



Consultation Response Form

Your contact details

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

If you are completing a paper copy of this form please use CAPITALS and BLACK INK.

| | |
|---|--|
| Your details OX NOLME ROAD RESIDENTS ASSOC | Your Agent's details (if you have one) |
| Organisation: EDITH OLIVE ARMSTRONG | Organisation: |
| Name: EDITH OLIVE ARMSTRONG | Name: |
| | Address: |
| | |
| | Postcode: |
| | Tel: |
| *Email: | *Email: |

*We aim to minimise the amount of paper printed and sent out. Therefore, where an email address is supplied, future contact will be made electronically.

This response contains pages including this one.

Please tick the box if you would like us to notify you when the Land Allocations Development Plan Document is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and when it is adopted by the Council.

If you have any questions, or no longer wish to be consulted on the South Lakeland Local Development Framework, please call the Development Plans Team on tel: 01539 717490.

Completed forms can be sent to:

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

Comments about suggested site allocations (and other map designations)

Please use this form to comment on emerging options and other sites as they appear on the settlement maps. Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.

| Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on? | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Settlement (e.g. Natland) | Map Number (e.g. 11) | Site reference number (e.g. R62) | Other designation – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here |
| KENDAL | 1 | R150M. | |
| Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate) | | | |
| I support /do not support /support in part the suggested site allocation/designation for the following use(s) <u>Housing/employment/retail/community uses/open space/</u> other (specify)..... | | | |
| Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary) | | | |
| <p>Please see attached sheet</p> | | | |

KENDAL PARKS AND
OXENHOLME ROAD RESIDENTS ASSOC.

Hayclose Opposition Group

Objections to R150M

LE2515

The development of the designated R150M 'emerging option' for residential housing i.e. 240 dwellings of a 'range of housing types' [Land Development Plan Document Kendal FirstPart pg 171] is opposed on the following grounds;

Traffic problems caused by access to these new houses

A development of 240 houses would mean approximately an additional 400 cars (based on local car ownership rates) using the local roads. While the Kendal Transport Assessment indicated that R150M (along with other developments e.g. R107, RN133M) would result in additional congestion at the Burton Road/Oxenholme Road/Heron Hill junction, the extra level of delay was deemed acceptable up to 2025. However, this assessment takes no account of the more local traffic issues which impact on the safety of road users and pedestrians.

There are three possible access routes into the development using current roads, all from the west as the railway line cuts off eastern access:

From the north via Kendal Parks Road:

Kendal Parks Road links Hayclose Road and Valley Drive with Oxenholme Road. Currently, the east end gets relatively little traffic as much turns off along Valley Drive, Blea Tarn Road and Kendal Parks Crescent, and the terminal cul-de-sac leading only to Kendal Parks Farm is very quiet. All this will change should this become the main Kendal-side access to the R1 50M (and R1 07M) developments.

Middle section from Hayclose Road via Hayclose Crescent:

The potential access route from Hayclose Road and Hayclose Crescent similarly makes use of a quiet cul-de-sac off a minor residential road (the Crescent) which would become, by default, a major thoroughfare despite its tight corners, blind curves and residents' curbside parking. Children still play in the street on these quiet roads - kids on bikes are a common sight but it's not something any responsible parent would allow should the development go ahead as currently indicated.

From the south, from Hayclose Road via Howe Bank Close:

Howe Bank Close is also a tight cul-de-sac of 30 dwellings. Residents and visitors parking cars in the Close already causes significant obstructions especially in the southern arm where access is envisaged to R1 50M. As a roadway, the Close was clearly not designed as access for a much larger residential development. It is difficult to see how it could be used to provide an access route for some extra hundreds of vehicle movements per day without causing a significant traffic hazard, as well as being extremely detrimental to the quality of life in this area.

It is also worth noting that Hayclose Road itself has ongoing problems with parking causing obstruction to traffic, especially the local bus service, and the recent construction of roadside parking bays and use of

KENDAL PARKS &
OXENHOLME ROAD
RESIDENTS ASSOC

parking restrictions has not solved the problems. Adding the traffic from several hundred new houses into this road will clearly exacerbate an already marginal situation and increase the hazards and inconvenience of those who live along and adjacent to this road.

Should area RI50M continue to be considered for development, it is proposed that the developers must provide access directly to Oxenholme Road from the south end of the development. This would avoid extra traffic on Hayclose Road, avoid the use of Hayclose Crescent and Howe Bank Close as unsuitable conduits and minimise the need for traffic to use Kendal Parks Road.

Land drainage and sewerage capacity

The R150M site is currently open grassed fields which fall steeply to the west, immediately behind the existing housing, along the whole western boundary of the site. Drainage of the land 'relies on soak-aways which, in some areas, are at capacity in periods of extremely wet weather (the frequency of which is likely to increase due to climate change) leading to threat of minor flooding of some houses (e.g. along Hayclose Crescent). The question is how this surface water will be dealt with by the developers since hard-standing in the form of roads, footpaths etc will increase the rate of surface run-off compared to the existing grassed surface. Are the sewerage systems able to cope with the additional load from the surface run-off in addition to the additional dwellings?

Should area RI50M continue to be considered for development, it is proposed that the developers must make provision for surface water collection ahead of the housing development to ensure the existing downslope properties are not detrimentally affected.

Privacy and quality of life of residents adjacent to the development

As already noted in the consultation documents for emerging option R150M, the site is steeply sloping from high ground along the railway on the eastern boundary to the low points along the back of existing properties on Hayclose Road, Hayclose Crescent and Howe Bank Close. The steepness of the terrain means that any houses built on the site will not only overlook but be physically above the existing properties - typically the land rises 3-5 metres within the first 10 to 15 metres of the boundary fence so that the ground floor of new dwellings would be level with the bedroom windows of existing properties. Not surprisingly, residents are very concerned about invasion of their privacy in this situation.

Further, there is the issue of enclosure of the existing properties by physically dominating new structures cutting out the light from homes and (in some cases, already restricted) gardens. Again, the residents are concerned that development of housing on R150M will very severely impact on their quality of life.

It is not clear how these concerns could be mitigated - levelling the hillside is assumed to be impractical on several grounds (environmental, engineering practicality, cost etc.) and for this reason the site should not be considered for further development.