

Report No: 2R1
Objections: 2288
Support: 2382, 2288
Subject: Supporting the rural economy
Chapter: 5
Policy:
Para: 5.1.2
Other: Bullet point 4

ISSUES RAISED

1. Support addition of “supporting the rural economy” (2382, 2288) but look to see this reflected through commitments in Local Plan Objectives and individual policies throughout the plan (2288).
-

RESPONSE

1. Support noted. Council believes support for rural economy is given throughout plan.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R2
Objections:
Support: 2180
Subject: Employment land allocation
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP1
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

1. Support reference to “other plan policies”
-

RESPONSE

1. Support noted.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R3
Objections: 2151
Support:
Subject: Employment land allocation
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP1
Para:
Other: E7 Leconfield Extension

ISSUES RAISED

1. Objection is made to the reduction in allocation of land for employment use on the Leconfield Street employment site. The site is a key site identified for attracting new investment via the activities of the Regional Development Agency to take advantage of the operations of the Nuclear Decommissioning Agency and will attract significant public sector funding including Regional Development Agency and European Grants for investment. Reduction in allocation is likely to lead to a reduction in opportunity in an area of need.
-

RESPONSE

1. Employment land identified in 1st Deposit Version represented a significant overprovision based on JSP requirements. All proposed allocations have therefore been reassessed and several reduced or deleted. The Leconfield Extension was allocated in the Copeland Local Plan 2001 but since this time no land uptake has occurred and the site has been reduced in size in the 2nd Deposit Version. Should the proposed allocation become fully developed before the next review of employment allocations (anticipated to be 2008/9) then there is still opportunity to extend the site through implementation of Policy EMP4: Extension of existing employment use.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R4

Objections: 2092, 2107, 2109, 2112, 2113, 2115, 2117, 2120, 2121, 2138, 2146, 2294, 2332

Support:

Subject: Employment land allocation

Chapter: 5

Policy: EMP1

Para:

Other: E8 Cleator Mills

ISSUES RAISED

1. Object to loss of employment land for reasons including the following:
 - Only site in Cleator / Cleator Moor with potential to be developed for major employment, leisure and tourism – more suitable for this use
 - Site area should not be reduced
 - Loss of employment land not appropriate especially when decline at Sellafield
 - A larger employment / tourist development similar to the all weather, leisure and retail facility that the Council supported should be encouraged – also supported by local priest, Chamber of Trade
 - 1D stated that land allocated had been reduced and was needed for economic well being of the area
 - CBC welcomed proposal to allow tourism / employment use in 1991 / 2001
 - CBC have accepted the need for additional tourism activities
 - Land more suitable for inclusion within TOS2
 - Land adjacent to Cleator Mills is on a floodplain with 1 in 75 or 100 years flood risk
 - Mixed use unacceptable when development land available at Flish Meadows

2. Part of the site is now subject to compulsory acquisition under the North West Water Act 1977. This land, forming part of site E8 will be lost to employment use as it is intended to construct a new waste water separation plant. This should be compensated for by the retention of the land proposed to be deleted from the site as shown in 1D.(2332)

RESPONSE

Agreed that allocation as defined in 2D should be designated as an employment allocation rather than mixed use. Additionally reference to “Permitted Uses” should be amended to cover “also leisure and tourism related uses”. Employment use more suitable for floodplain than housing. See report 2HS12 with reference to housing land in Cleator.

All employment allocations as contained in 1D were reassessed in response to objections that there was a significant overprovision in the plan area when considered against JSP requirements. Most allocations were either reduced or deleted in order to be more in line with this requirement and it is therefore not necessary to compensate for the small area that may be lost to accommodate a waste water treatment plant.

PROPOSED CHANGES

Allocation HA32/E11 in 2D is changed to an employment allocation E11 (i.e. no longer mixed use housing / employment site) with an area of 3.74ha. Amend reference in Permitted Uses to “Also leisure and tourism related uses”. Delete reference in EM2 “see also HSG2 re mixed use”

Amend Table EM2 to read

E11: Cleator Mills Employment Allocation: 3.74ha Permitted Use: Also leisure and tourism related uses.

Amend EM2: Total Employment allocations (EMP1)(ha): 38.04

Amend paragraph 5.2.12 and Policy EMP1 accordingly

See also Report 2HS12

Report No: 2R5
Objections: 2145
Support:
Subject: Employment land allocation
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP1
Para:
Other: E10 Bridge End Extension

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Object to reduction of the site. Decline at Sellafield will mean many seeking employment in surrounding areas. Imperative for future of Egremont and the stability or preferable increase of its population to have industrial sites available for new industry. The existing site at Bridge End Extension could cater for substantial industrial development which would be in keeping with the requirements of Egremont – in contrast to the very much smaller amended site. Site is immediately adjacent to by-pass, existing industrial estate and has readily available mains water, electricity and sewage nearby. Full site would cause no detriment to visual amenity.
-

RESPONSE

1. Employment land identified in 1st Deposit Version represented a significant overprovision based on JSP requirements. All proposed allocations have therefore been reassessed and several reduced or deleted. The Bridge End Extension was allocated in the Copeland Local Plan 2001 but since this time no land uptake has occurred and the site has been reduced in size in the 2nd Deposit Version. Should the proposed allocation become fully developed before the next review of employment allocations (anticipated to be 2008/9) then there is still opportunity to extend the site through implementation of Policy EMP4: Extension of existing employment use.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R6
Objections: 2269, 2303
Support:
Subject: Employment land allocation
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP1
Para:
Other: E11 Millom Pier

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Site is inappropriate for employment use and should be considered as allocation as a town asset making use of the coastal strip, ample car parking, and possibility to develop a tourist attraction. Development for industrial purposes of this site which is viewed from far distances across the Duddon Valley and elsewhere, will do little to enhance the visual amenity and broader tourist attractions of Millom. It is understood that the site is partly contaminated and like the rest of Millom, in a high or medium flood risk location.

Allocation of this site for employment purposes is a new allocation, and clearly introduced to compensate for the loss of E14 to housing. Site highly visible and valuable coastal, potentially recreational resource. Visual intrusion would be inexplicable. If ever a link between Millom and Askham this would be gateway to Millom. Very little thought appears to have been given to the allocation of this site for industrial use other than as a 'quick fix' means to making up the allocation numbers so that HA17 can be taken out of housing use. The strategy for Millom deserves better than this.(2269)
2. E11 appears to be brought in to compensate for loss of E14 but causes problems. Land is privately owned - owners vision doesn't fit with Copeland's Plan. Visual impact against marketing Millom as an attraction.

RESPONSE

1. A larger area which incorporated site E11 was allocated in the 1st Deposit Version as an Employment Opportunity Site (EOS1) and featured as in Table EM2. All employment land has been reassessed in light of objections expressed at the 1st Deposit Stage. EOS1 has been reduced in size and made an Employment Allocation as opposed to an Opportunity Site in order to improve clarity and allow for greater certainty (see also Report R7 and 2HS7).
 2. As above. Land ownership has not been taken into consideration when determining the most appropriate sites for allocations.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R7
Objections: 2334
Support:
Subject: Employment land allocation
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP1
Para:
Other: E15 Beckermest Industrial Estate

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Beckermest Mine site is an existing industrial site. The deletion of the allocation includes land in the ownership of G&AM Lawson for which proposals exist for extension of buildings. This land only forms part of the proposed deleted area but would affect the full use of the site as currently operated.
-

RESPONSE

1. Employment land identified in 1st Deposit Version represented a significant overprovision based on JSP requirements. All proposed allocations have therefore been reassessed and several reduced or deleted. It is proposed that the allocation be deleted as it does not fit well with the Development Strategy. Policy EMP4: Extension of existing employment use may allow for future expansion of the site.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R8
Objections: 2335
Support:
Subject: Employment land allocation
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP1
Para:
Other: E16 Furnace Row, Distington

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Objection is made to the deletion of this site as an employment location. Given its location adjacent to the Lillyhall Industrial Estate and proximity to the national trunk road network the site is located in a key location for sustainable employment opportunity and compliments other developments in the vicinity.
-

RESPONSE

1. As a result of overprovision of employment allocations in the Borough against the JSP requirement all allocations in 1st Deposit Version have been reassessed. The land at Furnace Row, Distington has been allocated in previous plan with no take up which is unsurprising given its proximity to the Lillyhall Strategic Employment Site. The site does not fit well with the overall Development Strategy. It has therefore been proposed that the site will be deleted.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R9
Objections: 2181
Support: 2289, 2307
Subject: Westlakes Science and Technology Park
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP2
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Neither the Policy nor the text makes reference to the fact that a whole site Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy will be required or the importance of retaining wildlife strips adjacent to watercourses. (2181)

Support

1. Support extension to allow creation of a centre of excellence and range of job opportunities which will follow. Hope that many of jobs will go to younger local people (2289)
 2. Welcome and support references to be designed to a high standard and make a positive contribution to the high quality appearance of the Park. Consistent with NWDA intention that strategic regional sites identified within the RES should act as a flagship developments for the region (2307)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Agree to add reference to this issue in the reasoned justification. Also suggest that additional reference should be made to implementation of ENV16 with relevance to all employment sites.

Support

- 1&2. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend paragraph 5.2.16 to read:

“Overall, with the potential for future growth in mind, 17ha of land have been allocated. All proposed development on the Park must be designed to a high standard and Transport Assessments and/or Travel Plans will be required in accordance with Policy TSP7. Flooding issues must also be taken into account and a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy will also be required. The importance of retaining wildlife strips adjacent to watercourses must also be considered. A sensitive landscaping scheme will ~~also~~ be an essential part of any development proposals to maintain the established character of the Park.

Also insert additional paragraph after 5.2.14 to read

“Most sites will require a Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy in line with Policy ENV16.”

Report No: 2R10
Objections: 2059, 2182
Support:
Subject: Former Marchon Site, Kells, Whitehaven
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP3
Para: 5.2.17
Other: Whitehaven Opportunity Sites

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Changes to policy EMP3 are not specific and leave the policy open to interpretation. Without the presence of a development brief is not specific and does not offer any certainty, which will assert in the promotion and development of the site. Therefore it is believed that the policy should recognise that the future development of the site can make an important contribution to the economic strategy of the Borough. The policy should strongly indicate that the Borough Council will support a development of the site which assists in the delivery of the regeneration strategy of the Borough. (2059)
 2. Wording of the final sentence regarding this site is incorrect and should be replaced by the following "Copeland Borough Council has determined that the Marchon site is designated as a 'special site'. Therefore regulation for inspection and remediation of contamination, under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 Part IIA, will be undertaken by the Environment Agency. Investigations of the pollutant linkages on site are underway and appraisals of remedial options and/or further investigation, with the aim to improve land quality suitable for use, is ongoing.(2182)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. There is currently work commissioned on both sites to assess future potential and treatment of contamination. Whilst is anticipated that the end uses for the site is likely to include workspace development it is not appropriate at this time to speculate what the detailed land use implications will be. It is proposed (para 5.2.17) that detailed land use implications for the site will be contained in Action Plans (DPDs). It is felt appropriate to identify the site in this Plan however as they are seen as contributing significantly to the future

regeneration of the area. To not identify the sites or to make suggestions for uses which may differ to the proposed outcomes of current works would be misleading.

2. Agree - "The Environment Agency has notified it as a "special site" is a factual error.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend last sentence, paragraph 5.2.17 to read:

"The Council has designated it as a "special site". The Environment Agency is responsible for inspection and remediation of contamination and investigations are underway into the most appropriate remediation works and possible end uses."

Report No: 2R11
Objections:
Support: 2183
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP4
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R12
Objections:
Support: 2184
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP5
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R13
Objections:
Support: 2185
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP6
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R14
Objections: 2128
Support: 2186
Subject: Alternative use of employment sites
Chapter: 5
Policy: EMP7
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Policy should be modified to give greater certainty by the addition of the words “including housing” after “non employment use”. Council’s approach of balancing benefits against loss set out in paragraph 5.2.24 is apparently at odds with the use of the word “only” in the thrust of the policy approach (2128).

Support

1. Support reference to ‘other plan policies’. (2186)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Felt that it is not necessary to make addition the proposed text – “non employment use” would include housing. Use of the word “only” is not a 2D change, but the Council does not believe it is at odds with paragraph 5.2.24 as this suggests that alternative use will only be permitted where wider community benefits outweigh the loss of employment land.

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R15
Objections: 2350
Support:
Subject: Town centre uses
Chapter: 5
Policy:
Para: 5.3.13
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Most of uses listed in para 3.1.8 (also 5.3.13) 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

Objection

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. (see also Report 2D7)
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Delete reference to “small scale community facilities” from paragraph 5.3.13 (also see Report 2D7).

Report No: 2R16
Objections:
Support: 2187
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN5
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R17
Objections:
Support: 2376, 2188
Subject: Retail and service development in local centres
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN6
Para: 5.3.18
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support inclusion of new paragraph and policy which recognise importance of shops and services in maintaining vitality and viability of villages and surrounding rural communities. (2376)
 2. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.(2188)
-

RESPONSE

Support

- 1&2. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R18

Objections:

Support: 2189

Subject: Town Centre Opportunity Development Sites

Chapter: 5

Policy: TCN8

Para:

Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.(2189)

RESPONSE

Support

- 1&2. Support noted

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R19
Objections: 2127
Support:
Subject: Town Centre Opportunity Development Sites
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN8
Para:
Other: TC2:WTC2

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Potential use ascribed to site WTC2 although “only intended for guidance” falls into the trap of being “overly prescriptive”. It is also noteworthy that it is the only reference for a single use in Table TC2. WTC4 also refers to a potential hotel. It is doubtful there is scope for two. Reference to comprehensive development is again unnecessarily prescriptive. Separate development could be possible. Description should revert back to that in 1st Deposit Version.
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. The uses ascribed to sites are only intended for guidance. This is clearly stated in the Plan – paragraph 5.3.20 states that uses “...are only intended for guidance...” whilst Table TC2 identifies “Potential use or mix of uses”. The Council has determined that site WTC2 is the preferred location for a new hotel and the proposed changes reflect this.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R20
Objections:
Support: 2190
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN9
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R21
Objections: 2319
Support:
Subject: Out of centre retailing
Chapter: 5
Policy:
Para: 5.3.22 to 5.3.23
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Paragraph 5.3.2 does not provide an explanation of a related Policy in the Plan, rather than it is itself a statement of Policy. It is also considered that the proposal to delete old Policy TCN9: Off Centre Retailing will create some uncertainty as to the Council's intended approach to such developments. Whilst DEV policies set the overall context for the consideration of all development proposals, and new DEV5 is of particular relevance, nonetheless it is considered that specific advice on Out of Centre Retailing is needed to provide clarity and certainty both for prospective developers and the public at large. This needs to be more than supporting text and it is requested that a TCN9 is reinstated or a suitably worded replacement Policy that is consistent with PPS6 and adopts the sequential approach is prepared. (2319)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. The Council does not consider that large store development will be justified in out of centre locations during the life of the Plan and clearly states this. All criteria set out in previous TCN9(1D) are addressed by Policy DEV5 and DEV4 and it is stated in paragraph 5.3.23 that any such development must satisfy these two policies. It is unnecessary to include an additional policy which repeats the approach set out in these policies.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R22
Objections:
Support: 2191
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN10
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R23
Objections:
Support: 2071, 2192
Subject: TNC14
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN14
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support inclusion of wording to take account of the potential impact in release of grease and fats from food establishments (2071).
2. Support reference to 'other plan policies' (2192).

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R24
Objections:
Support: 2193
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN15
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R25
Objections:
Support: 2194
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TCN16
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R26
Objections:
Support: 2195
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TSM1
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R27
Objections:
Support: 2196
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: TSM6
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R28
Objections: 2326
Support:
Subject: Deleted Policy TSM7 (1D)
Chapter: 5
Policy: TSM7 (1D)
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Removal of this Policy (and also RUR2) notwithstanding the detailed objections at 1st Deposit Stage, leave a vacuum. It is unclear what the Council's approach to tourism related facilities (especially Class A3/A4/A5 uses) will be. It is considered that such facilities should be directed to the Key Service Centres in accordance with the Development Strategy with ancillary facilities being permitted at existing tourist attractions subject to the consideration of their detailed impacts – suitably worded policy should be reinstated.
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Such development should be assessed against other plan policies and in particular RUR1. Suggest reference to this added to paragraph 5.4.15 and 5.5.4.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend last sentence paragraph 5.4.15 to read:

“The Council will support any such proposals in appropriate situations including the expansion of existing facilities subject to the requirements of plan policies, in particular the implementation of Policy RUR1”

Amend first sentence, paragraph 5.5.4 to read:

“Small scale tourist attractions and facilities in the rural areas, perhaps involving building conversion, may also be acceptable (see paragraph 5.4.15)

Report No: 2R29
Objections: 2286
Support:
Subject: Employment in rural areas
Chapter: 5
Policy:
Para: 5.5.3
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Paragraph refers to HSG17 - believe it should be amended to allow exceptions associated with farm diversification schemes and the development of small rural businesses, recognising landscape, biodiversity and other environmental concerns.
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. HSG17 concerns the conversion of buildings to residential use in rural areas. It sets a priority such that applicants must demonstrate that alternative employment, community or mixed uses are not viable before residential use is permitted. This therefore supports farm diversification and development of small rural businesses. Other plan policies recognise landscape, biodiversity and environmental concerns.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R30
Objections:
Support: 2197
Subject: Policy wording
Chapter: 5
Policy: RUR1
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support reference to 'other plan policies'.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2R31
Objections: 2325, 2290
Support:
Subject: Deleted Policy RUR2 (1D)
Chapter: 5
Policy: RUR2 (1D)
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Removal of policy leave a gap not obviously filled elsewhere in the plan. Considered that in many cases new attractions should be directed to the Key Service Centres in accordance with the Plan's Development Strategy - however some new attractions will in fact be location specific – key is to have suitably expressed policy that ensures that opening up such a tourist attraction does not cause harm either to the very attraction itself or to its setting / surroundings. Requested that suitably worded policy be reinstated (2325).
 2. Object to deletion of paragraph and policy as this is one of the few place where farm diversification schemes and possibly small rural businesses are supported directly. Policy offers way of addressing shortfall in tourist accommodation which doesn't appear to be covered elsewhere in the plan. Some modification of the text and the policy to refer to farm diversification schemes and diversification of the rural economy within the constraints of landscape. Biodiversity and other environmental concerns would be appropriate. (2290)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

- 1&2. Small scale tourist attractions, facilities, accommodation and rural businesses are addressed by Policy RUR1.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change