

Report No: G1
Objections: 910
Support:
Subject: Policy Wording
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Whole plan

ISSUES RAISED

1. There are numerous inclusions within the Plan of policy wording which is either a statement of intent or does not provide certainty to uses of the Plan. Policies which are merely statements of intent should be avoided. Phrases such as “the Council will resist” “will normally” etc should be replaced by wording which makes it clear what will and will not be permitted. Review policies within the Plan to ensure that they are clear and capable of implementation or move them to the R/J.
-

RESPONSE

1. Agreed
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Appropriate amendments made throughout the plan.

Report No: G2
Objections: 911
Support:
Subject: Terminology
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Whole plan

ISSUES RAISED

1. Frequent use is made in policies of phrases beginning “The Council will..”. This is generally considered undesirable as decisions will often met by other using Plan policies. The plan should be checked to ensure this form of wording is rephrased.
-

RESPONSE

1. Agreed
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Appropriate amendments made throughout the plan.

Report No: G3
Objections: 912
Support:
Subject: Cross references
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Whole plan

ISSUES RAISED

1. Throughout the plan there are numerous cross references within policies to other policies in the plan. May be exceptions but advise against cross referencing as a general rule as there is a danger the omission of a reference could imply that another policy is not as important. Other LPA's have tried listing related policies. Plan should due checked to ensure that this form of wording in policies is rephrased.
-

RESPONSE

1. Agreed
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Appropriate amendments made throughout the plan.
Add new paragraph to Chapter 1 para 1.3.3 "It is important to recognise that the Plan must be read as a whole and therefore it is likely that more than one policy, often from more than one Chapter can and will be applied when considering development proposals."

Report No: G4
Objections:
Support: 093
Subject:
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Whole plan

ISSUES RAISED

1. Document appears very comprehensive and covers issues in ways which take into account national and regional guidelines. Specific comments on detailed land allocations or policies would need to be made by local groups e.g. Whitehaven Civic Society

RESPONSE

1. Support noted. Local interest groups included on consultee list.

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: G5
Objections: 600
Support:
Subject:
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Whole plan

ISSUES RAISED

1. The needs of horseriders have been completely overlooked. Employment and safety of existing riders has been ignored as has potential for benefits to local business and tourism. You have responsibility to improve the rights of way for all not just ramblers and cyclists.

RESPONSE

1. Agreed reference to horseriders should be made in the plan. See proposed changes as included in reports E25, S21, S22, T3

PROPOSED CHANGES

See changes proposed in reports E25, S21, S22 and T3

Report No: G6
Objections: 689
Support:
Subject:
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Proposals Maps

ISSUES RAISED

1. Maps clear. Have already commented upon discrepancy in the line of the County Landscape at Lamplugh. However the Cumbria Coastal Way is missing from the Map, and some areas of the Coastal Zone are shown as developed whereas we believe them not to be. Would recommend that the green spacing between settlements such as Whitehaven to Parton should be maintained.
-

RESPONSE

1. County Landscapes dealt with by Report E12. Coastal Zone dealt with by Report E28. It is unnecessary and beyond function of the plan to show Cumbria Coastal Way on proposals map. Settlement Boundaries discussed in Report SB1
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

See relevant reports

Report No: G7

Objections: 977
Support:

Subject:

Chapter:

Policy:

Para:

Other: page 48

ISSUES RAISED

1. H37 should read Scawfell not Scaffell
-

RESPONSE

1. Agreed

PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend Table HS3 (1D) to read Scawfell not Scaffell

Report No: G8
Objection: 001

Subject: Landownership Rhodia/Huntsman

Chapter: 4 and 5
Policy:
Para: 4.2.17 and 5.6
Other:

ISSUES RAISED
Objectors

1. Anomaly in sections 4.2.17 and 5.6.3. 4.2.17 states site is an opportunity, 5.6.3 states it is a major contaminated sites. Should be reworded to reflect that ownership of any contaminated land at the Whitehaven site is Rhodia.
-

RESPONSE

1. Site does offer an opportunity but issues surrounding contamination of the site must firstly be overcome.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Reference to Huntsman removed from 5.6.3 (1D)
"Former" inserted before "Marchon Chemical Works" paragraph 4.1.17
(1D)

Report No: G9
Objections: 1108
Support:
Subject:
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Economic Regeneration

ISSUES RAISED

1. Present speculation on devolution of government offers opportunities to redress north south divide. Council should be lobbying strongly for a government office move to Copeland. Would bring employment opportunities but also to some extent justification for improved communication and transport links (rails not road).
-

RESPONSE

1. A reasonable suggestion but not one which requires any change / addition to text or policy.

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: G10
Objections: 1171
Support:
Subject:
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Comments from NWRA

ISSUES RAISED

1. NWRA did not wish to make a formal objection but raised several points, most of which were also made by other objectors.
 - References to RPG welcomed and context is excellent.
 - Local plan housing figures will need to be brought into line with revised JSP Policy H14. There should be no mark up of the RPG target for slippage and rate of housing provision should include existing commitments. The target in RPG is not a target just for new permissions but for all housing completions.
 - Policy HSG1 refers to all existing commitments which seems to contradict the need to review and possibly de designate them
 - Reconsider HSG3 and add an ongoing element that restricts granting new permissions once a 5 year supply relative to the annual target is available. To allow for some flexibility this might be extended to a six year supply. Local conditions might warrant some exceptions. Would be beneficial to RPG if a policy could be included that allows authority to prioritise applications if any new consents can be released or to review those that do come up for renewal against sequential, affordable provision , brown field and other criteria.
 - TCN9 does not deal with need aspect
 - TSP2 – environmental considerations are not sufficiently emphasised.
 - Support for Duddon road crossing but would oppose barrage.
 - Regional Parks. Relationship between this potential and the coastal TOS areas should be explored and cross referenced as appropriate
 - TOS – not possible to be specific but brownfield nature of the sites should be clarified if they are to be justified. Should be made clear that they are areas of search and presumably not expected all of this land will be developed with built tourist facilities. Need to avoid cumulative impact , Possibly larger scale needs to be explained more clearly.

- TSM4 is too permissive. No reference to scale of cumulative impact or avoiding high quality landscape areas. May be that some of brownfield TSM2 sites could be prescribed areas of search for caravan sites
-

RESPONSE

Reports relevant to these comments include:

H1

H3

R26

R35

R38

T7

Report No: G11
Objections: 027
Support:
Subject:
Chapter:
Policy:
Para:
Other: Greenbelt

ISSUES RAISED

Unable to consider objection as insufficient information provided.
Further information requested 12/05/04 but no reply.

RESPONSE

PROPOSED CHANGES