

SOUTH LAKELAND  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
RECEIVED

- 9 SEP 2011

RESOURCES

30<sup>th</sup> Aug 2011

Dear Sir, Madam,

In reference to the Further Consultation Summer 2011 -Alternative Sites, we would like to register our objections in specific respect to site MN22# proposed by Mr William Bell.

We feel strongly that whilst the Local Plan identifies that Kendal requires substantial housing development, this site has been identified as not appropriate and as such is not an "alternative site" that should be included in the "Further Consultation".

As identified during your Consultation on Emerging Site Options (Kendal), the Land Allocations Development Plan Document identifies the following issues with respect to site MN22#;

1. The site is located outside the existing Local Plan Development Boundary and is not identified in the SHLAA or Employment and Housing Land Search Study. We feel strongly that there will be more appropriate sites within the existing Plans and Studies and as such this site would not be the best option for the people of Kendal.
2. The Employment and Housing Land Search Study states that "the lower land to the north of Birk Hagg is very attractive but screened and contained by mature woodland and parkland character". This land is an asset to Kendal and is crossed by Public Footpath's that allow the town's people to enjoy the nature and character of the area. To destroy this by creating a housing estate would be in-appropriate and impact many people who walk in the local area.
3. Cumbria County Council has stated that whilst development would be feasible, the cumulative effect of existing sites would require significant infrastructure investment. Creating this requirement for investment over other more appropriate sites would not be appropriate in these times of financial austerity.
4. The Environment Agency has stated that this site is in Flood Zone 1 and there will be possible drainage issues, specifically with Natland Beck downstream. As a resident of the local area we regularly see the effect of flooding from this site onto neighbouring fields. This has happened several times this year already. In our view there is substantial risk to this site causing additional impact to flooding in not just the local area, but areas of Kendal further downstream.
5. United Utilities has stated that the Sewer network would have to be extended. This is the best appropriation of funds in our local community.
6. National Grid state that the site is unfeasible with major infrastructure / service investment needed. Again this will not be the best appropriation of funds in our local community.
7. English Heritage have stated that for the following reasons the site should not be considered an emerging site option for development;
  - i. The site contains a stream that is regularly in flood and hence poses significant flood risk.
  - ii. Due to the presence of the stream the site has great wildlife / biodiversity value and hence should be protected.

SOUTH LAKELAND  
DISTRICT COUNCIL  
RECEIVED

9 SEP 2011

iii. The development will significantly impact listed buildings at Birk Hagg Farm and Parkside House. We all have a duty to protect our heritage for future generations.

RESOURCES

iv. There is no direct access to the site

Within the SLDC Settlement Fact Files we have noted that in response to the suitability of the site for development, the following issues were identified;

- The site falls within the "Kendal South East Landscape Character Area". This is identified in the Employment and Housing Land Search Study. This document will have been compiled with guidance from the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit. We believe this gives clear guidance that would mean that the site is one of the least appropriate sites identified for Kendal.
- The lower land to the north of Birk Hagg is very attractive but screened and contained by mature woodland and parkland character. The destruction of this area would be highly inappropriate and would impact the many local people who use the area and local footpaths.
- Development in this area is generally limited by the line of the railway and topography. There are many more appropriate sites identified in your consultations.

All of the above information and assessment has already been carried out in respect of this site, we feel strongly that the evidence and facts have identified that the development of this site is not in the best interest of Kendal, its environment, its people (current and future) and its local resources.

We have also noted that the development would also require substantial investment to create a new roundabout at the top of Parkside Road. We have been informed that the site does not have the appropriate access due to a miss-understanding of boundaries. The access would now need to be gained from Singleton Park Road. This would also require the felling of trees that form part of the ancient woodland that forms the boundary of Kendal. This new access and roundabout would be dangerous and not appropriate in the local environment.

We would also question whether it would be appropriate to create a further 100 houses that will rely upon the single carriageway railway bridge for access. This access can often create significant delays at peak times. Adding a further 100 houses to this bottleneck will cause significant delays and increase the risk of traffic accidents.

We hope you feel like us, that whilst sites for development do need to be identified, site MN22# is not appropriate for many reasons and that there are many more suitable sites that will serve the local community better.

Yours sincerely



(Mr & Mrs Capstick)