

Row Labels	1. Overview. Section 2
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Suggest that Greenside House also be included as a building of note in Hincaster. The data provided by the Cumbria Rural Housing Trust is based on replies from only 57% of the total numbers surveyed. What these 57% reveal is interesting, but what the missing 37% don't reveal is vital, sufficiently so as to necessitate caution in using the results of the Trust's survey as a basis for formulating valid policy conclusions. The Steering Group doesn't appear to have been inhibited in using the Trusts incomplete survey results. The 2011 Census shows 85 households in Hincaster, not 83 as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan
25341169	Para 2.6.Line 4. Being a pedant, but it should be "seven" family units rather than "six". eg Lower Haverflatts. Should some reference to the advent of fibre broadband be made? Its presence is of importance to householders, especially those working from home, and businesses. Otherwise - excellent!
25341834	Clearly set out
25389699	No comments
25407249	Thorough and complete
25449054	2.5 Refers to the 'excellent rail and road links', however 5.17 refers to 'poor connectivity' to access rail stations. In isolation 2.5 creates a biased view of excellence. 2.5 should therefore reflect the fact that 'although there are excellent rail and road links, poor connectivity is an issue'. 2.10 states that the CRHT Housing Survey 'showed a majority of the 56% who responded indicating the need for additional housing'. However Section 4 of the Appendices states that only '11.35% of respondents stated they foresaw a future housing need'. These two statements contradict one another. The survey figure of 13.35% indicates that only a 'minority' of the respondents indicated a need for additional housing. Or in other words, 88.65% did not foresee a future housing need. Section 2.10 is therefore incorrect.
25747223	The Constabulary welcomes the opportunity to contribute to this consultation. The Community Profiles make reference to the low levels of crime and anti-social activity occurring in these areas (Social and Cultural) (Equity and Prosperity) (Housing in the Built Environment)
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Well presented, well set out, easy to follow
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No comments
26325874	#N/A
26344026	(Arnside AONB) Mention of the AONB in paragraph 2.1 is welcomed, the Plan area being just to the north of A&S AONB and covering part of a landscape which forms the setting to the AONB.
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	Accurate
26575113	The overview highlights the main problem that the demographic is unbalanced in the favour of retired people. There is a prevailing attitude of preservation without change.
26605070	#N/A
26605795	2.1 Why should there be development just because we are on the borders of National Parks and AONB? An attractive buffer zone between parks and towns is surely a good idea? 2.5 Apart from working from home, and the work opportunities listed, it is difficult to imagine what work could be created in both villages, but particularly in Hincaster, which would not alter the character of the villages. It is inevitable and desirable that some areas remain residential. 2.10 Hincaster is surely already responding to the need for more housing in the development at Greenside, which will increase the number of households by 25%. This will put pressure on the very narrow lane, especially as it floods in winter. More houses will exacerbate the problem. Rural shops and Post Offices, (including those at Sedgwick, Endmoor and Milnthorpe), and pubs are failing all over the country. It is impractical to plan new ones. Most people left in Hincaster after the deregulation of the buses in the 80s rely on cars, and are used to going into Kendal for these amenities.
26611607	Introduction; Localism Act 2011 or 2012? Different dates on different pages. 2.3 Conservation Area; Document would have been better if it had had a plan defining this area. The group may know its extent but others may not. Tree Preservation orders that may exist in the 2 Parishes might also have been included/defined. 2.4 Russell Bros. Dugg Hill development was over 3 years 1967 to 1969. I suggest Haverwood was also late 60's but no matter. 2.8 4 units but only currently 3 businesses?

Row Labels	2 Focusing the plan. Section 3
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	The vision in 3.5 is laudable, but need to be corrected. The settlements of Heversham and Hincaster are no more "distinctive" than most of the surrounding villages; the immediate surroundings are not "conserved" landscapes in the usual sense of that word; and it is arguable whether in Heversham there is a strong "sense of community" bearing in mind the declining interest in community events which has been apparent over the last 20 years.
25341169	Excellent.
25341834	Good to learn that retention of present distinctive character of the 2 villages is considered throughout the plan
25389699	The point in para 3.1 about "creeping urbanisation" and "sensitivity to the scale of the settlements" should be emphasised.
25407249	Very good, especially 3.7
25449054	3.2 states 'many people have also made it clear that...development is both desirable and inevitable'. The term 'many people' is not quantifiable; for example, its use could be interoperated as 'a few', 'a large minority', 'majority' or any other subjective amount. Quantifiable figures or statements should be used instead of the term 'many people'. It would be erroneous for the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan to be driven by what could in effect be a minority of respondents; large or otherwise.
25747223	The Constabulary seeks The Group's support to reducing the opportunities for crime and anti-social activity, thereby enhancing the sustainability and wellbeing of the parishes.
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Concise, well explained, an easy read. Positive message.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No coments
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	I would take issue that the local people have commented. They maybe residents of the parish, but many have moved in (self included). I would suggest that being sympathetic to the area means ensuring more families can move in.
26605070	#N/A
26605795	3.3 If we accept that the location of the area makes it attractive to developers, and that they should have their way, we are accepting the very creeping urbanization that people don't want.3.8 Visions remain just that. Without knowing what might be built where, it is impossible to assess any impact.
26611607	No comment

Row Labels	3. General conditions HH1
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	The requirement to integrate with the characteristics of the existing settlements is a recipe for mundane future development. There will be no support for a "grand design", and the likes of Eversley will never get off the drawing board if such a restrictive policy condition is approved.
25341169	Excellent.
25341834	Emphasises the important requirements of the plan
25389699	The point in 4.1 about "new developments integrated within the existing communities" should be made more explicit in HH1.
25407249	Excellent
25449054	4.1 states 'wish to see new developments integrated within the existing communities in ways that enhance the community...'. This statement creates a bias that development is desired. 2.9 states 'in general, people are content with the Parishes as they are...and some...want very little change'. The bias is therefore not for change and 4.1 should be reworded to reflect 2.9 or at the very least, to remove the intimated bias for development.
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Clear concise statement, unambiguous.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No comments
26325874	#N/A
26344026	(Arnside AONB) Paragraph 4.1 covers general planning conditions. The plan area covers part of a landscape which forms the setting to the AONB and it will be important that development within the Plan area is not detrimental to the setting of the AONB or to views out from the AONB. Policy HH1 A states: "Each development proposal within the lifetime of the plan will be required to demonstrate that: A. It is of a scale and form that both respects and integrates with the topography; the surrounding landscape; the pattern and characteristics of the existing settlements and heritage assets..." Could we request that the AONB is acknowledged as being part of this surrounding landscape?
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	This doesn't actually say anything of substance
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.1 Obviously no-one wants their chosen way of life diminished. The principles seem sensible, but will be hard to adhere to, given Hincaster's narrow lane, and lack of mains sewage and gas. The number of vehicles coming through the village has increased considerably, and will increase again after the Greenside development. The speed and volume of these makes for danger to pedestrians who have to share the narrow lane with the traffic, there being no pavements.
26611607	How will these no doubt admirable if wordy policies A B C D be demonstrated by a developer. Submission of plans as now presumably. Who will decide then that they have been 'demonstrated'? I can understand A. B seems woolly C also. For instance how do you judge whether a development has a 'sense of place' D I can understand. I wondered if the group tried to apply these policies to say an application that has been determined or is may be current and if so did they come up with a different perspective/result?

Row Labels	4 Housing provision HH2
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Final planning consents for the Greenside Farm housing development were given after January 2015, and work on the scheme for inter alia 20 houses started this autumn. This would seem to preclude any further new dwellings in Hincaster until after 2025!
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Small and affordable housing should be the only housing developments allowed as there are already plenty of large houses with almost twice the number of detached houses as compared with the average in England
25389699	The issue of "additional housing need" is unclear: it is hard to see how this "need" could be demonstrated within such a small area as these two parishes, when (for example) the larger settlement of Milnthorpe is within walking distance of many parts of the area. It is not plausible, for example, that the new Greenside Farm development of mainly relatively expensive houses will help to meet housing "need" (however defined) in the immediate area. The section in HH2A "unless there is clear and quantifiable evidence of additional housing need in the two Parishes" should be deleted.
25407249	Modest figures wholly appropriate
25449054	4.4 states 'a large number of new houses...would significantly change the character of the communities and threaten the delivery of the vision'. 4.5 aims to prevent this by stating that the 'policy will...provide a ceiling for the number of additional dwellings'. Detail is provided in HH2. However the development of new business properties could also significantly change the character of the communities and as such, their ceiling should also be capped. Such a ceiling should be added to the plan and should be based on clear and quantifiable evidence. This should be incorporated into HH4.
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	I'm sure all parties are aware of national need and this document does not address this. However, personally I feel this review satisfies my opinion.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	HH2 A, B, and C. Not sure how the development at the old poultry farm between Hincaster and Viver fits in with these clauses.
26325874	#N/A
26344026	(Arnside AONB) We welcome the inclusion of housing policies restricting housing development to 30 dwellings in Heversham and Hincaster over the next 10 years (policy HH2) and limiting the scale of new development to a maximum of 6 houses (HH3).
26391370	#N/A
26469156	I would question / challenge the statement in section 4.4 that there is a local recognition that 'additional housing is likely to be required over the coming decade'. The Cumbria Rural Housing Trust Housing Survey showed that only 11.35% of respondents stated that they foresaw a future housing need, a very small proportion of only 56% of houses in the parishes. I do not support the numbers proposed for new dwellings in both Heversham and Hincaster nor the idea of carrying forward any unused balance. It suggests that 30 new properties would be acceptable over the next 10 years which I believe would have a too significant an impact on the look and feel of the parishes - an increase of 7.7%. I suggest an average of 1 new property per year is sufficient in Heversham and an average of 1 new property every two years in Hincaster. Wherever possible, these should be by reutilising derelict farm / other buildings.
26526602	#N/A
26555332	Disappointing that such a small number of new dwellings are being considered especially for Heversham, a sizeable community in need of affordable housing to encourage young people to remain in the village. With a maximum of 20 new dwellings in Heversham and 10 in Hincaster over the next 10 years, it goes nowhere to matching the projected population growth in the area. Also with 4 times the number of dwellings in Heversham to Hincaster, surely new development should be proportional. Hincaster is already getting 22 new dwellings this year, more than Heversham plans for the next 10 years!
26575113	This is insufficient
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.4 Agreed – a large number of new houses would completely alter both villages, and need radically different infrastructure. Do we need 10 new houses before 2025? Hincaster is already getting 22 at Greenside. The only lack is that of affordable homes. The current situation is that more expensive housing is not finding a market.
26611607	A So you could have 6 dwellings off Dugg Hill/Parkhouse Drive in 2020 and 6 the following year in 2021 in theory at least by reason of Policy HH3. OK

Row Labels	5. Housing delivery HH3
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	The Neighbourhood Plan refers to the demographic time bomb which will arise from the needs of an ageing population, and their wish to downsize. All that the Plan suggests is a few more bungalows to meet this need, yet a more sustainable approach would be to build retirement apartments near village centres/bus routes with a capacity per development of say 30 units. This could result in freeing up existing housing for younger residents, who also have housing needs at present. However, the current proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan preclude support for this kind of solution
25341169	Excellent
25341834	A staged development seems sensible as it will allow the required infrastructure to develop and hopefully ensure that requirement with regard to proximity of existing roads is met
25389699	The point in 4.6 about new housing being integrated into existing settlement footprints should be included as a specific policy.HH3E, on home working, should press for improved broadband provision - the basis of most home working now, and more so in the future.Traffic generation from new housing is not mentioned, although this is a major concern in an area with narrow (sometimes one-track) lanes - which contribute importantly to a sense of place and the "distinctive character" noted at 3.5. Just as employment developments will need main road access (HH4B), so housing developments should be considered in terms of the traffic they will generate and the capacity of the local road network.
25407249	Very good
25449054	4.8 states that the policy is designed to 'enable housing to be delivered in small developments which integrate well with the existing settlement form'. This is reinforced by HH3 B which states 'new housing developments will be subject to a proportionate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to ensure they do not cause any unacceptable impact...'. However the development of business properties will also impact the landscape and visual amenity of the area and as such the plan should subject such development to a LVIA. This should be incorporated into HH4.
25747223	Through the planning process, the Constabulary seeks the Group's support in encouraging developers to achieve Secured by Design. It may be of interest to note that developers in the private housing market are reluctant to adopt Secured by Design due to perceived cost factors. Consequently, the majority of housing achieving Secured by Design accreditation (across Cumbria) is in the social housing sector
25920152	#N/A
26055401	This ensures that the village as we now know it will retain its charm and character.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	Same comments as HH2. (No more than 6 dwellings)
26325874	#N/A
26344026	(Arnside AONB) We welcome the inclusion of housing policies restricting housing development to 30 dwellings in Heversham and Hincaster over the next 10 years (policy HH2) and limiting the scale of new development to a maximum of 6 houses (HH3).
26391370	#N/A
26469156	The proposal for new developments for up to 6 new properties would be too large and imposing. This number would be very difficult to fit in with the existing form of the village and could not be considered to be sensitive to the current look and feel of the parishes. I suggest this number is halved to a maximum of 3 properties.
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	See above
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.6 The Greenside development is a large cluster. Would the plan be supporting 2 clusters of 5 houses? Or a ribbon of 1 a year? 4.7 Builders rarely include more than a couple of "affordable" houses in any development, for reasons of profit. We could end up with more housing that still excludes the young/first-time buyer.Space for home-working is a good idea.
26611607	Policy B New housing to be subject to proportionate Landscape and Visual impact assessment; how will do this? SLDC. You would hope they do it now but do they? I doubt if the Parish Council will do it unless they give more attention and time to Planning Applications that come before them than they apparently do now.

Row Labels	6. Business/Employment HH4
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	HH4 is sensible but needs to be buttressed by a community infrastructure levy to prevent owners of business premises walking away at the close of their businesses leaving the site(s) to become derelict and a public nuisance. This occurred at Greenside Farm when the egg production business ended a decade ago, and is only now being redeveloped for 20 new houses. There is provision under the town and country legislation for a local authority to impose under Section 26 an order for a derelict site to be reinstated, but local authorities are reluctant to go down this route since, if the closed business has no assets, the reinstatement costs fall on the ratepayers. It is both unfair to the public who have to live amongst decaying structures, and immoral of owners of businesses who have taken the profits from their operations, to allow them to walk away and leave others to clear up the mess. A levy should be imposed on all new businesses which could be adjusted annually to yield a cumulative sum which would be sufficient to meet all reinstatement costs which might be incurred after the closure of the business. Hopefully this would prevent the kind of saga which occurred at Greenside Farm, which blighted the outlook of so many Hincaster residents for 10 years.
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Appears sensible, particularly for large developments to be adjacent to major road
25389699	No comments
25407249	Fine
25449054	4.4 states 'a large number of new houses...would significantly change the character of the communities and threaten the delivery of the vision'. 4.5 aims to prevent this by stating that the 'policy will...provide a ceiling for the number of additional dwellings'. Detail is provided in HH2. However the development of new business properties could also significantly change the character of the communities and as such, their ceiling should also be capped. Such a ceiling should be added to the plan and should be based on clear and quantifiable evidence. This should be incorporated into HH4.4.8 states that the policy is designed to 'enable housing to be delivered in small developments which integrate well with the existing settlement form'. This is reinforced by HH3 B which states 'new housing developments will be subject to a proportionate Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) to ensure they do not cause any unacceptable impact...'. However the development of business properties will also impact the landscape and visual amenity of the area and as such the plan should subject such development to a LVIA. This should be incorporated into HH4.
25747223	To resist criminal activity against business and employment development, the Constabulary seeks The Group's support in encouraging developers to achieve Secured by Design.
25920152	#N/A
26055401	There are several examples of former business sites that potentially could serve this community. To survive we must have balance.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No comments
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.9 Sensitive conversion of derelict buildings is a good idea.2B As far as Hincaster is concerned, our already dangerously inadequate lane could not support the traffic that such employment facilities must surely generate. In flood times, to go south, we already have to creep along Wellheads Lane, hoping not to meet any vehicle coming the other way.
26611607	I support Policy HH4. Strong control will have to be exercised in relation to any listed building. I presume is the Local Planning Authority who will determine any such application?

Row Labels	7 Tourism HH5
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Tourism yields no financial returns to Heversham and Hincaster generally (apart from caravan site owners and B&B operators), since the places where tourists might spend their money are outside the boundaries of the two parishes.If tourism is to develop, especially within Hincaster, the road infrastructure needs upgrading: the western approach from the Brettargh Holt roundabout contains a very long stretch of single track road without passing places, and the eastern approach is sometimes impassable because of flooding.An artificial ski slope and zip wire ropeway down Heversham Head towards Tristrams might kickstart Heversham as a tourist destination, but would it be supported under HH5?
25341169	I understand the Blue Bell is to be named "The Heversham Hotel" again after it re-opens in 2016 following major refurbishment.Otherwise excellent.
25341834	Desirable but possibly unrealistic
25389699	No comments
25407249	Fine
25449054	4.15 refers to 'redundant or underused farmland being considered' being considered for tourism development. Farmland is a finite resource which is highly desirable to existing farms which are trying to increase their landholding; which brings economies of scale (as highlighted in 2.6, sentence 4). Therefore, prior to any landowner converting their 'redundant or underused farmland' for tourism development, it should first be demonstrated that the land is not required by the wider farming community for ongoing agricultural use.5.14 refers to 'an increase in caravan movement on the marsh' and that it will 'affect movement on the single track roads...and some widening or additional passing places will be required. Also...' However 3.8 specifically stated that 'the plan should be framed around policies rather than being site specific'. 5.14 infers that certain development (associated with the marsh) is already going to take place. The reference to the site should be removed to prevent 5.14 being pre-biased in favour of the marsh for site specific development.
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	As proprietor of a hotel with 27 rooms and 80 seater dining room - the ultimate down sizing can and will result in a TOURISM VOID. Wearing a villager hat this must be regrettable - pathways essential.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No comments
26325874	There are walkers all year round who would welcome a cafe/shop.
26344026	(Arnsdale AONB) Paragraph 4.13 refers to tourism. The Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB is also an attraction for tourists in this area for its scenery, views, wildlife, and opportunities for outdoor recreation, and could be mentioned here (along with the Lake District National Park).Policy HH5 states that:"Tourism developments will be supported provided that they demonstrate that:A. They are of an appropriate scale so as not to have an adverse effect on the character or vistas of the immediate location."Could we suggest that this is amended to read '.so as not to have an adverse effect on the character or vista of the immediate location or wider landscape'.
26391370	#N/A
26469156	Fully support the proposal to support enhanced footpath and cycle path networks, primarily for safety and to encourage local travel avoiding use of cars. Focus also needs to be on traffic calming measures and improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists moving through the parishes.
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.13 We can't see tourism to our areas taking off, but accommodation for those visiting the National Parks could well do so. Traffic remains the most important consideration.4.16 Shops are unlikely to succeed. See comment on 2.10. Even Kendal struggles.4.18 Footpath upgrading is a good idea. The canal development has been a vision for many years without ever becoming affordable. Cyclists are already a danger, whistling past, fast and silently, through a village on a lane we must all share
26611607	I Support Policy HH5

Row Labels	8 Renewable energy HH6
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	No wind farm on Heversham Head then!
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Any large scale plans for renewable energy such as solar farms should be required to provide the energy for local residents
25389699	No comments
25407249	Fine except solar farming which is an unnecessary eyesore when there are so many roofs about. Fully cognisant of the practical difficulties of putting large areas on roofs as part of a farm but covering land - agricultural, conservation or otherwise <u>would be a travesty.</u>
25449054	#N/A
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	National renewable energy policy dictates any response. Whatever is said/proposed at local level must sit comfortably with National Policy. I abhor solar farms.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No comments
26325874	#N/A
26344026	(Arnside AONB) Policy HH7 covers renewable energy - developments which could impact on the setting of the AONB - but our view is that this is <u>adequately covered by Policy HH1.</u>
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.2 All acceptable, if on a suitable scale, apart from fracking, which in our view is not. Britain is too small and crowded for this <u>process to be carried out without danger to buildings and water courses.</u>
26611607	I Support HH6



Row Labels	9 Parish consultation. HH7
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Is this different from the current position. I thought the whole point of this exercise was to give more weight to local views in the decision-making process?
25341169	I understand the HH7 statement as presented. However, I am unclear from the Plan what would happen should a proposal be submitted which does NOT meet the general conditions HH1 - can SLDC overrule these conditions and approve any such proposal?
25341834	Reasonable
25389699	This seems inappropriate - if a specific set of policies have been agreed, a general power to then ignore them because of a vague reference to a "vision" is a mistaken approach.
25407249	Fine
25449054	4.22 allows the parish council to influence SLDC with its views regarding 'proposals...outside the terms of the specific policies...but...consistent with the objectives of the plan'. This is not within the spirit of the Act as it moves decision making away from the community in this situation. The Neighbourhood Plan allows the community to define the specific policies and therefore the community should also be able to comment on 'proposal...outside the terms of the specific policies'. 4.22 and HH7 should provide a community consultation process for such proposals.
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Applaud the intent. Question - what has it achieved? We are privileged to live in a delightful environment. The message - lets keep it thus!
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	No comments
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	4.22 It is hard to agree to the possibility of the future setting aside of policies as long as the "vision" is maintained.
26611607	HH7 appears to give power to the Parish Council/ Parish Meeting to recommend approval of a development that would otherwise be ruled out by a policy in the plan. In so doing have they not thus been in effect been given power to negate/override the Neighbourhood Plan that will have been approved by Referendum? i.e. as an example Policy HH3 A limits new development to no more than 6 dwellings; this Policy allows them to recommend say 8 houses instead of 6 say in one development. I wonder what the independent assessor will make of this Policy?

Row Labels	10 Objective 1 Infrastructure levy
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	No comment
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Vital that the 25% used locally and for Hincaster it should be an agreed requirement with SLDC that this will be the case, otherwise the development should not be allowed to proceed
25389699	No comments
25407249	Agree that despite reguatory requirement not to spend this in Hincaster, there exists a moral imoerative so to do.
25449054	#N/A
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Has Heversham Parish Council plans either immediately or long term that would benefit by a levy?Or does Hincaster really need a beaurocratic chamber?
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	Not much chance we will see any of this if SLDC get their hands on it.
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	It should be made clear to SLDC that any CIL received for Hincaster must be used in the village.
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	5.3 Parish Meetings have little legal standing. SLDC will no doubt do whatever it thinks fit.
26611607	OK noted

Row Labels	11 Objective 2 Pathways and connections
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Surely the county council/ SLDC should be included by name, as they are the major player in the provision/maintenance of pathways?
25341169	Excellent
25341834	This would be a great asset for residents and visitors
25389699	No comments
25407249	Agree
25449054	#N/A
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Would welcome better signage and display panels.
26061327	Could the old railway line from Sandside to Hincaster be developed to form a link (walking and/or cycling) between the coast and the canal?
26075604	#N/A
26114333	Section 5.6. There are pathways in this area of the churchyard, leading to the Head, which are generally adequate.
26211074	Good
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	Everything should be done to encourage the extension of the Hincaster Trailway to join the 2 village communities, including involving the landowners to gain permission for access.
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	5.4-5.7 Good ideas. Footpaths need upgrading and maintaining.
26611607	I support this Policy. I would have liked to have seen a Plan to illustrate the footpath network and proposals. The Objective/plan simply says development/improvement of paths and tracks, by both agencies and landowners will be supported... 'Agencies' are not defined. My question here is who will take ownership of these objectives and take them forward? . That aspect does not seem to covered. What are the Steering Groups thoughts? To illustrate this it must 45 years ago since I went to my first Heversham Parish Meeting. It was in the Old School; P G Thompson was the Chairman. Someone proposed that the old railway be made into a footpath; everyone thought this a good idea.Nothing happened until Bridget Pickthall put her energies to the task some 40 years later. The Plan we have before us here has been 3 years in the making. It could be approved in 2016; will somebody be ready and lined up to get on with it?

Row Labels	12 Objective 3 Facilities and Orgs.
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	The Athenaeum is a wonderful local asset, although its use for solely local activities has been in gradual decline in recent years, which is a great pity. It should be supported more robustly
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Encouraging more public use of existing facilities would be good for the community
25389699	No comments
25407249	Agree
25449054	#N/A
25747223	#N/A
25920152	#N/A
26055401	In spite of an age profile way above average we do have thriving village activities. Could Dallam School be encouraged to offer more?
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	OK
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	#N/A
26611607	I note that The increased use of the communities' assets and resources for the benefit of local people will be supported. Supported by whom and how?

Row Labels	13 Objective 4 Private Transport
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Comment has already been made on the need for upgrading the road system in Hincaster, which will become even more necessary after completion of the major current housing development at Greenside Farm.
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Any new developments should be required to provide adequate parkingBy restricting size of new housing it would/should avoid an increase in 3+4 car households
25389699	Roads should not be widened or otherwise changed to accommodate caravan traffic, in particular: caravans should be required to accommodate to existing road provision, rather than the other way around.
25407249	Agree
25449054	5.14 refers to 'an increase in caravan movement on the marsh' and that it will 'affect movement on the single track roads...and some widening or additional passing places will be required. Also...' However 3.8 specifically stated that 'the plan should be framed around policies rather than being site specific'. 5.14 infers that certain development (associated with the marsh) is already going to take place. The reference to the site should be removed to prevent 5.14 being pre-biased in favour of the marsh for site specific development
25747223	The Constabulary continues to invest in partnership work to minimise casualties due to road traffic collisions (utilising enforcement and education activity), with the intention of minimising disruption to the roads networks and consequential costs to the healthcare sector.
25920152	#N/A
26055401	Yes, additional passing places. Otherwise leave well alone.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	Agreed - see impact of planning/approval at Poultry Farm Hincaster/Viver
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	#N/A
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	5.14 More passing places would be helpful
26611607	The objectives of this Community Policy seem to be linked back to development thus For any developmentparticular emphasis is placed on provision of accommodation for.....I note that 'B' refers toRoad remodelling but only with regard to 'development'. I had hoped that this plan would have addressedthe issue of vehicles but particularly 555 service buses having to cross over to the wrong sideof the road at the blind bend at Crow Wood because cars are allowed to park projecting into the highway.The solution is obvious (extend the car park towards Crow Wood or ban parking or if not thesehave traffic lights). This Plan does not apparently address the issue or intend to provide a solution.This no one takes ownership and pursues the solution to this accident waiting to happen.

Row Labels	14 Objective 5 Public Transport
25240912	#N/A
25265520	#N/A
25265784	#N/A
25282104	Three bus's per day through Hincaster does NOT constitute an adequate service!
25341169	Excellent
25341834	Increasing 552 services would allow easier access to Arnside station and perhaps a service between Heversham/Hincaster and Arnside could fulfil this requirementA Sunday service and 'full' Saturday service (this is when visitors and employed residents are more likely to use this service) for the 552 would help residents and visitors and would/could reduce traffic on the narrow roads.
25389699	No comments.
25407249	Agree but wonder about the true viability of buses etc. without significant public financial input.
25449054	#N/A
25747223	The Constabulary continues to invest in partnership work to minimise casualties due to road traffic collisions (utilising enforcement and education activity), with the intention of minimising disruption to the roads networks and consequential costs to the healthcare sector.
25920152	#N/A
26055401	If the 755 travelled and stopped in Heversham village or proper provision made for shelter/stop on A6 this would be a vast improvement.
26061327	#N/A
26075604	#N/A
26114333	#N/A
26211074	More frequent bus services would help but appreciate limited usage is a problem.
26325874	#N/A
26344026	#N/A
26391370	#N/A
26469156	#N/A
26526602	#N/A
26555332	A scheme for community transport should be considered in the event of the bus service being lost.
26575113	#N/A
26605070	#N/A
26605795	Hincaster has lived through having quite a few buses, no buses, one privately run bus a week, and now 3 a day each way as described. Because the buses serve other and bigger villages as well as ours, they are impractically big for Hincaster's narrow lane, and we dread meeting one coming the other way! With passing places in suitable spots this problem would be alleviated. Buses are however essential for living independently of the car.
26611607	Again I note that Particular emphasis is placed upon support for ..... A, B, C, D . Who is it that is giving their support?An objective that could have been included here is the development of an initiative for provision ofvolunteer transport for people who need to get to hospital similar to that which some villages havehereabouts.

Row Labels	15 Further comment	Respondents
25240912	Many thanks for sending this neighbourhood plan, which I feel to be exemplary. I fully support its aims. There is little on which to comment as a formal response from Cumbria GeoConservation Group, which is why I have chosen not to complete the response form. It does appear that the geological basis to landscape and scenery is fully recognised. 2.1 mentions the underlying Carboniferous limestone and cover of glacially deposited drumlins which are characteristic of the area. I am not aware of any Local Geological Sites within the area of the Plan. However if you feel that any of the geology is worthy of protection and interpretation do please contact me again.I hope this response is useful.Best wishes	Sylvia Woodhead Geological Co-ordinator, Cumbria GeoConservation Group
25265520	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Heversham and Hincaster Neighbourhood Plan. I am pleased to confirm that Highways England has no objection to this proposal. The document provides a good overview of the proposals and how this is to be taken forward.Regards Lindsay	Lindsay Alder, Assistant Asset Manager Highways England
25265784	Mr Peter Shaw By email: petercshaw@btinternet.com Our ref:Your ref:TelephoneFax0161 242 14210161 242 1401 Dear Mr Shaw CONSULTATION ON THE HEVERSHAM AND HINCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2015 TO 2025 Thank you for consulting Historic England on your Neighbourhood Plan. We have no comment to make on this consultation and refer you to our letters dated 27th July 2015 and 12th October 2015. Yours sincerely	Gillian Laybourn Business Officer HistoricEngland
25282104		Kenneth Jenkins
25341169	With respect to my comments at point 9, Parish Consultation, I have reservations that notwithstanding this excellent document and its clear criteria, local wishes can still be overruled by SLDC should it deem it expedient to do so.	R M Stevenson
25341834	Impressive and considered plan Thank you for all the effort and hard work that has gone in to preparing the plan	Wendy Dodds
25389699		Paul Temple
25407249	An excellent document, even better if it has influence on events!	
25449054	I am happy to discuss any of the comments I have made.	Terry Sheldrick
25747223		Andy Hunton Crime Prevention Design Advisor Cumbria Constabulary Community Safety Unit
25920152	The Steering Group have done a good job in now producing a Plan which is less prescriptive and more flexible than the previous draft (that I could not have supported )and I hope it can proceed to be adopted. Should it be so, I hope there will be a mechanism and provision for villagers to be given periodic updates (say every two years) to measure and assess the effectiveness and degree of success of both the individual planning policies and any wider community objectives. It would be a shame if the Plan (or parts of it) quickly began to gather dust.I wish to thank all members of the Steering Group for all the time and effort that each has generously contributed.	John Bergus
26055401	Please, please make the Princes way drainage an absolute priority before we read of another tragedy! Very impressed by Neighbourhood Plan Would be easy to make statement which you later come to regret. Questionnaire excellent - excuse verbosity.	John Chew,
26061327	Very well done, Thank you.	George Wadsworth
26075604	Dear Peter, many thanks for this information and link.I have taken over as chairman of the Lancaster Canal Trust and would ask that all future correspondence comes to me.Regarding the consultation, we are delighted that the Neighbourhood Plan takes such a positive approach to the restoration of the canal and appreciates the benefits that it will bring.We are slowly moving forward again after a long hiatus and will be happy to keep you informed of progress if you wish.Kind regards Robin.	Robin Yates Chairman, Lancaster Canal Trust
26114333	I am generally in agreement with contents, and have no comments.Improvements to improve visibility between Crow Wood and Woodhouse Lane would be welcomed. ie deepen car parking at Crow Wood and remove all parking on road.	Jim Richardson
26211074	None other than earlier?	J Driver
26325874	Leasgill should be recognised as a separate village and retain its originality.	Mrs W E Tayler
26344026	(Arnside AONB) Thank you for consulting the Arnside & Silverdale AONB Partnership on the Heversham and Hincaster Neighbourhood Plan. Overall, we feel it s well written document and we commend the steering group and wider community on its production.We note that there appears to be no mention of the Hincaster Trailway. Several years ago, the AONB Sustainable Development Fund part-funded some improvements to the Trailway with the view that this would in time help improve access into the AONB from the Plan area. It may be appropriate to consider how the Neighbourhood Plan could encourage the extension of the Trailway and improvement of existing or creation of new access links into the AONB.I hope these are useful comments which inform the development of the Plan.Kind regards, Lucy	Lucy Barron AONB Manager Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
26391370	Heversham & Hincaster Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2025 Thank you for your email and links to the draft neighbourhood plan.You may be aware that we work closely with South Lakeland District Council to understand future development sites so we can facilitate the delivery of the necessary sustainable infrastructure at the appropriate time.It is important that United Utilities are kept aware of any additional growth proposed within your neighbourhood plan over and above the Council's allocations. We would encourage further consultation with us at an early stage should you look to allocate additional development sites in this area in the future.If you wish to discuss this in further detail please feel free to contact me.Best regards Becke	Rebecca Pemberton Planning Analyst Developer Services and Planning Operational Services United Utilities
26469156		Nick Clare
26526602	I thought this was a very comprehensive document and well presented. Objectives were clearly defined and i liked in particular the community objectives (section 5) which gave the opportunity for some exciting redevelopment. i think that the group achieved their vision as outlined in section3.5 Whilst not commenting on each individual section i would support this draft being submitted to the SLDC.	Jane Clarke
26555332	Many thanks to the volunteers who have contributed to the development of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Bridget & Adam Pickthall
26575113	While the plan is detailed and through, it misses the main point. Start from the point that Heversham in particular has an imbalanced population and that part of the remedy for the life of the villages is to encourage more families. The next question is where could they go and how many could the available space take. This report seems to have started with the premise of taking the minimum number of homes, not the maximum.There is an obvious fill in between Woodhouse Lane and Dugg Hill. Our view will be changed, but we would be happier with a more vibrant, younger village and the maintenance of the school, than worry that part of a field is now housing. All villages and towns should evolve and change with time. Preservation of existing limits eventually leads to fossilisation.	Iain and Gerry Richards
26605070		Iain Richards
26605795	The draft obviously represents a great deal of hard work on behalf of the two villages, and we must be grateful to the committee for putting together research and ideas designed to ensure that we have some say in our future.It is clear that nationally there is a great need for housing and jobs. But not housing in the wrong place or of the wrong type.Speaking principally for our own village of Hincaster, while it is clear that first-time buyers cannot find houses they can afford here, to provide them in any number would destroy the character of the village. And zero hours or temporary work or even retail work are not the sort of opportunities which will encourage the young to stay.We are not hostile to the idea of sensitive building in our village if its purpose is to meet the housing need of young and first-time buyers. But the very real danger imposed by our narrow lane cannot be over-emphasized. Pedestrians are already at risk, particularly children and older people, from speeding cars, inconsiderate cyclists, and those who either from ignorance of the terrain or sheer stupidity drive in the country and round bends as if it were out of the question that anyone might be coming the other way!	Rosemary Quillinan and Dorothy Constantine
26611607	I wish to thank the Steering Group for taking on and giving up their time to this task. Not easy to keep focused, enthusiastic and energised over 3 years of meetings. I hope their efforts are appreciated.I have tried to be constructive but is easy to criticise. I apologise if I have erred in that direction.	J D Smith