

FC LE 44



Development Plans Manager
South Lakeland District Council
Lowther Street
Kendal
LA9 4DL
Cumbria

9 August 2011

Dear Sirs



**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
LAND ALLOCATIONS – FURTHER CONSULTATION**

Further to your letter dated 28 July 2011, I am writing to object to the inclusion of Land Allocations R100 and RN154 in the recently published list of Alternative Sites.

The promoters of these two sites have suggested the inclusion of the two large parcels of land which front on to Castle Green Road which forms the A684 linking Kendal to the M6 and Sedbergh. Development in these fields would be clearly visible from this strategic road and would significantly detract from the high landscape quality of this most important approach to the town.

This area of land has been included as part of the town's greenbelt for many years and with good reason. The setting and approach to a town is critically important and the treatment of the town's 'edges' often establishes the character and quality of a place which is respected and recognised by townsfolk and visitors alike.

Any new development here would almost certainly be at least two storeys in height. This would either be treated as housing fronting on to the A684 or housing which requires to be substantially screened from users of the road. Either way, the impact of development here would be significant and unacceptable. Due to the slightly elevated level of the road at this location, travellers approaching the town from the south east get one of their first and most spectacular views of Kendal including the Castle, Serpentine Woods and Scout's Scar, views which would be lost if development, or associated screening took place.

There is no doubt that the land at R100 and RN154 form a critical southerly boundary to Kendal and to submit it to development would, in my view, have serious detrimental impacts on the setting of the town.

I note that SLDC, in their earlier considerations for these sites, were minded not to include them in the forthcoming Local Development Framework for no doubt very sound and important reasons. I think the Council should stand firm on this and maintain this position and not submit these two critically important parcels of land to development.

Yours faithfully



Mrs Kathleen Nelson