

From: Kevin Lasbury []

Sent: 16- May- 10 09:40

To: Programme Officer

Subject: South Lakeland Coe Strategy DPD Inspector's Possible Changes consultation

Dear Miss Rayner

Many thanks for your letter of 12th May.

I object strongly to two of the possible changes - items C and F in your letter - dwelling numbers and Kendal Traffic Impacts.

Item C Dwelling Numbers. The proposal is to reduce the number of new dwellings to be built in Ulverston because of the possible impact on the ability of Barrow to deliver the number of houses required within their AAP. This would mean increasing the number of dwellings to be built in Kendal to ensure SLDC meets its "quota".

My objection.

This proposed change illustrates the complete farce of different local authorities having definitive quotas of housing numbers, particularly in an area such as this where three authorities - Barrow, SLDC and the Lake District National Park - are all relatively small and are so inextricably linked and reliant on one another. None of them are large enough to be self contained in this delivery area.

There are sufficient concerns about the ability of Kendal's infrastructure and service provision to accommodate sustainably the housing numbers proposed for that town. Any further increase would be unacceptable.

I do not know how the change in the National political position will change the planning regime but, in the context of the current exercise the obvious answer is to define a **desired housing number across the entire south Cumbria area** and let the end result be dictated by market forces and the ability of specific urban areas to accommodate that development. It is totally wrong to artificially dictate the proposed SLDC development intensity simply because doing so **MAY** affect the ability of another authority to achieve their target - that is planning gone haywire.

Item F Kendal Traffic Impacts. The proposed change would involve replacing a very clear and definitive statement about the traffic issues in Kendal, identified in a formal traffic study, with a long wishy washy set of words which in the case of Cumbria County Council's record of delivery here mean **nothing**.

My objection.

Development in Shap Road and the Todds site. The traffic assessment came to some firm recommendations against development in these areas. The proposed words seem to ignore that assessment and as such considerably soften any position. Having identified the very real constraints against development here the authorities should accept that position and move on; and not try to find some excuse to justify the unjustifiable.

Road access between A590 and A6 Shap Road.

I happen to believe there is a need for some form of Northern relief route for Kendal. Whilst in Kendal the Inspector will have seen the totally inappropriate and unacceptable use of the poor highway infrastructure (Windermere Road, Sandes Avenue, etc etc) by articulated lorries travelling between these two routes.

However current, and recently approved developments (Carus Green golf course), appear to effectively close any cost effective outer solution.

The request by the County Council for the inclusion of this item by the Inspector is inexcusable. The County Council formally have a highway project called Kendal Northern Relief Road as their second priority in their Local Transport Plan - in fact now that work is proceeding on the Carlisle Northern Relief Road, it climbs to top priority. However, within the funding regime that existed under the previous administration (Regional Assembly, RDA, etc) the Kendal scheme did not achieve a high priority regionally (whether this system will prevail is unclear).

Because of the scheme's low regional priority, and undeliverability within the LPD/DPD timeframe it was not included within the Kendal Traffic Assessment undertaken to inform the current SLDC planning process.

Instead someone invented a scheme to provide some relief somewhere within the close urban environment - a scheme on which no work has been done at all and deliverability within the Plan's timescale is seriously questionable. And even if schemes are identified there is **no guarantee** that they could achieve adequate regional priority to be funded.

Park and Ride sites seem to be some officers' idea of a panacea to Kendal's poorly managed traffic ills (again the Inspector cannot have failed to notice the obsession with one way routes in Kendal and the excess travel involved as a consequence). Park and Ride cannot be sufficiently funded and with sufficient intensity to enable them to work in such a small place as Kendal.

In summary I believe the proposed changes are designed to cloud issues by the two local authorities, to encourage the Inspector to ignore the results of the formal traffic assessment and to accept development intensities that evidence confirms cannot be sustainably accommodated in this town.

I hope the Inspector will reject both requested changes out of hand.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Lasbury CBE CEng FCHIT