

**Report No:** T1  
**Objections:** 726  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Community Transport  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.1.1  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. There should be a reference here to community transport (726)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Agreed
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

6.1.1 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence (1D) amended to “public or community transport”

**Report No:** T2  
**Objections:** 727, 1107  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Local Plan Transport Policy  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.1.4  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Recognise car dependency in rural areas but would not like the plan to undermine attempts to improve public transport provision. Appropriate solutions such as community transport schemes may be more appropriate for deeply rural areas (727).
  2. Suggests the Council supports government transport policy but in practice do own thing. Rely too much on easy option dismissing potential of rail (1107)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

- 1&2. The Council believes that the plan does not undermine public or community transport system but gives a realistic view of issues facing the plan area.
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T3

**Objections:** 594, 602, 502, 505, 262, 1153, 1176, 1175, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180

**Support:** 753

**Subject:** Strategic Improvements

**Chapter:** 6

**Policy:**

**Para:** 6.2.1 – 6.2.5

**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objections**

1. Although comments in 6.2.1 and 6.2.4 are true they give impression no investment has been made on any part of the Cumbrian Coast Line. Have recently carried out works at Parton and Harrington which reflect Network Rail's commitment to maintaining the line. Text could be amended to reflect this position. (594)
2. Text indicates no plans in RTS for improvements - significant omission – SRA has ongoing study. Council should do more to encourage rail use and improvements (1153, 262, 1180)
3. Understand need to improve transport infrastructure but ask to consider needs of horse riders especially with regard to where bridleways are linked across a major road (602)
4. Council should be able to provide proof that increased road access brings economic regeneration to deprived areas. We have seen no evidence that this is the case (502)
5. Copeland does not seem to have any aspirations with regard to improvements and greater use of the rail network. No real enthusiasm towards governments transport policy, (1175,1176)
6. Copeland needs to have synchronised policies with National Park for long distance transport options to be realised in the future(1177)
7. Adopt as policy protection of all former railway lines within the borough of Copeland from any development which would prevent their reopening.(1178)
8. Note with dismay difference in attitude between rail and road transport – 'lobby' for improvements to roads, 'support' measures to improve public transport and railfreighting (505)
9. No further detail about what if any improvements to the rail network would be of benefit to the area (1179)

### **Support**

1. Support policy of seeking retention of trunk road status on grounds of uncertainty about future funding availability from Government and

of the possible perception by investors of downgrading of the infrastructure under detrunking proposals (753)

---

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. Comments noted
- 2,5&6. The Council has never said that there is no investment in transport infrastructure, only that it is woefully inadequate and that it will seek improvements on a strategic basis (including the rail network) with all partners in the area. One initiative which showed some promise was the joint NWRA/NWDA funded study “Access to Furness and West Cumbria” last summer. Unfortunately the recommendations from this work were very disappointing – instead of informing production of RSS on the need to link regeneration and infrastructure improvements it has left it to others to further the debate. Hopefully the new Strategic Forum for West Cumbria can have a beneficial influence, including support from the National Park Authority.
3. Disagree that this is an issue to be covered under ‘Strategic Improvements’. Changes made to 6.3.13 / TSP5 to address this issue. Also see Report T7 and subsequent changes to TSP2.
4. Evidence from areas including Scotland, Wales, Devon and Cornwall show links between improved transport and regeneration. The government also backed the Coalfield Communities Campaign’s “Roads for Prosperity” initiatives particularly as part of regeneration initiatives in Yorkshire.
7. The opportunity for this form of protection has already gone – but significant lengths have been incorporated into the cycleway network.
8. Paragraph 6.2.2 states Council will lobby for strategic improvements to transport infrastructure and links to national networks. Does not specify road transport.
9. The Local Transport Plan is the more appropriate location for this level of detail about improvements.

### **Support**

1. Support noted
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.2.1 (1D) “Although the line has been maintained...”

Add reference to “Access to Furness and West Cumbria Study in para 6.2.2

Add to para 6.3.13 (1D) “ In addition the Council will seek improvements to the bridleway network through the planning process”

Add to Policy TSP5 “..and Bridleways”

**Report No:** T4  
**Objections:** 460, 237  
**Support:** 524  
**Subject:** Duddon Bridge - Bypass  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.2.6  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. A bridge across the Duddon Estuary will impact on candidate SAC, SPA, Ramsar and SSSI. Also impact on tourist attractions. Object to the proposal until further information available. Policy in conflict with T22 JSP and previous studies have shown crossing would damage environmental significance of area (460, 237)

### **Support**

1. Welcome support for bridge (524)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. The objection appears to be directed at the major road improvement referred to in paragraph 2.8.26 (1D). Policy TSP1 actually refers to a much smaller scale local transport improvement which is to be safeguarded as part of JSP requirements. See Report D25. Whether it is a major road improvement or a local scheme there will be strict requirements as regards environmental and economic impacts and an opportunity for interested parties to object/support on the basis of the assessment produced.

### **Support**

1. Support noted
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T5  
**Objections:** 678  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Whitehaven Eastern Relief Road  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.2.6  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Scheme had no formal basis for inclusion in either the Draft Deposit JSP or RPG13.
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. The scheme is included in the current Local Transport Plan.
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T6  
**Objections:** 752, 1173  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Local Transport Plan  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.2.7  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

#### **Objection**

1. Should read A5093 not B5093 (1153)

#### **Support**

1. Welcome support for schemes and the identification of other potential schemes for inclusion in future capital programmes and LTP2
- 

### **RESPONSE**

#### **Objection**

1. Agree

#### **Support**

1. Support noted
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Change B5903 to A5903

**Report No:** T7  
**Objections:** 461, 728, 751, 679, 503  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** New road building and improvements  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP2  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## ISSUES RAISED

1. Cannot be confident that correct weight will be given to nature conservation in any road developments unless the policy is cross referenced to DEV6 and ENV4. DEV6 requires amendment. (461)
  2. Recommend 'so long as...on the environment' replaced with 'so long as any proposed transport infrastructure is planned, designed and maintained in a way that respects countryside character and contributes to the environment, and ensuring that, where necessary, all practical measures are taken to mitigate any harmful effects of such works on the environment" in order to ensure proposed transport infrastructure will be appropriate to the environment in which it is situated (728)
  3. Suggest 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point ' and take into account needs of public transport, pedestrians, cyclists and people with impaired mobility" (751)
  4. No policy basis to support TSP2 at JSP or RPG level. Flies in the face of PPG13. Sustainable strategy at odds with policy – to reduce need to travel by car. Would undermine attempts by County council to give priority to modernising Cumbria coast railway. Raises questions as to whether the LPA is really committed to principles of sustainable development. Delete. (679)
  5. TSP2, 6.2.6 and 6.2.7 are in conflict with DEV1 and should be deleted. (503)
- 

## RESPONSE

1. Plan should be treated as a whole therefore not necessary to refer to these specific policies. Objections to DEV6 dealt with in Report D34.
2. Disagree. Felt concerns already addressed and should apply to whole plan area, not just the countryside.

3. Agree.
- 4-5. The standard of communications in Copeland is very poor and acknowledged as an impediment to regeneration. Regeneration is required to deliver a sustainable future where there is overall balance between the environmental, social and economic considerations as set out in DEV1. Policy TSP2 is in line with JSP Policy T25.

---

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add new criteria to TSP2

“4. and take into account needs of public transport, pedestrians, cyclists, horseriders and people with impaired mobility”

**Report No:** T8  
**Objections:** 750  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Local Transport Improvements  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.1  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. APM stands for 'Annual Package of Measures'. Should note LTP may adjust national trends to reflect local circumstances.
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Noted
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Para 6.3.1 (1D) change 'Annual Programmed Maintenance' to read 'Annual Package of Measures' (750)

**Report No:** T9  
**Objections:**  
**Support:** 729  
**Subject:** Countryside Agency Initiatives  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.2  
**Other:**

---

**ISSUES RAISED**

**Support**

1. Pleased to see MTI's and Parish Plans referred to in this section. Initiatives will encourage community participation in transport planning (729)

---

**RESPONSE**

**Support**

1. Noted

---

**PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T10  
**Objections:** 749  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Home Zones  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.5  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Home Zones are not primarily traffic calming schemes but led by housing and liveable communities initiative. LTP2 will take on board highways elements of such schemes. (749)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Noted
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T11  
**Objections:** 748, 900  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Parking strategy  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.7  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Any parking strategy should encourage short stay use for town centres in preference to long stay parking. Presume this is the case in Whitehaven – clarify sort of parking envisaged (900)

### **Support**

1. Support intention to prepare a parking strategy (748)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. Agree

### **Support**

1. Support noted
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.3.7 (1D) “or replacement short stay”

**Report No:** T12  
**Objections:** 747  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Public transport, cycling and walking  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.8  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Would welcome addition of 'LTP targets' alongside 'government targets'(747)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Agreed
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add "LTP and.." to paragraph 6.3.8 (1D)

**Report No:** T13  
**Objections:** 730  
**Support:** 975,982  
**Subject:** Whitehaven Interchange  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.9  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Would like to ensure plan refers to consideration being given to the needs people living in surrounding rural areas as part of the transport interchange scheme at Whitehaven (730)

### **Support**

1. Proposal is important. Now people are having to walk with heavy luggage from the Station to Duke Street to catch buses. This is discrimination against the less able (975)
  2. Welcome the promise of a scheme to coordinate rail and bus services (982)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. The very idea of a transport interchange is that it serves and supports all transport users, including those in rural areas.

### **Support**

- 1&2. Support noted
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T14  
**Objections:** 731  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Rural public transport  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.3.11  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Would like to see a stronger commitment to improving rural public and community transport based initiatives. Publication 'Great ways to go' details examples of good practice in rural transport. (731)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. The Local Plan is unable to offer this commitment – more appropriate to Local Transport Plan.
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change

**Report No:** T15  
**Objections:** 680, 746, 160,  
**Support:** 238  
**Subject:** Public transport  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP4  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Policy does not address the importance of upgrading the Cumbria coastal service as envisaged by draft JSP review T21 and T24. Local Plan strategy entirely fails to drive forward priority of encouraging alternatives to the use of car and developing public transport. Should give higher priority to improving public transport and other forms of access as part of the wider sustainable strategy. (680)
2. This could seek appropriate funding contributions from developers to support new or extended public transport services (746)
3. Support enabling policy and important to ensure that development schemes pay an appropriate amount towards improving public transport infrastructure and services. (160)

### **Support**

1. Support – essential new multi modal interchange developed in Whitehaven (238)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. Council supports development which brings about improvement to public transport services and infrastructure. TSP4 and other plan policies are designed to achieve this in line with JSP Policies T21 and T24.
- 2&3. Agree

### **Support**

1. Support noted
-

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.3.11 (1D)

“Where appropriate and usually result of a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan (Policy TSP7) improved public transport service facilities will be required as part of development. Where necessary these could be delivered as part of a commuted sum payment to the Council or other provider as part of a larger scheme.”

Amend policy TSP4 to read

“Measures to improve public transport services and associated facilities will be supported. Development which will improve access to services and/or make them more attractive to users or is required to improve the efficiency of the service will be permitted.

The Council may seek funding contributions from developers to support new or extended public transport services required to service new development in accordance with Policy TSP 7 requirements.”

**Report No:** T16  
**Objections:** 25, 462, 681, 745, 957, 983  
**Support:** 239  
**Subject:** Cycleways and footpaths  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP5  
**Para:** 6.3.13  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. No mention of the need to promote new routes to give access under Countryside and Right of Way Act (025)
2. Support that policy is cross referenced to other plan policies but suggest helpful if 6.3.12 drew attention to opportunities for environmental enhancement in conjunction with cycle route design (462)
3. More reference could be made to the need for continuity in cycle lanes and footpaths to encourage use. (745)
4. Gosforth - Seascale cycleway needs given high priority as lack of public transport between villages (983)
5. Policy should recognise that different surfaces and materials are required for different users such as walkers and cyclists (681)
6. Copeland should reinforce its commitment to existing and developing cycleway network both on and off highway. Plan should include a map of the existing and proposed networks to allow positive and proactive action

### **Support**

1. Policy supported as an important element of improving attractiveness of Borough as tourist destination and support new enterprises (239)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

1. Policy ENV13 provides protection for Rights of Way and states support for new / improved locally important circular routes and long-distance paths.
2. Agreed
3. Agreed
4. Policy will be put into effect once approved route for Gosforth-Seascale cycleway once LTP adopted

5. Disagree – unnecessary for policy to specify this type of detail
  6. Council is committed to cycleway network, but unnecessary and beyond function of the plan to show all existing routes on proposals map.
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to 6.3.12 (1D)

“Their improvement can also be a means of achieving environmental enhancements. Policy ENV13 provides protection for existing rights of way and supports proposals for the improvement and promotion of locally important circular routes and long-distance paths.”

Add to Policy TSP5

“...and provide continuity in..”

**Report No:** T17  
**Objections:** 927  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** New development  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.4.2  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Referenced paragraphs should be 2.4 and 2.9.8/9 (927)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Agreed
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Cross references amended

**Report No:** T18  
**Objections:** 743, 901  
**Support:** 596  
**Subject:** General Development Requirements  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP6  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Add ‘..and appropriate public transport services’ to bullet point 4. Make reference in supporting text to ‘Cycle Friendly Infrastructure’ published by CTC and ‘Planning for Public Transport in Developments’ published by IHT (743)
2. Suggest text amended “...New development will only be permitted where the access and travel needs created by the development are catered for through the provision of ...”etc. the text as written does not include for travel needs of people using the development. Last paragraph of the policy might be better placed in the r/j (901)

### **Support**

1. Support – particularly reference to off site works. Important to secure contributions to transport infrastructure improvements (596)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

### **Objection**

1. Not appropriate for policy to specify ‘services’. Agreed should make reference to identified documents.
2. Agreed

### **Support**

1. Support noted
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.4.2 (1D) “The Council will consider proposals against the good practice guide “Planning and Access for Disabled People” (ODPM, 2003), Cycle Friendly Infrastructure (CTC) and Planning for Public Transport in Developments (IHT).”

Amend Policy TSP6:

“New development will only be permitted where the access and travel needs created by ....”

**Report No:** T19  
**Objections:** 902, 560, 561  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Transport Assessments and Travel Plans  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP7  
**Para:** 6.4.3  
**Other:**

---

## ISSUES RAISED

1. Does not adequately recognise importance of the trunk road network and as such may not afford adequate protection to safe and efficient operation of it. Suggest following paragraph is added "Access to the Highway Agency's trunk road network, whether indirectly by way of an existing access, or directly, via a new built one, will be assessed on a graduated basis. Developers transport assessments should assess the impact of development proposals on all the affected trunk road network. Contributions will be sought for any mitigation measures necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the trunk road network. Developers should refer to the DLTR Circular 04/2001 "Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980", which sets out Government Policy with respect to access to the trunk road network. The Highways Agency should be contacted at the earliest possible stage about any development that may affect the trunk road network." And 6.4.3 should be amended "...where development has the potential to cause a significant impact on the local highway and/or the trunk road network conditions will be necessary for the proposal to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment (TA), which would be made available to both the local highway authority and the Highways Agency" (560)
2. Highways Agency's policy concerning development affecting trunk roads and their requirements for Transport Assessments needs to be stated. Needs to be separate from local road policy. R/J should include information on how it will be decided whether or not a development is likely to have significant transport implications. Expand policy to cover trunk road consideration and clarify how significant transport implications will be defined. (902)
3. Wording of policy does not adequately recognise importance of trunk road network. Suggest wording "Development which is likely to have significant transport implications and all major development

proposals set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan or any developments which may directly or indirectly impact upon the trunk road network, must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan. Where a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan requires the undertaking of off site works or the provision of services, these must be provided before any part of the development is brought into use. This includes any such works affecting the trunk road network which must be agreed by the Highways Agency. Where a development would impact on the operation of the trunk road network, the content and findings of the transport assessment must be discussed with the Highways Agency. (561)

---

## **RESPONSE**

1. Agreed some of suggested text should be incorporated into para 6.4.3. Felt that suggested 6.4.3 amendment already covered by TSP7.
  - 2&3. Agreed reference should be made to impact on trunk road network. Relevant thresholds for development for Travel Plans and Transport Assessments set out in Appendix 4 to be amended in line with JSP. Amendments to 6.4.3 refer to early involvement of Highways Agency in development proposals.
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.4.3 (1D) "Where access is via a trunk road the TA should assess the impact of development proposals on all the affected trunk road network. Contributions will be sought for any mitigation measures necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the trunk road network. Developers should refer to the DLTR Circular 04/2001 "Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980", which sets out Government Policy with respect to access to the trunk road network. The Highways Agency should be contacted at the earliest possible stage about any development that may affect the trunk road network."

Add to Policy TSP7 "or any developments which may directly or indirectly impact upon the trunk road network"

Amend Appendix 4 to correspond with JSP Policy T30

**Report No:** T20  
**Objections:** 903, 161  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Parking requirements  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP8  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Parking standards are too lenient compared to PPG13, RPG and JSP. No justification of this. Appendix should make clear parking standards for C3 are intended to result in average throughout the plan area and over lifetime of plan of 1.5 off street parking spaces per dwelling.(903)
  2. Need for adequate car parking for rail users is important. Not expressed within TSP8 or Appendix 1. Policy would benefit from wording “An appropriate provision of parking facilities will be encouraged near rail and bus stations to encourage motorists to use public transport for part of their journeys” (161)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

1. The car parking standards set out in Appendix 1 are the same as the requirements of revised JSP Policy T32, themselves based on RPG 13’s maximum permitted levels. Standards are set for all the principal land-use types except residential development. The JSP refers to the detailed guidance “Parking Guidelines in Cumbria” published by the County Council for standards within residential areas and housing in town centres. It is therefore appropriate to make this same reference in Appendix 1 of the Local Plan.

The objector may have thought that the “Schedule of Guidelines” in Appendix 1 (pp 191-197) represented part of the car parking requirements. However, as noted on page 190 of the Local Plan at b) these were included specifically as a basis to work out requirements for disabled people, motor and pedal cycles which are not included in the RPG/JSP standards. To avoid any confusion it might be better to just make reference to the Parking Guidelines document for these purposes also rather than reproduce pages 191-197 in 2D.

2. Agreed that a reference to parking to encourage use of public transport should be made.

---

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.4.6 (1D) “The Council will liase with the providers of public transport, taxi services etc. to achieve appropriate levels of parking provision in association with modal interchange facilities.”

**Report No:** T21  
**Objections:** 742, 504, 928, 1174, 1181, 1182  
**Support:** 162  
**Subject:** Rail Freighting  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP9  
**Para:** 6.5.1  
**Other:**

---

## **ISSUES RAISED**

### **Objection**

1. Local Plan could provide stronger guidance on this through a policy that guides development generating significant amounts of goods traffic to locations easily served by rail.(742)
2. Dispute that it is the physical state of the railway that has reduced freight traffic. Either not the cause or matter of extreme and urgent concern since one of main users is BNFL for flask transfer. (504) 6.5.1 – Incorrect - frequent trains from Sellafield and bi weekly from Corus (1174, 1181,1182))
3. Reword second sentence “Proposals, in appropriate locations, for new development likely to have rail dependency etc...” for clarity (928)

### **Support**

1. Important that constraints in future development of rail freight minimised. Policy therefore supported as part of an enabling land-use planning framework. (162)
- 

## **RESPONSE**

1. Agreed
  2. Agreed
  3. Agreed
- 

## **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Amend para 6.5.1 (1D) to read “The physical state of the Cumbria Coastal Railway makes it difficult to expand its use for freight movements. Whilst improvements are necessary the Council will wherever possible encourage

development which is rail-dependent and facilities which support the transfer of freight between rail and road. It will expect that most development generating significant amounts of goods traffic will locate wherever possible on sites easily served by rail.”

Amend Policy TSP9

“...Proposals in appropriate locations for new development.....”

**Report No:** T22  
**Objections:** 463  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Port Development  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:** TSP10  
**Para:**  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. Millom Pier inappropriate for development – candidate SAC, SPA, Ramsar, SSSI. Is an areas where environmental improvements should be sought. Would conflict with ENV14 and would need to tie in with SMP. Land based development likely to have impact on Natterjack toads. Policy needs cross referenced with DEV 6 which requires amendment.(463)
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Policy recognises significance of nature conservation interest in area. Also afforded protection by other plan policies.
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

Add to para 6.6.2 (1D) "...international and local..."

**Report No:** T23  
**Objections:** 506  
**Support:**  
**Subject:** Airstrip  
**Chapter:** 6  
**Policy:**  
**Para:** 6.6.3  
**Other:**

---

### **ISSUES RAISED**

1. 6.6.3 is in conflict with DEV1 and should be deleted
- 

### **RESPONSE**

1. Disagree
- 

### **PROPOSED CHANGES**

No change