

**From:** derek kay [mailto:]  
**Sent:** 31- Mar- 11 14:18  
**To:** Development Plans  
**Subject:** SLDC local development framework

username DCKay

I would like to make a few general comments about the South Lakeland Local Development Framework and then more specific ones relating to the site RN154.

General comments

The proposed increase of over 2000 houses on top of the existing approximate 13000 house represents a very large percentage increase (ie at least 15%) The framework says that this is pressure from the government rather than from South Lakeland. This interference seems at odds with the present government wanting locals to take on more responsibilities for their own areas.

Is the government suggesting that the population of the country is going to expand by 15% in the next 15 years?

In the current economic climate it seems to make little sense especially when there are no major employers in the town. Tourism may become even an even more important part of the local economy and changing radically the outlook of the town by suggesting such a large urban sprawl will not help. It is important to maintain the attractive visual panoramas both as visitors approach the town and as a backdrop to their stay here.

This large increase seems at odds with an article on page two of the recently produced South Lakeland News, issue 16, Spring 2011 "Have your say now on home sites"

The tenth paragraph says  
"We have an ageing and DECLINING population - - -

Why, if the population is declining do we need another 2000 homes?

Also in Westmorland Today (Tim Farron) – "A Home For Every Family" – he estimates that there are 1000 empty homes across South Lakes and is trying to encourage South Lakeland District Council to step in. Should this be the first change to help improve housing in the area.

We are being pushed to accept this increase by the slogan "Affordable Homes". At the recent meeting held at Castle Park School on 03/03/2011 the percentage of affordable houses in this scheme was put at about 35% and no figure could be given as to what affordable meant. Looking in lakedistrictproperty paper from a local estate agent there already seems to be a reasonable number of properties available either for sale or rent at what to me seems an affordable price for this area ie less than £190000.

All these suggestions about extra homes seems little more than a property developers dream come true and I feel that profit is the main driving force. What proportion of these houses do SLDC expect to become second homes? What proportion will actually be owned by the people living in them?

I expect that the town must grow, within limits, but the first priority must be to the benefit of locals ie more “affordable” affordable homes and also all the services and long term full time jobs.

Kendal must not go the same way a number of small towns all over the country have gone by having their characters totally lost by urban spread.

Existing schemes around the area do not appear to be fully utilised

Specific comments relating to the site RN154 on the Kendal East map and the possible siting of over 130 new properties.

Although at present it is identified as private open space and suggested that it be retained as open space there is the comment on page 68 that if development is considered suitable - - - with a possible yield of 131

The following comments are to support that RN154 is retained as open space

This area is an important entrance to the town and current agricultural use with grazing sheep and lambs (particularly at the moment) gives a first and enduring impression on tourists, visitors and locals that Kendal is essentially an attractive rural town.

The extensive view of Kendal Castle would be totally lost if RN154 was to become a large housing estate.

Are any of the trees on the site protected or would the intention be to cut them all down to make room for houses

If the building proposal did get the go ahead would there be any plan of a green corridor to protect the local wildlife of birds, including woodpeckers, toads, hedgehogs, squirrels etc?

There is no access to the site at present from Parkside road and it is only reached from the A684. Any large development would only add to the traffic flow problems that already exist by many people using Parkside Road (in particular the narrow railway bridge), Castle Green Lane, Anne Street and Sandylands as a bypass for the town centre.

Loss of possibly important town centre farming land and so spoiling the semi-rural environment. Once the landscape is changed it can never be returned to what it was.

Kendal has always had and still needs a certain rural aspect ,which is enhanced by fields, walls, trees, wild life, close to and even within the town. Without these it is just another place to live with no character.

Every individual needs open green spaces in their neighbourhood for healthy living. Equally every town needs open spaces and open aspects within its boundaries to keep its character alive and its future healthy.

Various small towns throughout the country have had their rural aspect changed by building a sprawling mess of close packed houses becoming concrete jungles struggling to keep any sense of identity. This, even on a smaller scale, should not be allowed to happen to a lovely town like Kendal.

We hope to be kept informed about the consultation process, in particularly about any changes to the proposed use of site RN154

Derek Kay

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>