LE1459 – LE1486

WE THE UNDERSIGNED HAVE READ AND FULLY SUPPORT THE ATTACHED CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM, IN REGARD TO THE OPPOSAL OF LAND ALLOCATION OF R46, R674/R480, E65, RN169M.

IN SUMMARY

Due to.....
Flooding landscape + Visual Impact
Sewer/drainage issues (Hallgarth will need an upgrade as suggested by united Utilities)
Increase traffic flow/child safety
Access issues
Parking issues
Lack of green space
Lack of schools
Lack of NHS resources (dentist, no A+E, no CCU, no acute medical wards in Kendal)

To conclude....

This will have a detrimental effect on Hallgarth as a community, due to being saturated with more people..
Rubbish
Dog poo/wandering dogs
Less areas for children to be safe
De-valuing of current properties

Name	Address	Signature
LE1459		
1460		
1461		
1462		
1463		
1464		
1465		
1466		
1467		
1468		
1469		
1470		
1471		
1472		
1473		
1474		
1475		
1476		

LE1459 — LE1486

	Name	Address	Signature	
LE1477 1478 [redacted] 1479 1480 1481 1482 1483 1484 1485 1486	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	✓ ✓ ✓ occupier ✓ ✓ } together ✓ ✓ duplicate occupier ✓ ✓

South Lakeland Local Development Framework

Land Allocations Consultation **Room to Live, Space to Breathe**

Consultation Response Form

Your contact details

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

If you are completing a paper copy of this form please use CAPITALS and BLACK INK.

Your details	**Your details (if you have one)**
Organisation: Hallgarth Action Group	Organisation: Hallgarth Action Group
Na [redacted]	N
Ad	A
	k
	c
Po	F
Te	T
*E	*

*We aim to minimise the amount of paper printed and sent out. Therefore, where an email address is supplied, future contact will be made electronically.

This response contains ☐ pages including this one.

☐ Please tick the box if you would like us to notify you when the Land Allocations Development Plan Document is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination and when it is adopted by the Council.

If you have any questions, or no longer wish to be consulted on the South Lakeland Local Development Framework, please call the Development Plans Team on tel: 01539 717490.

Completed forms can be sent to:

Development Strategy Manager
South Lakeland District Council
South Lakeland House
Lowther Street
Kendal
LA9 4DL

Comments about suggested site allocations
(and other map designations)

Please use this form to comment on emerging options and other sites as they appear on the settlement maps. **Please complete one of these sheets for every response you make.**

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	**Map Number** (e.g. 11)	**Site reference number** (e.g. R62)	**Other designation** – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here
Kendal		R46	

Do you support, oppose support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)

I do not support **the suggested** site allocation **for the following use** Housing

Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

The site is outside the settlement boundary for Kendal and would form development into a green gap. This will cause harm to visual amenity:

- North west boundary of Kendal is locally distinctive and follows the existing historical field boundaries and contours of the landscape. It forms a well-defined edge to the town. Expanding this boundary will have a negative impact on the landscape character. Visually, the existing boundary blends well and forms part of an attractive gateway to Kendal. Expanding this boundary into agricultural land will form an obtrusive and illogical northern boundary to the town. The current development boundary balances well with the agricultural land to the west of Windermere Road, rising up to the rugged landscape of Kendal Fell.
- The land is heavily covenanted by the National Trust (Lane Foot Farm Covenant, 1944) and is adjacent to the National Park boundary.
- loss of an important green space which is used by many residents – 'room to live, space to breathe' This site is well used by children and young adults alike to play and by people to walk dogs and to admire the scenery and sunsets.
- The separation between Burneside and Kendal will be eroded. Loss of integrity of green gap.
- loss agricultural pasture and wildlife habitat – owls including the little owl and tawny owl, herons, lapwings, pheasants as well as many garden birds use this area.
- Site R46 appears to be a ribbon development, expanding the boundary rather than in-fill.
- The site is prone to flooding and in wet periods there is a large pond on the site where ducks congregate.
- **Other issues not to allocate this land for housing:**
- There are sustainable development issues with regard to drainage and run-off. These

could have detrimental effects on the River Kent Special Area of Conservation. The existing sewage and water run off system is already at capacity after the recent building of housing on Acre Moss. Leading to flooding of roads and houses on Low Garth. Any further houses would require greater capacity for sewage and greater capacity for water run off from the increased hard surfaces which will lead to greater pressure on the SAC on the river Kent.

- Development of green space is contrary to emerging options in the SLDC Local Development Framework
- Existing parking issues: Cars are currently parked on pavements, on blind bends and junctions. The estate roads are reduced to one lane in most places. More housing means, unsustainably, more cars. Increased traffic on already busy roads, increased pressure for parking. If this site was developed and access from Moore Field Close this road already has poor visibility on the corner with Kettlewell road, if more cars and vehicles access this is likely to lead to increased risk for child safety.
- Currently poor access, only Windermere Road and Burneside Road. Both these junctions are very difficult to exit from. Significant access and junction improvements would be necessary but could create a 'rat run' for people not wanting to dive through town, as in effect creating a northern bypass.
- Loss of green spaces – 'room to live, space to breathe' This site is well used by children and young adults alike to play and by people to walk dogs and to admire the scenery and sunsets.
- Loss of views and devaluing properties: Why does the amenity of people who pass an area have a greater bearing than the view people have everyday from their homes?
- Increased light pollution and noise pollution into open countryside
- Already the local schools are full to capacity as are the doctors, dentists and no emergency unit at hospital, with services been reduced further we do not believe services can cope with an increase the number residents

I consider it would be more appropriate to allocate this land as one or more of the following: Green field, open space, community orchard or for allotments – with priority to those living closest to the land.

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	**Map Number** (e.g. 11)	**Site reference number** (e.g. R62)	**Other designation – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here**
Kendal		R480	

Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)

I do not support **the suggested** site allocation **for the following use** Housing

Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

This will cause harm to visual amenity:

- loss of an important green space which is used by many residents – 'room to live, space to breathe' This site is well used by children and young adults alike to play and by people to walk dogs and to admire the scenery and sunsets.
- To develop this site would require the removal of 4 mature trees and a mature species rich hedgerow which contains the following species hazel, elder, blackthorn, hawthorn, cherry, ash, rose, brambles. It is used by local residents for making elderflower cordial and sloe gin. And is therefore greatly cherished. The removal of this hedge and tree would have a negative visual impact as it would make the houses of the estate more intrusive when viewed from Windermere road which at present are softly screened by the hedge and line of trees.
- The manhole cover for the sewers is found within the site.
- Existing parking issues: Cars are currently parked on pavements, on blind bends and junctions. The estate roads are reduced to one lane in most places. More housing means, unsustainably, more cars. Increased traffic on already busy roads, increased pressure for parking. if more cars and vehicles access this is likely to lead to increased risk for child safety. A 10 year old girl wearing bright fluorescent jacket cycling under supervision was nearly knocked of her bike at this junction with Kettlewell road in broad daylight. Any more cars and parking with increase this risk significantly
- Currently poor access, only Windermere Road and Burneside Road. Both these junctions are very difficult to exit from. Significant access and junction improvements would be necessary but could create a 'rat run' for people not wanting to dive through town, as in effect creating a northern bypass.

  -Loss of views and devaluing properties: Why does the amenity of people who pass an area have a greater bearing than the view people have everyday from their homes?
- Increased light pollution and noise pollution into open countryside
- Already the local schools are full to capacity as are the doctors, dentists and no emergency unit at hospital, with services been reduced further we do not believe services can cope with an increase the number residents

I consider it would be more appropriate to allocate this land as one or more of the following:
Public open space and or community orchard, the option for this has already met with support from SLDC.

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	**Map Number** (e.g. 11)	**Site reference number** (e.g. R62)	**Other designation** – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here
Kendal		R674	

Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)

I do not support **the suggested** site allocation **for the following use** Housing

Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

The site is outside the settlement boundary for Kendal and would form development into a green gap. This will cause harm to visual amenity:

- North west boundary of Kendal is locally distinctive and follows the existing historical field boundaries and contours of the landscape. It forms a well-defined edge to the town. Expanding this boundary will have a negative impact on the landscape character. Visually, the existing boundary blends well and forms part of an attractive gateway to Kendal. Expanding this boundary into agricultural land will form an obtrusive and illogical northern boundary to the town. The current development boundary balances well with the agricultural land to the west of Windermere Road, rising up to the rugged landscape of Kendal Fell.
- The land is heavily covenanted by the National Trust (Lane Foot Farm Covenant, 1944) and is adjacent to the National Park boundary.
- loss of an important green space which is used by many residents – 'room to live, space to breathe' This site is well used by children and young adults alike to play and by people to walk dogs and to admire the scenery and sunsets.
- To develop this site would require the removal of 4 mature trees and a mature species rich hedgerow which contains the following species hazel, elder, blackthorn, hawthorn, cherry, ash, rose, brambles. It is used by local residents for making elderflower cordial and sloe gin. And is therefore greatly cherished. The removal of this hedge and tree would have a negative visual impact as it would make the houses of the estate more intrusive when viewed from Windermere road which at present are softly screened by the hedge and line of trees.
- The separation between Burneside and Kendal will be eroded. Loss of integrity of green gap.
- loss agricultural pasture and wildlife habitat – owls including the little owl and tawny owl, herons, lapwings, pheasants as well as many garden birds use this area.
- Site R674K appears to be a ribbon development, expanding the boundary rather than in-fill.
- There are sustainable development issues with regard to drainage and run-off. These could have detrimental effects on the River Kent Special Area of Conservation. The existing sewage and water run off system is already at capacity after the recent building of housing on Acre Moss. Leading to flooding of roads and houses on Low Garth. Any further houses would require greater capacity for sewage and greater capacity for water run off from the increased hard surfaces which will lead to greater

pressure on the SAC on the river Kent.

- Development of green space is contrary to emerging options in the SLDC Local Development Framework
- Existing parking issues: Cars are currently parked on pavements, on blind bends and junctions. The estate roads are reduced to one lane in most places. More housing means, unsustainably, more cars. Increased traffic on already busy roads, increased pressure for parking. A 10 year old girl wearing bright fluorescent jacket cycling under supervision was nearly knocked of her bike at this junction with Kettlewell road in broad daylight. Any more cars and parking with increase this risk significantly.
- Currently poor access, only Windermere Road and Burneside Road. Both these junctions are very difficult to exit from. Significant access and junction improvements would be necessary but could create a 'rat run' for people not wanting to dive through town, as in effect creating a northern bypass.
- Loss of views and devaluing properties: Why does the amenity of people who pass an area have a greater bearing than the view people have everyday from their homes?
- Increased light pollution and noise pollution into open countryside
- Already the local schools are full to capacity as are the doctors, dentists and no emergency unit at hospital, with services been reduced further we do not believe services can cope with an increase the number residents

I consider it would be more appropriate to allocate this land as one or more of the following: Green field, open space, community orchard or for allotments – with priority to those living closest to the land

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	**Map Number** (e.g. 11)	**Site reference number** (e.g. R62)	**Other designation** – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here
Kendal		RN169M	

Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)

I do not support **the suggested** site allocation **for the following use** Housing

Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

The site is outside the settlement boundary for Kendal and would form development into a green gap. This will cause harm to visual amenity:

- North west boundary of Kendal is locally distinctive and follows the existing historical field boundaries and contours of the landscape. It forms a well-defined edge to the town. Expanding this boundary will have a negative impact on the landscape character. Visually, the existing boundary blends well and forms part of an attractive gateway to Kendal. Expanding this boundary into agricultural land will form an obtrusive and illogical northern boundary to the town. The current development boundary balances well with the agricultural land to the west of Windermere Road, rising up to the rugged landscape of Kendal Fell.
- The land is heavily covenanted by the National Trust (Lane Foot Farm Covenant, 1944) and is adjacent to the National Park boundary.
- loss of an important green space which is used by many residents – 'room to live, space to breathe' This site is well used by children and young adults alike to play and by people to walk dogs and to admire the scenery and sunsets.
- To develop this site would require the removal of 4 mature trees and a mature species rich hedgerow which contains the following species hazel, elder, blackthorn, hawthorn, cherry, ash, rose, brambles. It is used by local residents for making elderflower cordial and sloe gin. And is therefore greatly cherished. The removal of this hedge and tree would have a negative visual impact as it would make the houses of the estate more intrusive when viewed from Windermere road which at present are softly screened by the hedge and line of trees.
- The separation between Burneside and Kendal will be eroded. Loss of integrity of green gap.
- loss agricultural pasture and wildlife habitat – owls including the little owl and tawny owl, herons, lapwings, pheasants as well as many garden birds use this area.
- Site RN169M appears to be a ribbon development, expanding the boundary rather than in-fill.
- There are sustainable development issues with regard to drainage and run-off. These could have detrimental effects on the River Kent Special Area of Conservation. The existing sewage and water run off system is already at capacity after the recent building of housing on Acre Moss. Leading to flooding of roads and houses on Low Garth. Any further houses would require greater capacity for sewage and greater

capacity for water run off from the increased hard surfaces which will lead to greater pressure on the SAC on the river Kent.

- Development of green space is contrary to emerging options in the SLDC Local Development Framework
- Existing parking issues: Cars are currently parked on pavements, on blind bends and junctions. The estate roads are reduced to one lane in most places. More housing means, unsustainably, more cars. Increased traffic on already busy roads, increased pressure for parking. A 10 year old girl wearing bright fluorescent jacket cycling under supervision was nearly knocked of her bike at this junction with Kettlewell road in broad daylight. Any more cars and parking with increase this risk significantly.
- Currently poor access, only Windermere Road and Burneside Road. Both these junctions are very difficult to exit from, particularly Burneside road which is almost a blind exit when vans are parked near the junction. A lady recently got hit on a bike as a car could not see her. Significant access and junction improvements would be necessary but could create a 'rat run' for people not wanting to dive through town, as in effect creating a northern bypass.
- Loss of views and devaluing properties: Why does the amenity of people who pass an area have a greater bearing than the view people have everyday from their homes?
- Increased light pollution and noise pollution into open countryside
- Already the local schools are full to capacity as are the doctors, dentists and no emergency unit at hospital, with services been reduced further we do not believe services can cope with an increase the number residents
- I consider it would be more appropriate to allocate this land as one or more of the following:

Green field, open space, community orchard or for allotments – with priority to those living closest to the land.

Which site or allocation do you wish to comment on?			
Settlement (e.g. Natland)	**Map Number** (e.g. 11)	**Site reference number** (e.g. R62)	**Other designation – If you want to comment on something that doesn't have a site reference (e.g. development boundary, town centre boundary, green gap) please describe it here**
Kendal		E65	

Do you support, oppose or support in part the suggested allocation or designation? (delete as appropriate)

I do not support **the suggested** site allocation **for the following use** employment.

Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

The site is outside the settlement boundary for Kendal and would form development into a green gap. This will cause harm to visual amenity:

- North west boundary of Kendal is locally distinctive and follows the existing historical field boundaries and contours of the landscape. It forms a well-defined edge to the town. Expanding this boundary will have a negative impact on the landscape character. Visually, the existing boundary blends well and forms part of an attractive gateway to Kendal. Expanding this boundary into agricultural land will form an obtrusive and illogical northern boundary to the town. The current development boundary balances well with the agricultural land to the west of Windermere Road, rising up to the rugged landscape of Kendal Fell.
- The land is heavily covenanted by the National Trust (Lane Foot Farm Covenant, 1944) and is adjacent to the National Park boundary.
- loss of an important green space which is used by many residents – 'room to live, space to breathe' This site is well used by children and young adults alike to play and by people to walk dogs and to admire the scenery and sunsets.
- To develop this site would require the removal of 4 mature trees and a mature species rich hedgerow which contains the following species hazel, elder, blackthorn, hawthorn, cherry, ash, rose, brambles. It is used by local residents for making elderflower cordial and sloe gin. And is therefore greatly cherished. The removal of this hedge and tree would have a negative visual impact as it would make the houses of the estate more intrusive when viewed from Windermere road which at present are softly screened by the hedge and line of trees.
- The separation between Burneside and Kendal will be eroded. Loss of integrity of green gap.
- loss agricultural pasture and wildlife habitat – owls including the little owl and tawny owl, herons, lapwings, pheasants as well as many garden birds use this area.
- Site R674K appears to be a ribbon development, expanding the boundary rather than in-fill.
- There are sustainable development issues with regard to drainage and run-off. These could have detrimental effects on the River Kent Special Area of Conservation. The existing sewage and water run off system is already at capacity after the recent building of housing on Acre Moss. Leading to flooding of roads and houses on Low

Garth. Any further houses would require greater capacity for sewage and greater capacity for water run off from the increased hard surfaces which will lead to greater pressure on the SAC on the river Kent.

- Development of green space is contrary to emerging options in the SLDC Local Development Framework
- Existing parking issues: Cars are currently parked on pavements, on blind bends and junctions. The estate roads are reduced to one lane in most places. More housing means, unsustainably, more cars. Increased traffic on already busy roads, increased pressure for parking. A 10 year old girl wearing bright fluorescent jacket cycling under supervision was nearly knocked of her bike at this junction with Kettlewell road in broad daylight. Any more cars and parking with increase this risk significantly.
- Currently poor access, only Windermere Road and Burneside Road. Both these junctions are very difficult to exit from. Significant access and junction improvements would be necessary but could create a 'rat run' for people not wanting to dive through town, as in effect creating a northern bypass.
- Loss of views and devaluing properties: Why does the amenity of people who pass an area have a greater bearing than the view people have everyday from their homes?
- Increased light pollution and noise pollution into open countryside
- Already the local schools are full to capacity as are the doctors, dentists and no emergency unit at hospital, with services been reduced further we do not believe services can cope with an increase the number residents

I consider it would be more appropriate to allocate this land as one or more of the following: Green field, open space, community orchard or for allotments – with priority to those living closest to the land

How to suggest sites which do not appear on the maps

If you want to suggest a site that does not appear on the maps please provide a map with the site outlined in red. Please state the uses which you propose allocating the site for and explain your reasoning. Also, please include the name of the landowner if known.

Comments about community facilities in your area

New development can provide benefits to communities through enabling the delivery of improved or new community facilities (for example, play areas, allotments, green space, car parks, traffic management, pedestrian and cycle links, health and education facilities and community centres etc).

Do you think that your area needs new or improved community facilities?
If so, what sort of facilities and where?

Please explain the types of improved and/or new community facilities you feel your community may need in the next 15 years (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary).

Schools, Doctors, Dentist and hospitals are all at capacity with no accident and emergency department in the area.

Comments about the documents and approach

Please respond here if you have any comments to make about the documents and approach. Please indicate the name of the document, page number, paragraph number or policy reference (where applicable) by ticking the appropriate box.
Please complete one of these sheets for each specific comment you want to make on each document.

Which document do you wish to comment on? (tick one)					
Land Allocations Document* ☐	Sustainability Appraisal ☐	Scoping Report ☐	Retail Topic Paper ☐	Settlement Fact File (which?)	Other (please specify)**
What part of this document do you wish to comment on?					
Page:		Paragraph no:		Policy: (where applicable)	
Do you support or oppose this part of the document?					
I do not support **this part of the document.**					
Please explain your reasons (continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)					

* Note the Land Allocations Document is the main document that includes the emerging site options and maps. It also includes proposals for open space and employment land designation, town centre and retail boundaries, green gaps and development boundaries.

** Other documents include the Interim Consultation Statement, Appropriate Assessment Screening Report and the South Lakeland Gypsies, Travellers and Show People Accommodation Study (Final Draft).

Thank you for your views and suggestions. Electronic copies of the form can be downloaded from www.southlakeland.gov.uk/landallocations

LE1459	P Khamouli
LE1460	J Duff
LE1461	R Wilson
LE1462	Occupier
LE1463	Occupier
LE1464	R Allen
LE1465	N Stephenson
LE1466	C Sullivan
LE1467	J Sullivan
LE1468	J Sullivan
LE1469	D Cowan
LE1470	Occupier
LE1471	Occupier
LE1472	Occupier
LE1473	F Kinley
LE1474	D Kinley
LE1475	Occupier
LE1476	Occupier
LE1477	Z Dixon
LE1478	L Taylor
LE1479	M Robinson
LE1480	Occupier
LE1481	H Sherratt
LE1482	M Sherratt
LE1483	J Fallows
LE1484	R Birkett
LE1485	Occupier
LE1486	C Simpson