



**Carlisle City Council Local Plan
Examination**

Agenda

Wednesday 9 December 2015

Timing and Programming

In order to make efficient use of time whilst allowing each participant the opportunity to put their case, the hearing will be run as a "Rolling Programme" and so timings for the afternoon sessions are approximate only. There will be mid-morning, lunch and afternoon breaks.

09:30 am Inspector's Opening

Matter 5 – Economy

Issue 2: Whether the policies in the LP will support the viability and vitality of town centres, consistent with national policy.

Q1. Policy EC6 currently proposes a 200 sq. m locally set threshold for impact assessments. However, this threshold was based on advice in the 2012 Retail Study (EB 012) and predated the publication of National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) which set out the relevant tests to be considered in setting a lower threshold compared to the 2,500 sq. m floorspace figure set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Is it justified?

[Note: Carlisle City Council has commissioned CBRE to offer further advice on setting an appropriate locally set threshold for retail impact assessments (Retail Impact Threshold Report (EL1.005d)). On the basis of the analysis completed, it is recommended that the locally set impact thresholds are increased for the urban area from 200 sq. m to 1,000 sq. m (gross) in relation to convenience retail; from 200 sq. m to 500 sq. m (gross) for comparison retail and an impact threshold of 300 sq. m (gross) for convenience and comparison retail proposals in existing district centres – see the Council's proposed Main Modifications (EL1.006b) (MM05)].

Q2. The LP makes a major allocation in Policy EC4 for a foodstore at Morton with a capacity of 8,175m². Is this justified and is there a need to control the amount of convenience and comparison split of floorspace that can be accommodated?

[Please note that the Council's proposed Main Modification (EL1.006b – MM14) proposes to remove the floorspace figure and instead refer to "foodstore anchor"]

Q3. Land to the north of Lowther Street including Rickergate is identified in Policy SP4 for a potential future expansion of the Primary Shopping Area.

- (a) Is this proposal justified by the evidence, particularly in relation to flooding?
- (b). What other reasonable alternative options were considered?

Q4. Policy SP 4 identifies Caldew Riverside as a significant regeneration opportunity. Does the evidence that underpins this allocation demonstrate that the development of this site would not undermine the delivery of sequentially preferable site opportunities

in the City Centre, in particular the future expansion of the Primary Shopping Area and if so, will the policies be effective in ensuring the vitality and viability of the city centre is enhanced?

Lunch

Afternoon session start approx 1.30pm

Matter 6: Infrastructure Provision

Issue: Whether the LP will provide the necessary infrastructure to support the level of development proposed and within the timescales envisaged.

Q1. Is the Infrastructure Delivery Plan realistic in assessing the timescales that infrastructure will come forward over the plan period?

Q2. Is Policy IP 2 consistent with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework in so far as the policy states that "development that causes significant issues that cannot be mitigated against will be resisted" which is a lower threshold than severe harm referred to in paragraph 32?

Q3. Will a Supplementary Planning Document that sets minimum parking standards for the district (a) be setting out policy that should be included in the Local Plan? (b) be justified; (c) be consistent with national policy?

Matter 7: Other Questions

Q1. Should Policy CC2 refer to AONBs?

Q2. The NPPF requires that Plan policies should contain a positive strategy for the historic environment and how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. Does the support in Policy H07 for enabling development subject to compliance with a number of criteria, offer sufficient protection to ensure that proposals do not harm the significance of heritage assets and is it consistent with the framework that confirms that such proposals will be unacceptable unless a specific set of criteria are met?

Q3. On 18 June 2015, the Secretary of State published a WMS regarding onshore wind turbine development. The WMS sets out new considerations to be applied to proposed wind energy development so that local people have the final say on wind farm applications. When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:

- the proposed development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and
 - following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the proposal reflects the planning concerns of affected local communities and therefore has their backing.
- In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan.

(a) In light of this WMS, is Policy CC2 effective and consistent with national policy?

(b) Do the Main Modifications suggested by the Council ensure the LP would be sound in relation to wind energy development?