



4th September 2011



Dear Sir

With reference to proposed development of land to the east of Windermere Road , Kendal. SHLAA ref R169,R44,RN46 ,E65 and RN299~~#~~

We understand affordable housing in the Kendal area is needed but to build on the above areas would undoubtedly spoil a naturally beautiful area and negatively effect the environment. The area R44 is possibly an appropriate site but it would have to be sympathetically developed, however the proposed further extension RN169 and RN299~~#~~ are not .

To be brief are main objections are in no particular order :

1. FLOOD RISK

In the 2 years we have owned 9 Lane Foot flooding has occurred twice . Once very severely and to build such a large development would without doubt cause increased flooding for local houses and cause great hardship for those affected.

2. VISUAL

A lot cars and cyclists stop at the top of Lane Foot entrance to take photographs or just to admire the beautiful setting and view .This would be ruined by a development of the proposed size and would destroy the beauty of the north western entrance to Kendal. First impressions of anywhere or any place are the most important and this would negatively affect visitors/ tourists .

3 . TRAFFIC

Windermere Road is a very busy road and often takes a long time to join from Lane Foot road .To increase the amount of traffic in this area would cause greatly increased congestion and possible accidents involving vehicles and pedestrians . To place a roundabout to alleviate this wold cause major traffic chaos at the main roundabout 500 yards up Windermere road.

4 . NATIONAL TRUST COVENANT ON LAND

When buying 9 Lane Foot our solicitor stressed the numerous conditions that had to be observed , placed by and enforced by the national trust. To consider a development of such size would surely be breaking the covenant on the land . Having recently seen the National Trust opinions on large development on such sites I think their objections would follow ours.

In conclusion we understand that local affordable housing is a priority for all local councils especially Kendal . However a development the size being considered , 130 to 150 units , is about a developer/ landowner making money not an attempt to provide affordable housing. We believe this development is wrong for the above reasons .

We hope you take note of our objections and register them with relevant department.

Your faithfully



June Blakey

Graham Matthews