



# Consultation Response Form

Your details		Your Agent's details (if you have one)	
Organisation:		Organisation:	
Name: C R Gleeson		Name:	
		Address:	
Postcode:		Postcode:	
Tel:		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.

## Land Allocations - Further Consultation

Please use this form to comment on:

1. Alternative sites put forward by respondents to the earlier Land Allocations consultation (January - April 2011);
2. Time span of the Land Allocations document
3. The approach to development in small villages, hamlets and the countryside.

**Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**  
**(Please also note that comments made in earlier consultation need not be repeated.)**

## 1. Alternative Sites

Please let us have your views on alternative sites suggested by respondents to the previous consultation. (Please note, these are not SLDC suggestions.)

Which site do you wish to comment on?		
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	Site reference number (e.g. RN298#)	
Kendal – all areas	E31#, E4M#, R143#, R299#, RN46#, RN47#, R124#, RN302#, ON50#, R100#, R154#	
Please indicate below whether you support, support in part or oppose the suggestion that this site be included in the Land Allocations document (please tick as appropriate)		
Support <input type="checkbox"/>	Support in part <input type="checkbox"/>	Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Please explain your reasons/add your comments below (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)		
<p>As a tourist visitor to Kendal over the past 20 years I have seen a progressive major sprawl of urban development that has extended from the original small town on all sides. There is precious little 'immediate' landscape left now. Its almost impossible to walk from Kendal centre without getting lost in a large housing development. Although this may not be evident to people who live in Kendal its tourist appeal based upon the nearby landscape is being seriously eroded by these developments.</p> <p>It is sad to see the inexorable process of landscape destruction which is slowly but surely transforming what used to be a beautiful South Lakeland town into a marginally interesting, slightly run-down shopping centre with a few restaurants, surrounded by housing estates and increasingly devoid of the real countryside atmosphere that was its key selling point. The shopping centre is sadly descending into a predominantly low-grade 'sell-off', 'bargain-basement' and charity shop mix that tracks this process. Kendal and its local council need to recognise quickly that they are slowly strangling its golden goose status as the 'Gateway to the Lakes; it will soon be the place to drive past...</p> <p>The major issues in the current plans are the further and major encroachments into the surrounding countryside on all sides of the town.</p> <p>E4M# - a major encroachment to the South behind the natural boundary of the large line of trees which masks the start of the town and sets Kendal against the hills on the approach from the bypass, taking the eye away from nearby urban sprawl. This tree-line is a natural Southern endpoint for development. This development if approved would have a much bigger impact on the landscape setting of the town than its size indicates.</p> <p>E31# and E31M - although low lying is it necessary to build more new leisure facilities in this out of town centre location? Kendal seems well equipped with leisure facilities – can't they be renovated and improved where necessary? What is sustainable about this? They would be better in the centre of the town that people could access on foot – when is the Canal Head development going to fulfil these needs? It seems to have been on the agenda for many years with no apparent progress at all – but an ideal central space for development. Its puzzling why the Council is spending so much on these crazy plans when there are much better options with are being ignored.</p>		

**R143M# - a high level site that will further erode the landscape**

**RN299#, RN46#, RN47# and RN124# the sprawl creeping further northward erodes more countryside to the North but this has less impact due its low lying location**

**RN302# - this was I think part of another site(?) – but has the highest impact on one of the most impressive landscape aspects of the high level Eastern hills which are a key part of the ‘country setting’ of Kendal – where more development would have a major impact on the landscape when viewed from the West which is the aspect that most people see of Kendal as they go past, or see on their approach to Kendal from the bypass.**

**ON50# - this seems to be in the middle of farmland – I’m not clear what is meant by the “ON” status – but I recall that the land to the East of the Castle Green Hotel is already ‘open access’ – there seems little point of an area of ‘open land’ in the middle of a housing estate that has already destroyed the landscape. It would be better to leave all of this space as ‘green’ farmland.**

**R100# and R154# - I recall that this as a beautiful stretch of farmland (typically with sheep grazing) that extends the ‘countryside’ into the edge of the town down to the Castle Green estate of house and links with the farmland on the opposite side of the road. It seems to me that the green space is needed on both sides of the Castle Green Road (clearly visible from the West) to gain the landscape of a ‘green corridor’ into Kendal.**

**As a generic point it is puzzling why the plans focus on expanding the several small towns in the South Lakes instead of spreading a small increase in housing provision in the ‘gaps’ in local areas. This is really it seems more for the convenience of builders and developers who only want to work on large sites.**

## 2. Time Span of Land Allocations Document:

Should the Land Allocations document plan period remain 2003 – 2025 or cover a shorter period, for example, 2003-2020?

**Please indicate whether you support, support in part or oppose a reduction in the time span of the Land Allocations document** (please tick as appropriate)

Support ☐

Support in part ☐

Oppose ☐

**Please explain your reasons/add your comments below** (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

**I have no specific views on this except to note that the Council should assess the sustainability of a continual erosion of the landscape around the town of Kendal.**

### 3. Small Villages, Hamlets & Open Countryside

Do you think the future housing and employment land needs of small villages, hamlets and open countryside are best met by: -

- A. Allocating sites for houses and employment in the Land Allocations document; or
- B. Communities and/or developers bringing forward sites for housing and employment for consideration under relevant Core Strategy policies, through neighbourhood plans and/or other local initiatives.

**Please indicate which of the above options you would support.** (Please tick as appropriate)

**A** ☐

**B** ☒

**Please explain your reasons/add your comments below** (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

**My view is that the Strategic Plan as evidenced by the major stress on development in a few areas, that are already massively over-developed, is fatally flawed and should be reversed by whatever means are possible.**

**Minor gentle expansion to sustainable fulfil localised needs is far more preferable than the major destruction of landscape proposed in Kendal and other larger settlements.**

**Thank you for your views and suggestions.**