets, using FLD response to Q3. Specific policy required relating to conservation areas and their setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy required for design with reference to Management Plan. Potential hook for further detailed design guidance. Highest standards of energy efficiency required for all new buildings, as set out in section 5.2d of Management Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide. Energy efficiency for buildings will be subject to Buildings Regulation criteria</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v): sustainable and balanced approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support AONB Partnership response</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, for primary and secondary settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, with prioritisation of most appropriate sites e.g. brownfield sites. May be influenced by infrastructure availability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape capacity work required</li> <li>Policies should be AONB focused</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
252	Mrs Sarah Fishwick		Q6/10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour development of affordable housing on brownfield sites. Sub-divide larger houses to make more sustainable/affordable properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about funding reductions for public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance service</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support provision of more parking at Silverdale station</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resist development in flood-risk areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed as a key factor in site assessment</li> </ul>
253	Dr Bart Donato		Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope of good design standards to benefit nature and landscape elements of the AONB's character: e.g. in providing nest sites, associated landscaping, use of local energy sources (woodburners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD is likely to contain design policies</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for better enforcement and monitoring of existing infrastructure – particularly re sewerage provision and diffuse pollution. Could be a fundamental constraint to development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. More information required on sewerage and pollution</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include orchards and remnant orchards in the elements list</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek assurance that all sites with impact on biodiverse sites will be rapidly screened out. Consideration also to restoration potential of biodiverse habitats/species, and not be compromised by development. Importance of key habitat linkages (Ecological Network Planning by LCC)</li> <li>Important that biodiversity relates to diversity not just headline species</li> <li>Proactively aim to protect species that form part of settlement character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration. Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>Noted</li> <li>Noted – any examples?</li> </ul>
254	Mr Dave Sharratt	United Utilities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific comments on the Discussion Paper</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerning, given Q23.</li> </ul>
255	Ms Fiona Pudge	Sport England	Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommends that CIL list includes specific projects for sports facilities, and that mitigation for loss under NPPF para 74 falls outside CIL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although Lancaster has not introduced CIL</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommends use of s106 agreements for new sports facilities to meet new demand (detailed advice with links)</li> <li>• Need should be based on an Indoor and Outdoor Needs Assessment and a Playing Pitch Strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> <li>• Will base assessment on district wide assessments: separate studies would not be proportionate for such a small area</li> </ul>
			Q18/19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider the function of open space: should include playing fields (public and private). Need to ensure no loss of playing fields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
256	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for a definition. Decisions and policy should be based on NPPG which requires assessment of physical size of development in its setting, and the location in the context of the overall AONB environment. Therefore, case by case</li> <li>• Favour a threshold for housing development of 20 dwellings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See response to rep 26</li> <li>• See response to rep 26. Evidence required</li> </ul>
257	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement in Lancaster of requirements should be based on settlement hierarchy, adjusted to account for limits of AONB</li> <li>• Affordable housing could rely on housing needs roll-over, but will require new survey to inform later plan period</li> <li>• Complicated by government announcements on affordable housing/DCLG consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115</li> <li>• AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> <li>• Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
258	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support vision in principle, but it should say that development will be planned and delivered, not just managed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. We will</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should also say that development will meet identified housing, employment and other requirements of the AONB</li> </ul>	<p>review the vision, although it already refers to delivering as well as managing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree: important for the DPD to distinguish the needs and requirements that will be met, from the locations: some of the AONBs needs may be met outside the AONB</li> </ul>
259	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to wording of Objective (3): amend to read that the DPD will meet the housing requirement of the AONB, not just local needs, which could relate solely to affordable housing. Objective is to meet market housing too</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
260	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response will be subject to outcome of DCLG consultation on starter homes and affordable housing. DPD must incorporate delivery of starter homes once new definition adopted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
261	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unnecessary to include policy to prescribe how particular housing needs should be met apart from starter homes and affordable housing. Developers will deliver homes to meet different types of needs where they are needed. Proposals should be assessed on their merits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
262	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield land may not be sequentially prioritised in preference to greenfield land. A local target may be set but cannot be binding given the limited amount of brownfield land in the AONB, so no meaningful benefit of setting a target</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
263	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of drainage or sewerage is not an impediment in principle to development. Subject to EA and Building Regulations standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD. Serious concerns expressed by others about</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					ability of ground to accommodate more sewerage discharges
264	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour combination of options (ii) and (v), subject to reference to housing requirement. Development sites must be founded on settlement hierarchy, but must also ensure some scope for meeting local needs where they arise, including in smallest villages. Would allow planned allocations plus windfall allowance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
265	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Settlement boundaries are helpful to give certainty about principle of acceptable development, but not usually made in designated areas. If identified, should be applied to all settlements and should not be drawn too narrowly or tightly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development boundaries have been applied to AONB part of South Lakeland for many years</li> </ul>
266	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No requirement or justification for phasing: unnecessary risk to delivery, given need to boost housing supply and lack of 5-year housing land supply in Lancaster</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period. The 5-year land supply matter must be resolved against the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB</li> </ul>
267	Mr Graham Love	Janet Dixon Town Planners	Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of this site, on behalf of prospective developers, in the sustainable settlement of Silverdale, with a full range of local services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</b></li> </ul>
268	Mr Oliver Bateman	Carter Jonas	Sites A18/19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development of these sites (on behalf of owner), which are within development limits of the local service centre of Arnside and close to facilities. A19 has reduced visual impact. Sites surrounded by residential properties, and safe access could be secured (details available on request). Should be considered as a whole, not piecemeal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sites A18 and A19 are not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
269	Mr Matthew Wyatt	JWPC Limited	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definition of major development not contained in NPPF: DPD should not rule out developments of 10 or more dwellings. Limits could hinder Council ability to meet housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB,</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				targets: settlements are expected to accommodate growth	based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs14 (with footnote 9) and 115
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirements should be based on gross housing requirements for each Council. Gross figures should be adjusted to take account of completions. Limits on development will harm rural services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. Affordable housing proportions are likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations but some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be useful to have consistent affordable housing % in AONB, but uncertainty following ministerial announcements/consultation. Wise to promote starter homes to meet housing needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Starter homes are a specific type of housing type that has not yet been defined by the Government. We need to know what starter homes are before we can decide how starter homes will relate to this DPD</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, will limit economic growth in main settlements. Would limit viability to developers and add costs/increase risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No policy required: assess on a case-by-case basis. Applicants could justify mix based on local evidence base (of housing need) and site context</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfair to prioritise development on rural estates over any other exception policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site availability in the AONB is very limited. Will be ineffective against requirement to deliver housing against OAN and the requirement for development to respect AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement, and there will be no apportionment against the district-wide OAN calculations. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. Consider site by site, guided by AONB setting and viability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited capacity to improve historic roads. Focus development towards the east, closer to public transport routes. Favour development in Silverdale with close proximity to the station and other services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, at stations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>



## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May request LVIA where appropriate, to ensure schemes complement landscape features and settlement context. Sites should promote growth across whole of Silverdale settlement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, subject to landscape capacity</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate for DPD to expect high standard of design. No further policies required beyond those in district-wide plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, new site submission on land at Bottoms Lane, Silverdale, for residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted (site S128), now withdrawn</li> </ul>
270	Ms Maria Nelis		Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open land in Warton should be protected from development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
271	Ms Maria Nelis		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No, on a case by case basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
272	Ms Maria Nelis		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build only on brownfield sites, including those at Carnforth, which are closer to services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
273	Ms Maria Nelis		Q4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with vision/objectives, except objective (3): do not accept that housing needs survey shows need to increase housing in Warton or any open areas in AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements</li> </ul>
274	Ms Maria Nelis		Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing on brownfield sites only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield sites in AONB, and then outside AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield sites are under consideration for development. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New car parks on brownfield land only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate sites that are proposed for development in Warton as open space instead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from development. Unlikely to be required to protect open countryside</li> </ul>
275	Ms Maria Nelis		Site W82/85/96	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield suitable for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W82 withdrawn.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</li> <li>Site W96 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			W86	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideally keep open but could be developed if W85 is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W86 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site W85 is not being taken forward for allocation as it already has outline planning consent (15/00847/OUT)</li> </ul>
			Site W84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep open, flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W84 withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Sites W87/88/89/95/W83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep open: part of greenfield below Warton Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W83, W87 and W95 are not suitable for development. Part of Sites W88/W89 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Site W90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep open for school amenity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W90 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites W92/93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: poor access to sites. Road safety concerns. Retain as open land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites W92/93 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site W94	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep open; land close to Warton Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W94 already has planning consent for two dwellings (14/00499/OUT).</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, draw development boundary around Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
276	Mr Ray Lee		Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development in Silverdale: concern about impact on natural environment, about lack of jobs and services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
277	Ms Geraldine Moore		Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site not sustainable; has poor access on narrow road with no pavement. Village has few services, open spaces or jobs, poor drainage and sewerage. Impact on nearby listed building. Better to focus development on larger settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
278	Ms Rowena Lord		Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about fragile services in Silverdale, with several threats to closure. People will buy houses and drive to work outside the area</li> <li>Concern about SLDC indicative requirement for 123 houses, and apparent requirement for 72 affordable houses in the next 5 years</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> <li>We do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
					the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for 72 dwellings over five years (the DPD period is 15 years) but not all housing needs have to be met within AONB. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction
			Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development on a case by case basis according to criteria, with a presumption that what qualifies as a major development in the NPPF will count as one in the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider AONB requirements and opportunities in relation to neighbouring areas where there are more services: Carnforth and Milnthorpe, and assess real need for social housing on a rolling basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County Council commitment to bus services; water quality in the Bay; availability of brownfield sites; details of all caravan sites</li> <li>Speak to social housing providers about demand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All noted, important matters</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that affordable housing need will require considerable number of market houses to be built in AONB. Acknowledge difficulties in securing affordable housing in the context of Right to Buy and recent government policy.</li> <li>Consider self-build</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, new affordable housing should be limited to local people and or sole occupation. No local occupancy restrictions on market housing because they would not reduce house prices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. All affordable housing is subject to a local connection restriction</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sympathetic to genuine need, with brownfield priority, but sceptical of self-created need.</li> <li>Ensure minimum landscape impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise brownfield where possible, but no target. Not evenly distributed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not rigid, but generally better to have relatively high density, esp for small rental property, but needs to be appropriate to setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for reliable mobile signal, fast broadband, larger car park at Silverdale station, short term parking in Silverdale village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Services point is important but services are not fully under the control of the planning process: plan aims to protect and enhance services</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy should cover fracking, wind turbines (of all scales), commercial solar arrays, tidal energy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited scale of development. No major development in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking at Arnside and Silverdale stations. Short term parking in Silverdale village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for caravan site audit for AONB. Favour no new sites, no expansion of existing sites, no new pitches within site curtilage – in interests of minimising landscape and traffic impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data already known. It shows that there are 1684 pitches on 18 sites in the AONB (July 2015). Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to penultimate point “or will it be required to provide the forthcoming public access to the coastline?”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. This will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add land around Leeds Children’s Home and Site A2: important views and visual amenity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set criteria for assessment: clear presumption against development that would have major impact on seascape, landscape or coastal features. No development on the coast at all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict development where no mains drainage or sewer, especially near the coast</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare design guides, with reference to recent successes and failures. Ideas from elsewhere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Favour option (v), though anticipate capacity of the landscape to allow only very small amounts of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use criteria instead of boundaries, especially helpful in respect of dispersed settlements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, this will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify sites with periodic review. Rule out unsuitable sites now and explain why to prevent repeated proposals for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood. Site assessments for all suggestions will clearly set out why any site is suitable or unsuitable</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public access to the coast: its potential impact and how best to accommodate it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site A1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support continued use as allotments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A1 is being protected as Open Space.</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of any sort: part of site is designated SSSI, and adjoins designations; prominent coastal land; development would be conspicuous; adjoins shore access point.</li> <li>Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A3/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support designation as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A3 and A20 are being protected as Open Space.</li> </ul>
			Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: distant from village and services, surrounded by open land; narrow access; visual intrusion on adjoining open access land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A11/12/14/107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider all sites together</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A11 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site A12 (A11).</li> <li>Site A14 is not available for development.</li> <li>Site A107 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unsuitable for development: edge of village away from services; landscape impact; traffic and road safety</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A17 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A18/19/23/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should not creep up the slope to obscure view across to the fells</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A18, 19 and 24 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site A23 is being protected as part of a Key Settlement Landscape.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site A22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should be left open or not developed to any height</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A22 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A23/24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comments made]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A23 is being protected as part of a Key Settlement Landscape.</li> <li>Site A24 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would have little impact on landscape. Care with visibility splay at junction with Station Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Sites A26/27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some brownfield and some vulnerable to flooding. Must retain access to path on railway embankment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites A25/26/27 are being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site A29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A29 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site A97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development of any sort: open countryside. Distant from amenities; poor and unsafe access; surrounded by designated sites; site planting undertaken in 2002 after quarry activity ceased was a condition; geological and engineering safety in the quarry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A97 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site A106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development if well-designed and no flood-risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A106 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: near village with restricted amenities; LPO; wooded open countryside, access roads narrow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B31 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Closer to village centre and its facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: remote; narrow access roads; adjoins SSSI; in open countryside, no facilities, already developed as a caravan park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B33 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield, adjacent to other development, though distant from other facilities. Consider cumulative impacts along with other sites in Sandside/Storth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B35 is being taken forward for business or mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distant from services along narrow road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: distant from transport and services, part protected by LPO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large site for a small village: traffic problems, LPO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site W34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good connections with services at Carnforth, but concerns about flood-risk and run-off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site has full planning permission for residential development</li> </ul>
			Sites W88/89/90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large development site: impact on Warton Crag and landscape</li> <li>Ribbon development, urbanising effect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parts of Sites W88/W89 are being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>Site W90 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site Y99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is within village, but is close to historic buildings; prominent in the village and landscape and distant from facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consent granted for outbuildings and amended vehicular access (13/00798/FUL) for Site Y99. Any amendments to this consent could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site Y101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: harm to visual amenity and open countryside views. Would merge Yealand Redmayne and Yealand Storrs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y101 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object: development would merge Yealand Redmayne and Yealand Conyers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield with limited impact on landscape, but remote from services. Access problems. Consider with S46/56/58</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites S41 and S46 are not available for development.</li> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of whole site would be inappropriate: too large and distant from services; traffic impact. Favour road frontage development plus S41</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S46 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: drainage; major site; access and traffic impacts, greenfield agricultural land</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S58 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development on greenfield site, potential traffic safety and access problems, but small development may be suitable - short walking distance to village centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small amount of development is proposed on part of Site S56.</li> </ul>
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site developed, no further consideration</li> </ul>
			Site S43/57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of an important open vista in Silverdale, including Townsfield. Neighbouring property holds restrictive covenant [check]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S43 withdrawn</li> <li>Site S57 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S57 – If developed on its own – low rise</li> </ul>	
			Site S45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about access and impact on setting of house</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S45 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Sites S44/52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: in open countryside; biological designations; tranquil; water quality risks. Poor access. Leisure or tourism would be inappropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S44 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S52 was linked to proposed development on S44 and no development was proposed on S52 itself.</li> </ul>
			Site S47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning consent granted on this site. Work started</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed. Consent granted for residential development on Site S47 (13/00085/FUL).</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: no access, valuable footpath across it, not available – owner not willing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development on well-connected site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site S50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major site: unsuitable for large development. Owner does not want it built on.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site withdrawn</li> </ul>
			Site S53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs care with design, visual impact and access point - access may not be suitable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S53 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable but long pedestrian access to village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site undeliverable</li> </ul>
			Site S55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: prominent site in open countryside, away from services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S55 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable as a car park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S70 is being taken forward for mixed-use development.</li> </ul>
			Site S98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: greenfield site in open countryside away from services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S98 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
279	Mr Stephen Gibbs		Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All development in the AONB should be considered major development and permitted on an exceptional basis only if there are sustainable reasons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but questions basis of 72 properties. Suggestion that some needs could be met outside the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AONB Housing Needs Survey (2014) gives a good indication of needs arising in all settlements. However, we do not believe it is necessary to identify an AONB-specific housing requirement. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could parts of existing caravan sites be used where there are already facilities?</li> </ul>	<p>NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caravan sites are not residential, and do not contribute towards housing requirements or targets</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visitor Travel survey, population breakdown</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend supplementary vision to begin: “<b>Any</b> new housing...”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, this will be considered</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy starting point should be 100% affordable. Encourage self-build, make it easier to convert larger houses, community schemes, seek Govt grants etc.</li> <li>Avoid large executive houses subsidising low cost housing – this is inappropriate and another model must be found</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> <li>The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. The Housing Needs Survey identified needs including by type/size of property</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, for new housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycleways, coastal footpath, parking at Silverdale station and in Silverdale village, fast broadband, better mobile coverage, bury overhead electricity cables</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Some of these items are outside the control of the DPD</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledge limited scope for improving AONB roads: meaning development should be limited. Promote cycling and public transport. Country lane lay-bys for walkers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to 12 and 15</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new caravan sites or further expansion. Surveys needed of what exists</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data already known. It shows that there are 1684 pitches on 18 sites in the AONB (July 2015). Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledge the special character of open spaces within Silverdale. Avoid temptation to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Open space policies are designed to protect land within the built up areas from</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				infill: retain village open spaces as essential to character	development. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD
			Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate the coastline, protect Site A2 from development and Leeds Children's Home for inappropriate development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of mains drainage in Silverdale limits future development opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider what works/doesn't work: good example at Cove Orchard and Stoneleigh Court; Royal Hotel, West Lindeth and next to Masonic Lodge not good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summary of general observations (detail) in favour of the benefits offered by the AONB. Favour development in Carnforth and Milnthorpe where sites and services available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Boundary for Silverdale inappropriate because of fragmented nature of settlement, which is an essential and characteristic feature</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing is essential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>
			Q31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict caravan movement times to ease congestion.</li> <li>Avoid suburbanisation of villages (street furniture, signs, white lines)</li> <li>Do not wish to increase signage but consider 40mph limit for whole AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, although evidence required for this</li> <li>Noted: some of this is outside the remit of planning</li> <li>Noted: subject to consideration by two highway authorities</li> </ul>
			Site A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect from development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A2 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about traffic levels on Lindeth Road, but support development on road frontage. Incorporate failed café into affordable housing scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S46 is not available for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: no access, significant wildlife site, part not available, limestone pavement order, public footpath, privacy issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S48 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site S49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support development for housing if sympathetic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S49 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
280	Mr John Scargill	Beetham Parish Council	Q20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Propose that sites at Beetham Sports Field, Storth Recreation Ground and Dixies at Sandside be protected as open spaces (map)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: these suggestions have been received. All open space proposals will be considered separately prior to publication of draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aware of balance between need for development and the protection of the AONB from development in the NPPF. Recognise significances of the parish and the limitations (e.g. narrow roads). Main focus on promoting brownfield sites and improving Quarry Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
			Sites B31/33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to expansion of caravan park: conflict with landscape and biodiversity; adverse impact on narrow roads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B31 and B33 are not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: Unsuitable for significant housing; narrow access from private road; high landscape value and impact on Conservation Area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B32 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: popular recreation area includes woodland and limestone pavement; landscape and biodiversity. Narrow road access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B73 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield site: landscape and biodiversity, woodland and limestone pavement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B74 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield site: landscape and biodiversity value with public access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B76	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development on greenfield site: includes extensive limestone pavement and woodland; high landscape and biodiversity value; prominent site with poor access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B76 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development or redevelopment within site curtilage may be acceptable with form and material to respect existing buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B104 would more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Sites B108/109/110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Narrow access. High landscape value. Very limited development of eastern portion of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B108 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				B108/110 may be acceptable if in keeping with Conservation Area character and views into and from AONB.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of Site B109 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> <li>B110 is being taken forward for residential development as part of B108.</li> </ul>
			Site B112	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential infill site if developed with respect to character of the Conservation Area and view into and from the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B112 is being taken forward for residential development.</li> </ul>
			Sites B35/38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li>Site B35 is being taken forward for business or mixed-use development.</li> <li>Site B38 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site: design should acknowledge high landscape value of setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B36 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site B37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site: poor access; any development must account for large historic heronry.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B37 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site. Land to east has high biodiversity value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B39 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: high landscape and biodiversity value. Limited access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B40 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B77 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should require improvement of un-adopted Nun's Avenue and respect landscape/biodiversity value of wider area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B78 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: high landscape and biodiversity value; long standing access and recreational use. Poor road access. Major development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B79 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: landscape and biodiversity value; widely used by the public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B80 is being protected as Open Space</li> </ul>
			Site B81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed by the Parish Council for development. Support to access through TP site to access land to rear</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B81 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development acceptable if site assembly can be achieved from multiple ownerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B113 is not available for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Site B114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: high landscape and biodiversity value. Close to Teddy Heights reserve. Limited access with no footpaths</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site suggestion has been withdrawn by the new owners</li> </ul>
			Site B115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suitable for infill, but with care for the immediate landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B115 could more appropriately be dealt with through the Development Management process.</li> </ul>
			Site B116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: poor access on Quarry Lane. Major development too big for Storth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B116 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support access road through B81 to access development of this site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B117 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
281	Ms Kerstin Nagel		Q26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose development in Silverdale, except for council houses for local people; concern about village character, traffic on narrow roads, caravan developments, empty properties, impact on biodiversity, loss of open land. Favour brownfield development, use of empty buildings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations. Brownfield sites are under consideration for development</li> </ul>
282	Mr George Wright		Site A15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: designate as open space: limestone grassland which floods regularly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A15 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
283	Mr Allan and Mrs Helen Sayers		Site Y103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to ribbon development: no mains drainage or sewers and close to existing soakaways; close to listed buildings; access, traffic, road safety, flood-risk, school capacity, limited services. Concern about bus service cuts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y103 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
284	Ms Wisdom	Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of mains sewerage is a major problem in much of the AONB. Resolution requires enforcement, better monitoring, and better design standards. Diffuse pollution is compromising water bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include orchards and relict orchards in elements list</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many sites have direct or indirect impacts on designations, including local wildlife sites. Expect these to be screened out. Concern also about restoration potential for biodiversity, including key linkages (ecological networks)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood. The draft plan will be guided by the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development within the AONB, based on our interpretation of the NPPF, including paragraphs 14 (with footnote 9) and 115. The site</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support required for key species that form part of the settlement character: diversity of species and species assemblages</li> </ul>	<p>suggestions are the result of a 'Call for Sites' process designed to help ensure that as many sites as possible were considered in order to select the most appropriate sites. At this stage, the process has not allocated any sites for development: all potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted: need information on the species under consideration</li> </ul>
285	Mr Michael Barry	Cumbria County Council	Q1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major development is addressed in national policy and guidance and need not be defined in the DPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to rep 26</li> </ul>
			Q2/8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD should identify specific development sites to cover the plan period, using SHMA information. Allocations require detailed environmental consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robust assessment of infrastructure requirements and economic development interventions, and set out in IDP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend "protects" to "conserve" in first bullet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. We will consider this</li> </ul>
			Q6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>% guided by evidence in SHMA and any subsequent work including viability evidence. Market housing may be a cross-subsidy option on exception sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occupation restrictions may not be in line with NPPF and may hinder housing delivery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Follow existing planning policy framework, including impact on AONB character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use sustainable brownfield sites first and maximise opportunities to do so, but no need for sequential testing in a policy – could place unnecessary barriers to otherwise appropriate sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Affordable housing likely to be guided by need, combined with viability calculations</li> </ul>
			Q11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not appropriate: guide by local character and case by case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed. Approach to density based on NPPF para 47</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
			Q12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, with appropriate delivery strategy in IDPs. Need to work with County Councils to quantify requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support creative AONB-specific approach to employment development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large scale energy developments would not fit with AONB character. Small scale energy development may be appropriate, esp solar. Policy should refer to AONB setting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for appropriate access arrangements and for developments to be sustainably located. Promote sustainable transport, including cycleways and pedestrian links. Use of developer contributions to provide or fund. Enhancements to Arnside station. Reduce car dependence and support visitor economy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted, including location</li> </ul>
			Q17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider against established policy and character of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Caravan policy and possible allocations will be informed by evidence including impact assessments</li> </ul>
			Q18/19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support approach to designation of important open spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific policy on the conservation of the landscape character and visual amenity, with reference to specific landscape character assessments. This should specify how landscape characteristics are conserved when considering new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed</li> </ul>
			Q22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand on national or local policy if detail of protection/local evidence warrants it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage and sewerage facilities are critical. Sewerage treatment should be guided by EA standard conditions. CCC can supply policy wording</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make use of Conservation Area Appraisals, Historic Designed Landscape Survey and Traditional Orchards Survey. Cross reference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				these studies to design, open space, landscape and historic environment policies	
			Q25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider detailed design guidance, which could be incorporated into DPD policy (or a Supplementary Planning Document)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DPD is likely to contain design policies, so it will not be necessary to prepare a separate design guide</li> </ul>
286	Mr Robert Pickup		Site B75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site recently annexed by Dallam Estate, despite having had open access for over 150 years. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B75 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B80	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site with open access for over 150 years. Designate as open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B80 is being protected as Open Space</li> </ul>
287	Mr Eric Roberts	Electricity North West	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to ENW responsibilities and relationship with potential developers. Scope for some impact on infrastructure, subject to decisions or preferences on site allocations</li> <li>Mapping service available which shows ENW assets (at cost)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Noted and welcomed</li> </ul>
288	Mr Andrew Tait	Steven Abbott Associates	Site Y102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter in support of original site suggestion, for residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y102 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
289	Mr Andrew Tait	Steven Abbott Associates	Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter in support of original site suggestion, for residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
290	Mr Andrew Tait	Steven Abbott Associates	Site Y101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter in support of original site suggestion, for residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site Y102 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
291	Ms Ann Gegg		Q8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need smaller and cheaper housing, not 4-beds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. The Housing Needs Survey identified needs including by type/size of property</li> </ul>
			Q15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about traffic and road safety on narrow roads, and about loss of public transport</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
			Q23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about building over soakaways, and about drainage and flood-risk in Silverdale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and understood</li> </ul>
292	Mr David Parker		Sites S43/53/54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to development: concern about access along narrow roads, and road safety; loss of good pasture. Concern about flood-risk, drainage, biodiversity and loss of views from the school. Develop alternatives elsewhere</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S43 withdrawn</li> <li>Site S53 is not available for development.</li> <li>Site S54 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
293	Mr Michael Redman		Q30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPD requires implementation plan that is phased across 5 year periods to relate to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Phasing will be applied as a way of guiding development throughout the plan period</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
				housing needs surveys, to avoid inappropriate development	
294	Mr Bob & Mrs Sue Harrison		Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about impact that development would have on traffic and road safety on Knott Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
295	Mr Neil & Mrs Michelle Entwistle		Site S43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owners of site S43: wish it to be withdrawn from consideration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and agreed: site withdrawn</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

No	Name	Organisation	Question /Site Ref	Summary of Comments Received	Officer Response
ES1	Mr N.M. Dyson		Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access unsuitable. Road can't cope with current traffic levels. Unsafe, untreated in winter.</li> <li>• Water pressure below national minimum standard</li> <li>• Limited local amenities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• <b>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
ES2	Ms Steph Rhodes	Lancashire County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing to add to comments sent in response to previous consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
ES3	Dr Colin Peacock		Site W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension to village footprint</li> <li>• Distant from village centre and school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site W128 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
ES4	Ms Alison Chippendale	Health & Safety Executive	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No representation to make at this stage</li> <li>• Would like to be consulted when specific site allocation proposals are put forward</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
ES5	Ms Fiona Pudge	Sport England	Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would result in loss of part of golf course – object unless either: a needs assessment demonstrates it is surplus to requirements OR this part of the golf course is replaced by an equivalent or better quantity and quality</li> <li>• Suggest consult with England Golf to ascertain whether this portion of golf course is surplus to requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
ES6	Mr & Mrs Bennett		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local highways and drainage insufficient</li> <li>• Harm the landscape / tranquillity</li> <li>• Harm local wildlife habitats</li> <li>• Risk of loss of mature oak tree</li> <li>• Contradicts AONB designation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
ES7	Denise Challenor	Silverdale Parish Council	Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would result in loss of part of golf course</li> <li>• Unsustainable location far from village centre</li> <li>• Visually intrusive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• <b>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green field site surrounded by woodland/fields</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent woodland is Biological Heritage Site</li> <li>• TPO nearby</li> <li>• Away from village centre</li> <li>• Visual impact</li> </ul>	
ES8	Mr David Wood		Silverdale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of sewerage system means any development will exacerbate groundwater contamination from septic tanks/package sewage treatment plants</li> <li>• Not possible to meet EU requirements/Building regulations – no development should be permitted until issues resolves</li> <li>• EU Directive requires areas with over 2000 residents to have wastewater collection systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
ES9	Mr Michael Bolton		Site S126/ S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green field sites</li> <li>• Restricted vehicular access</li> <li>• No mains sewerage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• <b>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</b></li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
ES10	Mr Karl Saxon			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New site suggestion north of Black Dyke Road, Arnside</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site suggestion received and being subject to assessment</li> </ul>
ES11	Mr Alan Reeves		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detrimental impact on natural setting</li> <li>• Would result in congestion and safety issues on Bottoms Lane</li> <li>• Impact on views and landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
ES12	Ms Jane Harvey		Site S126/S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on visual amenity</li> <li>• Greenfield site beyond established limits of village core resulting in urbanisation</li> <li>• Set a precedence for further development</li> <li>• Modern buildings would impact on character of older buildings nearby</li> <li>• Trees subject to TPOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• <b>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</b></li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
			Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on visual amenity and landscape</li> <li>• Beyond established limits of village core resulting in urbanisation</li> <li>• Isolated location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• <b>Site B123 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>

## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

			Site W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on visual amenity and landscape</li> <li>• Beyond established limits of village core resulting in urbanisation</li> <li>• Visible from Warton Crag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• <b>Site W128 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
ES13	Dr James Edwards		Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of site is subject to Limestone Pavement Order</li> <li>• Access to site is inappropriate and unsafe for vehicles and pedestrians</li> <li>• Low water pressure and no mains drainage in the area</li> <li>• Lack of local facilities, including public transport</li> <li>• Likely cost of any new homes too high for locals – existing houses not selling</li> <li>• Existing development here has negative impact on topography and woodland landscape</li> <li>• Slackhead development would not have been approved had AONB designation been in place at the time</li> <li>• Would destroy important wildlife and woodland habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>• Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>• All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity/geodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> <li>• <b>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
ES14	Dr Richard Neary		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would destroy tranquillity of this part of the village</li> <li>• Bottoms Lane unsuitable for further traffic</li> <li>• More suitable sites in the Lancaster area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• Some housing needs may be met outside the AONB if suitable sites are not available within</li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
ES15	Ms Gail Armstrong		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of this site would harm the AONB designation</li> <li>• Harm to landscape and views</li> <li>• Limestone close to the surface</li> <li>• BAP Priority Habitat</li> <li>• Site contains features that the Sustainability Appraisal says should be protected such as walls, trees, hedgerows.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
ES16	Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments to make at this stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
ES17	Mr David Alexander		Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess against considerations set out in introduction to Issues and options paper</li> <li>• Unsustainable area with no services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slackhead development probably should not have been allowed – visually intrusive from wide area</li> <li>Development should be for local needs only</li> <li>Large, greenfield site</li> <li>Out of scale and at odds with intimate AONB landscape</li> <li>Local infrastructure (roads and services) cannot cope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES18	Keith Reed		Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isolated, unsustainable site</li> <li>Create a precedent for further isolated developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a precedent for further isolated developments</li> <li>Open attractive area - views would be harmed</li> <li>Harm rural nature / landscape character of area</li> <li>Would constitute major development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site is already developed</li> </ul>
ES19	Mr Andrew Hunton	Cumbria Constabulary		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No observations or comments to make at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES20	Mr Nick Smith	Network Rail		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments to make at this time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES21	Mr Wallace Park		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beautiful, tranquil, rural area close to biological heritage site and woodland and characteristic of AONB</li> <li>Road unsuitable for additional traffic</li> <li>Monotonous, urban style housing inappropriate</li> <li>No mains sewage system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES22	Mr Brian Lunt		Site A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prominent, open, highly visible and large site</li> <li>Harm views from Arnside Knott and its appeal to visitors/walkers</li> <li>Site intrinsic to natural beauty of AONB and its development would contravene the designation</li> <li>Knott Lane unsuitable for additional traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD.</li> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Site A7 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES23	Mr Jeremy Pickup	Environment Agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comments to make on specific sites at this stage</li> <li>Sequential test must be applied during the site selection process to ensure new development is steered away from areas of flood risk – use EA's soon-to-be-updated flood risk maps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

ES24	Mrs E Threfall			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only brownfield sites should be developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
ES25	Mr & Mrs K Conlon		Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Severely impinge on AONB special qualities</li> <li>No local services or facilities</li> <li>Local infrastructure unsuitable for further development including roads, sewers, public transport, drainage etc</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES26	Mrs Pam Davies		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside existing village footprint</li> <li>Adjacent Grade II listed farmhouse and limekiln</li> <li>TPO on large veteran oak tree</li> <li>Development would be contrary to AONB designation and would set a precedent for further development</li> <li>Road not suitable for additional traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visually intrusive across a wide area of the AONB</li> <li>Access roads unsuitable to accommodate further traffic</li> <li>Site remote from bus routes, schools and other facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES27	Mr Henry Parrott		Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to site is inappropriate and unsafe for vehicles and pedestrians</li> <li>Low water pressure and no mains drainage in the area</li> <li>Lack of local facilities, including public transport</li> <li>Likely cost of any new homes too high for locals</li> <li>Existing development here has negative impact on topography and woodland landscape</li> <li>Slackhead development would not have been approved had AONB designation been in place at the time</li> <li>Would destroy important wildlife and woodland habitat</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment.</li> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES28	Mr E W Craker		Sites B118/B119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites should be used for housing to remediate eyesore</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B118 and B119 are being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield site with severe access difficulties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B121 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B122	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield element should not be developed</li> <li>Southern half/old coal yard should be used for housing to remediate eyesore</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B122 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

			Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Isolated site, often waterlogged and prone to flooding</li> <li>Greenfield – should not be developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B123 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B124	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should be used for housing to remediate eyesore</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B124 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some logic to including this site if developed alongside neighbouring land such as B81</li> <li>Ship Inn is an asset to the village/wider area and should be retained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small part of Site B125 is being taken forward to facilitate mixed-use development of the surrounding sites (B81).</li> </ul>
ES29	Mrs Jean Holden		Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Woodland forms a wind barrier, protecting properties and is an amenity for residents</li> <li>Flood risk and flood defence</li> <li>Tourist draw – views over estuary and fells</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B123 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ship In is a popular public house and valuable local amenity that should be retained</li> <li>Flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small part of Site B125 is being taken forward to facilitate mixed-use development of the surrounding sites (B81).</li> </ul>
ES30	Mrs Gillian Maltas		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would create a blot on the landscape and give the area a 'built up' feeling</li> <li>Lane cannot cope with additional traffic</li> <li>Trees on site subject to TPO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES31	Mr Timothy Procter		Sites S126/S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tranquil greenfield site outside village and away from village centre</li> <li>Impact on neighbouring properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES32	Mrs Anne Porter		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Harm to limestone, pastoral landscape and precious, rare habitats</li> <li>TPO on mature oak tree</li> <li>Harm to vernacular character and listed buildings</li> <li>Lane too narrow - unsuitable for additional traffic</li> <li>Far from services and facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES33	Mr and Mrs D and L Shields		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lane too narrow - unsuitable and unsafe for additional traffic</li> <li>Impacts on views, wildlife and limited facilities in village</li> <li>Greenfield development contrary to AONB designation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES34	Ruth Livesey		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lane unsuitable for additional traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of noise, pollution</li> <li>• Small number of starter homes would be acceptable but not a large development</li> </ul>	
ES35	Mr Roger Cartwright		General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standard of design required to make such sites acceptable is rarely achieved</li> <li>• NPPF's Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development is questioned</li> <li>• Only genuinely sustainable development likely to be small scale eco-housing for those who live and work locally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
			Site B118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well designed, small scale commercial development could improve the landscape</li> <li>• Although brownfield, still a rural area - risk of cumulative development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B118 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield site with buildings that currently spoil the area</li> <li>• Any development must be really well designed to enhance the area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B119 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development would be visible from wide area of the AONB and would extend existing eyesore</li> <li>• Should remain open space, although very limited, small scale development possible</li> <li>• Restoration to small agricultural holding possible or create new woodland</li> <li>• Remote location – no justification for large scale development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attractive open field</li> <li>• Effectively a green belt protecting Storth</li> <li>• Remain as open space</li> <li>• More housing unnecessary and would extend already overdeveloped village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B121 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B122	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site already compromised and urban in nature of uses</li> <li>• Although brownfield, still a rural area - risk of cumulative development</li> <li>• Well designed, small scale commercial development could improve the landscape</li> <li>• Adjacent nature reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B122 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>



## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

			Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent belt of trees subject to TPO</li> <li>• Retain as green space and retain rural use as storage for sea-washed turf</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B123 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B124	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site already compromised – well-designed similar use could improve landscape</li> <li>• Adjacent nature reserve</li> <li>• Although brownfield, still a rural area - risk of cumulative development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site B124 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visually attractive historic building – positive asset to area – should be retained</li> <li>• Continue existing use</li> <li>• Flood risk</li> <li>• Development of rest of site would harm landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A small part of Site B125 is being taken forward to facilitate mixed-use development of the surrounding sites (B81).</li> </ul>
			Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly visible</li> <li>• Retain as green space</li> <li>• Golf course only allowed providing land remained open</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S126 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous damage to landscape as a result of conversion of farmland to gardens/paddocks</li> <li>• Retain as green space/woodland pasture</li> <li>• Support traditional management</li> <li>• Nature conservation has been given greater priority than historic, cultural landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large block of outlying, partly brownfield land.</li> <li>• Retain as green space for farming use and new woodland</li> <li>• Housing would extend ugly ribbon development beyond Sand Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site W128 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES36	Randy and Gail Coldham		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As owners of this site, we would like to withdraw it from consideration for development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>
ES37	Miss Jane Lambert		General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield sites should not be developed in an AONB</li> <li>• Sewerage situation in Silverdale should limit further development</li> <li>• Planners should rule out unsuitable sites before they are put out for consultation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harm to views and nearby listed buildings</li> <li>• Lane is unsuitable and unsafe for additional traffic</li> <li>• Harm to wildlife habitat including biological heritage site</li> <li>• Sewerage situation problematic</li> <li>• Greenfield site with limestone close to surface</li> <li>• Old oak tree with TPO</li> <li>• Not an infill site – far from village core – could set a precedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment.</li> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>
			Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site</li> <li>• Lane is unsuitable and unsafe for additional traffic</li> <li>• Development would be visually intrusive</li> <li>• Far from village</li> <li>• Sewerage situation problematic</li> <li>• Part of the golf course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site</li> <li>• Far from villages</li> <li>• Lane is unsuitable for additional traffic</li> <li>• Boggy land</li> <li>• Sewerage situation problematic</li> <li>• Development would be visually intrusive</li> <li>• Isolated - could set a precedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site S123 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
ES38	Mrs Ann Pearson		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see evidence of need for affordable housing in Silverdale before any is developed</li> <li>• Greenfield sites should not be developed</li> <li>• Lane is unsuitable and unsafe for additional traffic</li> <li>• Sewerage requirements cannot be accommodated and solutions visually intrusive and difficult in limestone bedrock</li> <li>• Contrary to AONB designation/principles</li> <li>• Listed farmhouse and limekiln nearby</li> <li>• Serious visual impact</li> <li>• Trees subject to TPOs, rare plants</li> <li>• Could set a precedent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site S127 withdrawn.</b></li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

ES39	Mr Brian Jones	Ramblers' Association, Lancaster Group	B120, B123, S126, S127, W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open countryside</li> <li>Visible in a way that detracts from AONB purposes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B120, B123, S126 and W128 are not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES40	Mr Alan Hubbard	The National Trust	S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visually sensitive location outside of main settlement and separated from it by Silverdale Green area</li> <li>Harm to open character of area and urbanising effect</li> <li>Lack of mains drainage and sewerage – solutions may also be harmful to local amenity and character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES41	Mrs Sarah Fishwick		Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elevated, isolated site</li> <li>Development would be visually intrusive and contrary to AONB designation</li> <li>Could set a precedent – prioritise brownfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Against greenfield development except as a last resort</li> <li>Could set a precedent – prioritise brownfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would have serious visual impact, stretching the village boundary</li> <li>Could set a precedent – prioritise brownfield</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W128 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES42	Mr Alan Bennett			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space due to its history, special character and range of benefits to people and wildlife</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES43	Mrs Lili Atkins	Friends of Silverdale		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES44	Dr Richard Neary			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
ES45	Ms Sue Crossley		Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield site</li> <li>Adverse impact on landscape</li> <li>Set a precedent for further isolated development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield site</li> <li>Natural Beauty of AONB should be protected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES46	Mrs Anne Neary			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developments that contravene AONB guidelines should be rejected</li> <li>Brownfield sites available</li> <li>No mains sewerage system</li> <li>Lane unsuitable for additional development</li> <li>Impact on wildlife habitat and large oak tree</li> <li>Questions why housing proposals on such sites are being assessed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment.</li> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES47	Mr Alan Ferguson		Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental to AONB and village character</li> <li>Ribbon development</li> <li>Greenfield site outside village footprint</li> <li>Species rich grassland with drystone walls and hedgerows – AONB characteristics</li> <li>Large oak tree subject to TPO</li> <li>Highly visible from 'The Pepperpot' National trust viewpoint</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visually prominent from the south and east</li> <li>Adjoins Underlain Wood SSS and shares many of its features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES48	Mr Derek James Lund			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES49	Mrs Margaret Roberts			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect from development</li> <li>No mains drainage in the village</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
ES50	Mr Peter Roberts			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

## Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	
ES51	Mr and Mrs Mike and Carole Evans			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silverdale Institute Field should be protected as Important Open Space, for which it was gifted to the community</li> <li>Object to current application for MUGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES52	Ms Lucy Barron	Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Partnership	Site B118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site that could be improved through sensitive development provided no detrimental impact to AONB's special qualities or adjacent woodland and limestone pavement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B118 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site that could be improved through sensitive development provided no detrimental impact to AONB's special qualities, coastal setting or adjacent international biodiversity designations</li> <li>Incorporate pedestrian and cycle access along the coast and with existing paths, including improved access to the brownfield land off Quarry Lane to help facilitate sensitive development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>Site B119 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>
			Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object - Significant impact on landscape character</li> <li>Limestone grassland/scrub woodland</li> <li>Highly visible from wider area of AONB</li> <li>Impact on biodiversity – includes priority habitat and is close to areas subject to biodiversity designations and limestone pavement order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity/geodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object – detrimental impact on landscape character</li> <li>Highly visible greenfield site</li> <li>Forms part of green / habitat corridor</li> <li>Site contributes to rural settlement character</li> <li>Adjacent limestone pavement order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity/geodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> <li>Site B121 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B122	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield section could be improved through development provided no detrimental impact to AONB's special qualities</li> <li>Greenfield section should be retained</li> <li>Whole site is adjacent limestone pavement order and ancient woodland development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity/geodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> <li>Site B122 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

				should not result in any detrimental impact to these	
			Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object – detrimental impact on landscape character</li> <li>• Highly visible greenfield site</li> <li>• Part of distinctive low lying pastoral landscape</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on biodiversity – includes priority habitat</li> <li>• No significant need for additional car parking here – suggest instead alter arrangements in adjacent ‘disabled only’ car park to provide small number of spaces for non-disabled users without expansion – together with additional parking at Station Yard, this would give adequate provision for walkers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>• <b>Site B123 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site B124	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield site that could be improved through development provided no detrimental impact to AONB’s special qualities</li> <li>• Ensure no detrimental impact on adjacent woodland and limestone pavement order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity/geodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> <li>• <b>Site B124 is being taken forward for mixed use development.</b></li> </ul>
			Site B125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could accommodate some further sensitive development provided no detrimental impact to AONB’s special qualities, coastal setting or adjacent international biodiversity designations</li> <li>• Historic Ship Inn should be retained as existing with garden, trees and sufficient car parking</li> <li>• Incorporate pedestrian and cycle access along the coast and with existing paths, including improved access to the brownfield land off Quarry Lane to help facilitate sensitive development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A small part of Site B125 is being taken forward to facilitate mixed-use development of the surrounding sites (B81).</b></li> </ul>
			Site S126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object – detrimental impact on landscape character</li> <li>• Rough limestone grassland with trees in visible, raised open countryside</li> <li>• Detriment to biodiversity – priority habitat and part of Local Wildlife site / adjacent Local Wildlife Sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that have passed the exclusion tests and are under consideration for allocation will be subject to a specific biodiversity assessment</li> <li>• All potential development sites that overlap a biodiversity/geodiversity designation have been excluded from further consideration</li> <li>• <b>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</b></li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

			Site S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We understand this site has been withdrawn from consideration by the owners and therefore have no comments at this stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object – detrimental impact on landscape character</li> <li>Open countryside and highly visible, including from Warton Crag</li> <li>Distant from main village</li> <li>Encroachment of development along Sand Lane</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impacts of potential development on the landscape will be assessed and used to inform the draft DPD</li> <li>Site W128 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
ES53	Ms Janet Baguley	Natural England	Sites B118, B119, B121, B122, B124, B125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites are in close proximity to Morecambe Bay SAC/SPA/Ramsar, Lune Estuary SSSI, Cockerham Marsh SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites B118, B119, B122 and B124 are being taken forward for mixed use development.</li> <li>Site B121 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>A small part of Site B125 is being taken forward to facilitate mixed-use development of the surrounding sites (B81).</li> </ul>
			Site B120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is in close proximity to Underlaid Wood SSSI and Marble Quarry and Hale Fell SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B120 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Site B123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site in close proximity to Morecambe Bay SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site B123 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
			Sites S126 /S127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site in close proximity to Leighton Moss SPA/Ramsar/SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site S126 is not suitable for development.</li> <li>Site S127 withdrawn.</li> </ul>
			Site W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site in close proximity to Morecambe Bay SAC/SPA/Ramsar/SSSI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site W128 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue of functionally linked land that supports qualifying bird species on a number of European Designated sites will need careful consideration in assessing any site's suitability</li> <li>Sites should be assessed using Natural England's Impact Risk Zone GIS tool to determine need to consult Natural England about nature impacts, avoidance or mitigation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
ES54	Mr Matthew Whittaker OBO over 40 residents of Warton		W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents support W128 as preferable alternative to other sites proposed for development in Warton</li> <li>Part brownfield site</li> <li>Site could fulfil development needs of village whilst avoiding areas of flood risk, retaining</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Site subject to assessment</li> <li>Site W128 is not suitable for development.</li> </ul>

## Arnside & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document: Interim Consultation Statement September 2016

				character and feel of village and minimising impacts on existing residents	
ES55	Jenny Hope	United Utilities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No specific site comments at this stage but response repeatedly refers to 'the proposed site'</li> <li>It may be necessary to coordinate any infrastructure improvements with the delivery of development</li> <li>Deliverability and practical issues associated with sites in multiple ownership needs to be carefully considered to ensure site-wide infrastructure strategy</li> <li>On greenfield sites, the natural discharge solution should be at least mimicked, having regard to the surface water hierarchy – every option should be investigated before discharging surface water into a public sewer</li> <li>Permeable paving and reduced hardstanding should be sought, as well as use of SuDS</li> <li>Water efficiency measures including water saving and recycling should be sought as part of the design of new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>Infrastructure needs and capacities are under consideration to inform the draft DPD</li> </ul>
ES56	Mr Alastair Skelton	Steven Abbott Associates		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New site suggestion north of Main Street/West of Church Hill, Warton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site suggestion received and being subject to assessment</li> </ul>
ES57	Mr Stuart Woods		Site B125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sole pub in Storth – Ship In should be retained along with adequate parking</li> <li>Further development of pub grounds should be for pub users not residential development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A small part of Site B125 is being taken forward to facilitate mixed-use development of the surrounding sites (B81).</li> </ul>