

5.
LE2725



Name GINA MORRIS

Address [REDACTED]

I oppose the development of R107M on the following grounds

Hayclose Opposition Group
ALL HIGHLIGHTED AREAS -
Objections to ~~R150M~~ R107M.

Email/phone [REDACTED]

The development of the designated ~~R150M~~ ^{R107M} 'emerging option' for residential housing i.e. 262 dwellings of a 'range of housing types' [Land Development Plan Document Kendal FirstPart pg 171] is opposed on the following grounds;

Traffic problems caused by access to these new houses

A development of 240 houses would mean approximately an additional 400 cars (based on local car ownership rates) using the local roads. While the Kendal Transport Assessment indicated that ~~R150M~~ ^{R107} (along with other developments e.g. R150M RN133M) would result in additional congestion at the Burton Road/Oxenholme Road/Heron Hill junction, the extra level of delay was deemed acceptable up to 2025. However, this assessment takes no account of the more local traffic issues which impact on the safety of road users and pedestrians.

There are three possible access routes into the development using current roads, all from the west as the railway line cuts off eastern access:

From the north via Kendal Parks Road:

Kendal Parks Road links Hayclose Road and Valley Drive with Oxenholme Road. Currently, the east end gets relatively little traffic as much turns off along Valley Drive, Blea Tarn Road and Kendal Parks Crescent, and the terminal cul-de-sac leading only to Kendal Parks Farm is very quiet. All this will change should this become the main Kendal-side access to the RI 50M (and RI 07M) developments.

Middle section from Hayclose Road via Hayclose Crescent:

The potential access route from Hayclose Road and Hayclose Crescent similarly makes use of a quiet cul-de-sac off a minor residential road (the Crescent) which would become, by default, a major thoroughfare despite its tight corners, blind curves and residents' curbside parking. Children still play in the street on these quiet roads - kids on bikes are a common sight but it's not something any responsible parent would allow should the development go ahead as currently indicated.

From the south, from Havclose Road via Howe Bank Close:

Howe Bank Close is also a tight cul-de-sac of 30 dwellings. Residents and visitors parking cars in the Close already causes significant obstructions especially in the southern arm where access is envisaged to R1 50M. As a roadway, the Close was clearly not designed as access for a much larger residential development. It is difficult to see how it could be used to provide an access route for some extra hundreds of vehicle movements per day without causing a significant traffic hazard, as well as being extremely detrimental to the quality of life in this area.

It is also worth noting that Hayclose Road itself has ongoing problems with parking causing obstruction to traffic, especially the local bus service, and the recent construction of roadside parking bays and use of

parking restrictions has not solved the problems. Adding the traffic from several hundred new houses into this road will clearly exacerbate an already marginal situation and increase the hazards and inconvenience of those who live along and adjacent to this road. Should area R150M continue to be considered for development, it is proposed that the developers must provide access directly to Oxenholme Road from the south end of the development. This would avoid extra traffic on Hayclose Road, avoid the use of Hayclose Crescent and Howe Bank Close as unsuitable conduits and minimise the need for traffic to use Kendal Parks Road.

Land drainage and sewerage capacity

R107M

The ~~R150M~~ site is currently open grassed fields which fall steeply to the west, immediately behind the existing housing, along the whole western boundary of the site. Drainage of the land 'relies on soak-aways which, in some areas, are at capacity in periods of extremely wet weather the frequency of which is likely to increase due to climate change) leading to threat of minor flooding of some houses (e.g. along Hayclose Crescent). The question is how this surface water will be dealt with by the developers since hard-standing in the form of roads, footpaths drives Etc will increase the rate of surface run-off compared to the existing grassed surface. Are the sewerage systems able to cope with the additional load from the surface run-off in addition to the additional dwellings?

Should area R150M continue to be considered for development, it is proposed that the developers must make provision for surface water collection ahead of the housing development to ensure the existing downslope properties are not detrimentally affected.

Privacy and quality of life of residents adjacent to the development

R107M

As already noted in the consultation documents for emerging option ~~R150M~~, the site is steeply sloping from high ground along the railway on the eastern boundary to the low points along the back of existing properties on ~~the~~ **VALLEY DRIVE BLUEBELL CLOSE**. The steepness of the terrain means that any houses built on the site will not only overlook but be physically above the existing properties - typically the land rises 3-5 metres within the first 10 to 15 metres of the boundary fence so that the ground floor of new dwellings would be level with the bedroom windows of existing properties. Not surprisingly, residents are very concerned about invasion of their privacy in this situation. Further, there is the issue of enclosure of the existing properties by physically dominating new structures cutting out the light from homes and (in some cases, already restricted) gardens. Again, the residents are concerned that development of housing on ~~R150M~~ will very severely impact on their quality of life.

R107M

It is not clear how these concerns could be mitigated - levelling the hillside is assumed to be impractical on several grounds (environmental, engineering practicality, cost etc.) and for this reason the site should not be considered for further development.

(details above)