

5th May 2013

Development Plans Manager  
South Lakeland District Council  
South Lakeland House  
Lowther Street  
Kendal LA9 4DL

Dear Sir / Madam,

I would like to submit for consideration my comments on the Major Amendments Document to the draft revised LADPD within the consultation period. Due to the large number of modifications in this document I will limit my comments specifically to those modifications which are most pertinent to me.

**MM 051 Berners development**

The main modification refers to “leisure use” and the “cluster of facilities and attractions” created by the development. As I understand it the proposed plan for this site does not fulfil these stated objectives, consisting primarily of housing development, including affordable housing. Please could you explain what these “facilities and attractions” are?

The Core Strategy states that “tourism, leisure and heritage sectors are to be developed in order to achieve a sustainable local economy”, whereas the plans for Grange in the LADPD consist entirely of houses, houses and more houses.

There is no modification to the limited infrastructure provision to support proposed development to the south of Grange, which constitutes the majority of the large amount of development allocated to Grange.

The proposed footpath linking Lindale to Grange is on the opposite side of the town to the proposed development area and wholly irrelevant to development to the south of Grange. It cannot be cited as “supportive infrastructure” for the proposed development area to the south of Grange.

**MM052 Proposed cycleway / footpath from the Promenade to Kentsford Road.**

This route is entirely unsuitable to the combined use of pedestrians and cyclists. The sections of the path alongside the railway line in Kentsford Road are very narrow and it is currently impossible for 2 pedestrians to pass easily in opposite

directions. There will be considerable risk to pedestrians if this route is opened up to cyclists. In addition, it is highly likely that 2 cyclists would not be able to pass without dismounting and lifting cycles over each other. To designate this route as per the modification is simply not fit for purpose.

In addition there is a series of steep concrete steps of larger than normal stride length which are already difficult to negotiate by less mobile people and impossible to access by the disabled/wheelchair. This route cannot be modified due to the walls of adjacent properties on one side and very close proximity to the railway line on the other.

The same problems of width apply to the section between Cart Lane and the Promenade. Of particular concern is access to the Promenade via the subway at the end of this section. There are 2 blind turns into a subway under the railway line and the risks here are considerable, including collision of unsighted cyclists and pedestrians and head injury to cyclists due to the low ceiling. These problems recur at the station end of the promenade.

To quote the Core Strategy:

Policy T4, "all development and associated highway proposals should provide for safe, direct, convenient and attractive means of movement on foot".

Policy T5, on cycling states "when assessing development and associated highway proposals, safe, direct, convenient and attractive provision for cyclists will be sought". This may also include "detailed traffic management and traffic calming schemes to ensure both cyclist safety and priority of movement".

Policy T13, "seeks the safe and convenient movement of pedestrians and cyclists as well as people in cars".

It is clear that pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled (the less able bodied also) should not have to use substandard or potentially unsafe infrastructure as part of community development as is proposed with this route. These user groups are entitled to the same consideration as other highway users when assessing "safe and convenient movement".

Lastly, the Core Strategy states that Grange has a number of cycle ways crossing the town. This is not true. The town is on the National Cycle Network between Low Fell Gate and Meathop Road, passing through the town, using the B5277 and minor roads for the majority of its length with no part of it comprised of dedicated cycle paths. There are no other dedicated cycle ways therefore no cycle routes which would benefit any proposed development.

The Local Plan should comply with Core Strategy Policy in relation to essential supportive safe infrastructure, which the proposals contained in this modification

clearly do not.

I am sending this letter by email prior to the 1pm deadline on 6th May with a hard copy hand delivered by 9 am on 7<sup>th</sup> May.

I await your response,

Yours faithfully

Chris Eckersley