

Report No: 2D7
Objections: 2348
Support:
Subject: Development Strategy for Copeland
Chapter:
Policy: 3.1.8
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

1. Most of uses listed in para 3.1.8 are included in PPS6 with exception of “small scale facilities”. Would suggest that this reference is removed given that small scale community uses could reasonably be provided near where people live. Second sentence of paragraph 3.1.8 should be deleted and replaced with: “Proposals for town centre uses which include retail, leisure, entertainment facilities and the more intensive sport and recreation uses, offices, arts, culture and tourism developments, should ideally be located within the town centre boundaries.”
Encouraged by recognition that historical character of town centre means that it does not lend itself to larger scale developments and as consequence edge of centre will be considered.

RESPONSE

1. The 2nd Deposit Version of the Plan was prepared with reference to draft PPS6 which did refer to ‘small scale community facilities’ as development to which town centre policies would apply. PPS6 was published earlier this year and it is noted that “small scale community facilities” has been omitted from the final version. The Local Plan will be amended to reflect these changes.

PROPOSED CHANGES

Delete reference to “small scale community facilities” from paragraph 3.1.8 (also see Report 2R15).

Report No: 2D8
Objections: 2349
Support:
Subject: Development Strategy for Copeland
Chapter: 3
Policy:
Para: 3.1.9
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

1. Wording implies that where there is potential to contribute to other wider regeneration aims and strategies, this would give added impetus to the demonstration of 'qualitative need' and therefore the 'need' for a proposed development in an edge of centre or out of centre location. Government guidance contained in PPS6 is clear that the demonstration of "need" relates to both quantitative and qualitative considerations, albeit greater weight is given to quantitative need. It is also clear, however that wider benefits such as regeneration and employment benefits are not in themselves factors that lead to the demonstration of 'retail need' but are material considerations to be weighed in the balance when considering the planning merits of individual schemes. On this basis, we consider that the text of the paragraph 3.1.9 should be amended to reflect this and the sentence quoted above should state "A need for the proposal must also be demonstrated. This will be in the form of quantitative need but also qualitative need will need to be taken into account".

RESPONSE

1. The Council believes that the wording as proposed in the 2nd Deposit is appropriate. It is recognised that regeneration and employment issues do not constitute indications of need for additional floorspace but in an area such as Copeland, where regeneration is the number one priority, such factors are very likely to be given considerable weight as a material consideration. It is therefore considered relevant and justifiable to make reference to this in the plan.

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D9
Objections: 2320
Support: 2158
Subject: DEV1 Sustainable Development and Regeneration
Chapter: 3
Policy: DEV1
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Considered there is an inconsistency between DEV1 and revised Aims and Objectives in that absence of reference to pursuit of the enhancement of environmental quality in the Borough. DEV1 requires amendment to ensure revised Local Plan Aims and Objectives are secured. Add following wording "...where social progress and economic growth combine with prudent use of resources and the protection and enhancement of the quality of the environment" (2320)

Support

1. Support introduction of the words "Local Plan Aims and Objectives" (2158)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. DEV1 makes specific cross reference to the Local Plan Aims and Objectives which state 'Protect and enhance landscapes, habitats and the built and natural environments', 'Protect and enhance landscapes and townscapes', 'Protect and enhance biodiversity', 'Protect and enhance features of historical and archaeological importance'.

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D10

Objections: -

Support: 2087, 2090, 2130, 2148, 2150, 2242, 2244, 2246, 2248, 2250, 2252, 2254, 2256, 2258, 2260, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2374, 2405,2406 (Total: 21)

Subject: DEV3 The Green

Chapter: 3

Policy: DEV3

Para:

Other: The Green

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support for removal of The Green from the list of Local Centres for reasons including:
 - Being a Local Centre would detrimentally alter The Green's character.
 - The Green has insufficient local infrastructure to support future growth. Impact on safety of children.
 - Local Centre would allow fundamental alteration to rural hamlet with many undesirable consequences.
 - There should be no large scale development at The Green.
 - Local Centre would mean loss of greenfields
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D11
Objections: 2153
Support:
Subject: DEV4 Frizington
Chapter: 3
Policy: DEV4
Para:
Other: Frizington

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. The extension of the development boundary at Mid Town Farm offers the opportunity for greenfield housing development under other policies of the plan which will reinforce and extend ribbon development on this busy main road. Other opportunities exist within the settlement for infill development including land at the former coal yard at Yeathouse Road (south of Trafalgar House). Logically this land should be included within the development boundary as being more appropriate for development as a brownfield site than Mid Town Farm.
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. The Development Boundary in the 1st Deposit Version did not allow sufficient space for infill development which the Local Plan Working Group thought appropriate given that Mid Town Farm has always been in the settlement boundary.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D12
Objections: 2419
Support:
Subject: DEV6
Chapter: 3
Policy: DEV6
Para:
Other: Criteria 3

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. The bracket in subsection 3 should read (HSG13, 16 and 19). The other policies are re-numbered in line with the 2nd Deposit Version revisions. All cross references in this section should be verified against the new revisions.
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

All cross references will be updated and amended as appropriate.

Report No: 2D13

Objections: 2377

Support:

Subject: Village Design Statements and Parish Plans

Chapter: 3

Policy:

Para: 3.2.2 and 3.4.4

Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support references to Village Design Statements and Parish Plans and the commitment by the Council to take these into consideration and, where appropriate, adopt these as SPD.

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D14
Objections:
Support: 2066, 2159
Subject: New development accommodated within capacity of existing infrastructure
Chapter: 3
Policy:
Para: 3.2.8
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support inclusion of 'foul and surface water drainage' in paragraph.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D15
Objections:
Support: 2067, 2160
Subject: Conservation of water resources
Chapter: 3
Policy:
Para: 3.2.10
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support inclusion of “quantity” (2160) and “water saving devices” (2067 / 2160) in paragraph.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D16
Objections: 2161
Support:
Subject: Sequential flood test
Chapter: 3
Policy:
Para: 3.2.11
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. New sentence does not adequately reflect sequential test in Table 1 PPG25. Following revised wording suggested: “Where developed has to be located in high flood risk areas, such development will be more acceptable in areas that are already developed and protected by existing flood defences rather than in undeveloped and sparsely developed areas. Development in functional floodplains will be restricted to essential transport and utilities infrastructure that has to be there.”
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Agree
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend wording to that suggested.

Report No: 2D17
Objections: 2068
Support:
Subject: DEV 7Sustainability in Design
Chapter: 3
Policy: DEV7
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support addition of “water saving devices”. Customers use more and more water to support ‘modern’ living the answer is not to build more utility infrastructure alone but to conserve resources as well.

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Support noted

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D18
Objections: 2097
Support:
Subject: **Accommodating Biodiversity Design Guide**
Chapter: 3
Policy:
Para: 3.4.3
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Object to change in text which involves withdrawal of commitment to a Design Brief to accommodate biodiversity.
-

RESPONSE

1. The Council has set out proposals for future planning policy documents in the Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS schedule at present does not allow for the production of such Design Guides. To suggest otherwise would be misleading. If resources allow, such guides may be incorporated into the LDS in the future.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2D19
Objections: 2162, 2298
Support: 2380
Subject: Supplementary Planning Documents
Chapter: 3
Policy:
Para: 3.4.4
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. New paragraph makes no mention of need for Flood Risk SPD. Environment Agency's Flood Maps are reviewed every 3 months and hence it is essential that Flood Risk SPD is produced which refers to the latest flood maps in order to successfully operate Policy DEV7 (2162).
2. Best Value Performance Indicator concerns Conservation Area Appraisals – would be appropriate as SPD. Suggested that Conservation Areas Appraisals are referred to as well as Town and Village Design Statements and Parish Plan (2298).

Support

1. Support intention to prepare SPD on Landscape Character as well as other issue (2380).
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. The SPD's mentioned in paragraph 3.4.4 form part of the adopted Local Development Scheme whereas a Flood Risk SPD does not. Resources currently available do not allow for Flood Risk SPD and to make reference to such a document at this stage would be misleading. It is anticipated however that such work will be carried out in the future and provide an evidence base for the future Housing and Employment DPD's.
2. The Council does not currently have the resources to carry out Conservation Area Appraisals. If and when resources are available for such work it is suggested that they would be adopted as SPD. To make reference to such documents being produced would at this stage be misleading.

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change