

From: muriel hildrew [mailto:]
Sent: 13 April 2011 18:30
To: Development Plans
Subject: Objection

Dear Sir

Re: Proposed Land Allocations Development R121M, R141, R56

I am writing with concerns regarding the proposals to build up to 147 dwellings on the areas detailed above. I believe that the plan to build houses on valuable green spaces across Kendal is unnecessary and the evidence for this need is weak. At the present time there are a large number of empty houses in Kendal, so why do we need to build more? There are properties for sale in Kendal at the lower end of the price market and these are not selling. If it is affordable housing that we need, why is such a small proportion of the development allocated as such? Surely the only people to benefit from such a large development are the developers themselves. I also wonder who would be able to afford the 'affordable' homes - not many of our young people have the thousands of pounds needed for a deposit. People love to live in and visit Kendal because it is a small rural town with beautiful open spaces. Would people still want to visit and live here when it becomes a concrete metropolis?

The target for houses was set under the previous government, so why are we still acting on these targets and not waiting until the present government completes the new Localism Bill? Interestingly, the Conservative Party is saying that they will cancel the housing developments if they win the May elections. If we build on our beautiful landscape now it will be lost forever to us and future generations - a tourist attraction no more.

Flooding

There is considerable risk from flooding in this area and significant problems with drainage. The drainage on the field is very poor with natural springs and would necessitate extensive and costly mediation for this and flood prevention were building to be considered. The buildings themselves would cause increased surface water to run off, thus making the threat of flooding lower down even more serious. There are many thirsty trees next to these fields and if any of these

wooded areas were felled then that of course would create even more risk of flooding. I believe that these areas are highly unsuitable on all these counts and I ask that they be removed from the land allocations.

Traffic

Access to this area would increase considerably the traffic that is already heavy on the main road, which is used in effect as a bypass for the frequently congested Town Centre. Sedbergh Road is a narrow road and would not be suitable for vehicular access to the proposed site. Oak Tree Road itself is just as narrow, and would also be unsuitable, impractical and dangerous for vehicular access to R56.

Environment

The proposed area is extremely important in terms of the natural environment, a site for many species of flora and fauna, as well as a habitat for birds - a precious local environment that would be destroyed by the proposed development.

Landscape

My most serious objection is to do with the dramatic effect on the landscape that such a development would bring about. Kendal is, justly, regarded as a beautiful town, nestling in the valley and surrounded by country landscape of fields and woods that attract many visitors as well as employers to the area. Any development needs to take extreme care not to spoil forever the beauty of the surrounding landscape. In this case there are fields that roll in curves and hollows down from the hill above the railway. This open space with its ancient stone walls provides grazing for sheep, lambs and cattle as well as a natural surrounding to the town, a visually stunning approach that should not be considered for destruction.

There are currently many mid to high range houses, modern and older, on the market around Kendal. These properties would satisfy demand for housing for incoming workers to any new business developments. It would seem to be both unnecessary and economically disastrous in the current climate to build many more such houses in an unsuitable, difficult to access area, when they would be most unlikely to sell.

In conclusion, I urge SLDC to look most carefully at the above objections to the proposals for this area, applying sound planning principles which should lead to the rejection of R121M, R141 and R56 for development and to rethink the entire Strategic Development Plan which is so obviously against the wishes of the local population.

Yours sincerely,

Muriel Hildrew