

1st Sept 2011

Dear Sir,

Objection to Development of R100# & RN154#

I

I am yet again staggered by SLDC's determination to fly in the face of earlier planning decisions and hope that these sites will be eliminated from planning proposals in their entirety and in perpetuity for the sake of Kendal's identity. I object for the following reasons:

- **The landscape visible at and across R100# & RN154# is unique to Kendal and delineates the history and geography and rural nature of the area, particularly the valley. It defines the entrance to Kendal from the east and south and it separates the town dwellings from the rural dwellings and farmland in and around our stone hamlet at Castle Green Lane. It sets Kendal in the valley below this agricultural and rural area and reminds visitors and locals alike that we are a historical country town en route to the grand fells beyond.** Wainwright would be horrified at this proposal. When driving or walking or visiting the Castle Green Hotel the views across to the Kendal Castle Mound, the Scar, the Fells and Golf Course are stunning and invaluable to all those who visit or live in or use the area. Come along to the sites on November 5th to appreciate how many people know this is a unique Kendal vantage point. This is Kendal's shop window and we are constantly stopped or knocked on by streams of visitors asking how to get to the Castle or the town or the scar or the fells I refer you to your previous planning decisions. These sites must not be lost to development. It would be an act of vandalism in the extreme.
- **R100# & RN154# are existing precious unique open spaces used for agricultural purposes and recreation and encourage tourism .** They which characterise the outskirts of Kendal and are vital to the well being of locals and visitors. They encourage tourism locally, and can be viewed from other prominent tourist areas in Kendal such as Scout Scar, The Kendal Golf Course, The Kendal Castle Mound and Benson Knott as well as the West Coast Railway Line. We need more tourism in Kendal, not less. The viewing link is unique in Kendal. The links between R100# & RN154# and R121M, incorporating the open green land across the main road, views to Benson Knott and the fells in the distance is unique in Kendal, linking the history of the castle to the history and geography of the fells and civilisations in the past. It is invaluable and irreplaceable and creates a sense of the rural outskirts of historical Kendal. If any of these sections either side of Castle Green Lane are developed, Kendal loses her identity. We are currently a shop window for Kendal for all those entering from the east or visiting at the Castle Green Hotel or on the railway. Are you really wanting to turn our town into a glorified anonymous housing estate?
- **Building on these sites will destroy the character of the area and damage civic pride and identity.** To build any more modern monstrosities on the Castle Green Lane as were allowed on Oak Tree, Rowan Larch Grove etc, whether low level or high rise housing, if slate or grey stone are used, eradicating the green spaces, will destroy and urbanise our auld grey town and in particular Castle Green Hamlet. Do not repeat the mistakes of the past but learn from them. Other towns nationally and internationally, are going out of heir way to preserve their identity and landscape, housing characteristics and materials. There is a civic pride and a potential tourism impact in doing so. SLDC appear not to care about Kendal's civic identity. They should learn from Rinteln which has gone out of its way to retain its historical features and character. The unique views to the Castle, the Scars and the Fells will be lost in an urban sprawl which I am sure will not be gazed upon as lovingly by locals, tourists and travellers.
- **Building of houses on these two sites will surround and eradicate our historical hamlet and surround it by urban development along with traffic, noise, pollution and congestion.** I object to losing our beautiful peaceful historical hamlet to any of these urban blights. The character of our hamlet should be preserved not destroyed.
- **The area is already subject to flooding issues which will be exacerbated along with winter ice issues.** More houses mean more problems.
- Previous planning rejected this site as not suitable for any housing, let alone affordable housing and it still isn't. These 2 sites fly in the face of planning aims locally and will require too much in the way of financial assistance to address the local issues to allow many, if any, low value houses. It is a source of continuing concern that the deliberations of previous planners may be overturned because of the pressure to build houses at a time when purchasing houses is becoming ever more difficult for the people you say you want to assist, those wanting affordable housing. **This site will never meet the affordable housing objective.** It will not be cheap enough to develop or to buy on but will ruin the locality which encourages tourism and well being.

Please write back to assure me that SLDC will never destroy this landscape and unique Kendal heritage.

Fiona Hanlon

From: Fiona Hanlon [
Sent: 02- Sep- 11 12:22
To: Development Plans
Subject: Re: SOUTH LAKE LAND ALLOCATIONS - FURTHER CONSULTATION

Thank you for your confirmation of receiving my objections.

I now have further comments to the proposals and a further query as a result of a visit this morning by a neighbour who has apparently spoken to the planning department in the last day or so. The planning department apparently gave the impression and voiced the opinion that they will not be interested in building on R100# and RN154#.

If that is the case why have these sites been included as proposed sites in the alterations schedule? Surely decisions can be made by SLDC not to include any unlikely proposals rather than cause further concern and stress to SLDC residents when there is little chance that development will take place. We already have enough stress with the prospect of the proposed site R121. Do you realise that out of 13 Kendal proposed sites 6 of them now are around where we live? This changes the whole nature of our area from a tranquil beautiful rural part of Kendal which encourages tourism to a potential building site nightmare for years.

There ought to be a protocol that allows any such proposed sites to be acknowledged but not included in new consultations by reason of previous planning decisions.

Please explain why they have been included if the planning department do not intend to develop them? If they are not serious contenders please revise the schedule and remove them.

Fiona Hanlon

On Fri, Sep 2, 2011 at 9:43 AM, Development Plans <developmentplans@southlakeland.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Ms Hanlon,

I acknowledge receipt of your representations made with regard to this current phase of consultation on the Local Development Framework. Your responses will be available to view on the Council's website, although I am unable at this stage to advise you of the timescale.

With regards, Kim

Kim Russell

-----Original Message-----

From: Fiona Hanlon []
Sent: 01 September 2011 17:40
To: Development Plans
Subject: Re: SOUTH LAKE LAND ALLOCATIONS - FURTHER CONSULTATION

Dear Mr Hudson

I hereby send m objections to the new proposed land inclusions at R100# and RN154#. I was under the impression that these sites too had been refused by earlier planning decisions. What is the point of making decisions only to ignore them. I hope SLDC will refuse yet again and in perpetuity. What a waste of money in times when every penny counts. Please acknowledge receipt. Lodging objections appeared to be a serious issue in the last phase of the consultation. I will check mine have been recorded on your website but expect an official acknowledgement just in case too.

Fiona Hanlon