

SHLAA Consultation May - July 2012 - Consultation Responses

| Ref | Name/Organisation | Comment | Council Response |
|------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 001 | Barclay Simpson, Care and Lifestyle Villages | OC37 - site should be suitable for a care village | Disagree - Site is isolated in the open countryside. It would be unsustainable and is not suitable for development. |
| 002 | Lake District National Park | No comments on sites at this time | Acknowledged |
| 004 | National Trust | Concern over the potential impact of WE01 and WE02 on Wetheral Woods and the Old Priory. Suggests that a) Development should be focused on the northern and western parts of these sites; b) careful consideration would be need to be given to design and materials on these sites; c) appropriate landscaping of sites should be required. | Noted. Any detailed proposals for development on either of these sites, should they be allocated in the Local Plan, will be subject to a planning application which will address and be assessed upon all the issues listed here. It is not appropriate to consider such detail during the SHLAA process. |
| 005 | Persimmon | CA23 - confirming that Persimmon own the site and that they consider it to be both viable and deliverable. | Noted. CA23 has been classed as a deliverable site in the current version of the SHLAA. |
| 006 | Coal Authority | No site specific comments. Welcome the assessment of ground conditions when considering sites. Also request that any future allocations take account of potential impacts on mineral resources in a locality. | Acknowledged |
| 007 | Cumbria Constabulary | No specific site comments. Statement of intention to continue to engage with Local Plan Process and at allocation/planning application stage in particular | Noted |
| 008 | English Heritage | Guidance on ensuring heritage and conservation are taken into account during SHLAA assessment | Noted - the impact on the historic environment and conservation constraints were taken into account when assessing SHLAA sites |
| 009 | SmithsGore | BR10 - Support inclusion of the site in the SHLAA and state belief that is likely to be developable within the first 10 years of the plan period. Request it brought into the deliverable classification. | Noted. However, this site has caused significant local concern, which has prompted the Council to reassess the land and its inclusion within the SHLAA. After investigation we feel that the concerns of local residents are justified and that this site would not be able to be developed without significant and unacceptable detriment to the landscape and the amenity of neighbouring properties. As such, the site is considered unsuitable for residential development and is now considered to have no potential. |
| 010 | SmithsGore | RO04 - Support for inclusion of site in the SHLAA. | Acknowledged |
| 011 | SmithsGore | Sites at Wetheral - Concern that two sites submitted for SHLAA have not been included. | Acknowledged. Unfortunately we have no record of these sites being submitted to the SHLAA. We are however aware of them as potential housing sites as our colleagues in Development Management are currently dealing with enquires on both of them. This would suggest that work has moved on from the SHLAA stage, we can however include both pieces of land in the annual review of the SHLAA. |
| 012 | Carlisle Conservation Officer | No site specific comments. Recommends ensuring sites area assessed in terms of proximity to and impacts on heritage assests. Sensitive design should also be a coniseration should sites be taken forward. | Acknowledged. An assessment of site suitability included taking into consideration the potential impact of a site on heritage assets. Policies will guide and ensure good design of development should sites come forward for development at later stages of the planning process. |
| 013 | SmithsGore | New site submitted at Wetheral Pasture | New sites will be considered in the next update of the SHLAA due to commence later this year |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 014 | Stanwix Rural Parish | <p>HO01 - Object on grounds of rural encroachment, proximity to M6, local resistance to new housing in the village and the potential to set precedent of encroachment</p> <p>HO02 - Object on grounds of local resistance to new housing in the village</p> <p>HO03 - Object on grounds of part of the site being County wildlife/local nature reserve, impact upon connectivity of wildlife sites, and local resistance to new housing in the village</p> <p>OC30 - Object to site on proximity of silage pit and anaerobic digester, foul drainage system capacity, local resistance to new housing in the village and that site had previously been listed in the SHLAA as having no potential</p> <p>OC31 - Object to site on grounds of foul drainage capacity, local resistance to new housing in the village, and the fact that the site was originally discounted from the SHLAA</p> <p>OC32 - Object to site on proximity of silage pit and anaerobic digester, foul drainage system capacity, local resistance to new housing in the village and that site had previously been listed in the SHLAA as having no potential</p> | <p>Noted. Objections have been logged and shall be considered should any site be taken forward into the formal allocation stage. The constantly evolving nature of policy and the SHLAA has meant that some sites that have perviously been ruled out can now be justified through national policy. Mitigation measures shall be required for any possible developments that may impact upon the natural environment, likewise for any development where future residents would need to be screened from noise pollution. The SHLAA, which merely assesses the technical potential for housing development is not the appropriate stage to explore these measures in detail.</p> |
| 015 | Environment Agency | Assessment of numerous potential constraints on sites - including proxmity to landfill, flood risk, biodiversity and ground water vulnerability | Noted. This data shall be used to inform site suitability. |
| 016 | I Turnbull | <p>DA03 - Not in favour of development on site.</p> <p>Would like to see more development in Lingey</p> | <p>Noted. Should sites come forward in Lingey the Council will consider their potential to be allocated for housing within the Local Plan. It should be noted however that Lingey has no services and limited access to public transport. It is unlikely that it would be considered a sustainable location for new housing development.</p> |
| 017 | I Turnbull | DA04 - Agree with SHLAA assessment. | Noted. |
| 018 | I Turnbull | DA02 - Agree with SHLAA assessment. | Noted |
| 019 | I Turnbull | DA01 - Supports SHLAA assessment, would like to see new foot/cycle links with the train station should development come forward on the site. | <p>Noted. The establishment of new pedestrian/cycle links associated with new development is a matter for any planning applications that may come forward on this site in future. The Council would expect development to be well connected to existing services and support the creation of new sustainable transport links wherever it is possible to do so.</p> |
| 020 | Natural England | No site specific comments. Natural England requests that the potential impact on biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape and green infrastructure are considered when assessing SHLAA sites | <p>Noted. The potential impact of sites on the natural environment has been considered as demonstrated in the SHLAA methodology. Constraints presented by the natural environment on development have been used to assess site suitability.</p> |
| 021 | United Utilities | A number of site specific comments regarding potential utility constraints. United Utilities have also expressed a desire to engage with the Local Plan process from the start, suggesting a possible joint working group to work on site selection and policy development. | <p>Noted. These comments were used in assessing site suitability. The Council welcomes United Utilities offer of support as the Local Plan develops, and will look to open discussions surrounding a possible working group in the near future.</p> |
| 022 | SmithsGore | WB02 - concern over mention of flood risk within constraints when this is not supported by EA flood zones. Desire to see site classed as deliverable rather than developable and with a greater potential yield. | <p>Noted - site has been reassessed. It is unclear why flood risk was mentioned on the site constraints, reference to which has since been removed. The site has therefore also been reclassified as deliverable to reflect the removal of this constraint. The Council agrees that the site could perhaps support a greater number of houses, there is concern however that development here could have a detrimental impact upon the landscape, particularly given the already jarring transition between countryside and settlement resulting from the straight-line form of this part of the village. As such development should be limited. An increase of potential capacity to 40% (24 dwellings) could be justified however.</p> |
| 023 | Taylor & Hardy | HO03 - Concern that the site has an estimated yield considerably lower than what it would be capable of providing | <p>Noted. This site currently has an estimated capacity of 124 new dwellings. This is considerably lower than the 838 that could be provided if a standard 30 dwellings per hectare multiplier was applied to the site as a whole. As it stands however, within the wider context of Houghton, 124 new dwellings would be a highly significant increase in settlement size, any greater would begin to verge on being of unsustainable scale. Part of the site is a Cumbria Wildlife site, which again would limit housing potential. United Utilities have highlighted that waste water treatment for the settlement is nearing capacity, which also limits the deliverable capacity of the site.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 024 | J Dalglish | OC48 - Desire to see site brought back into the SHLAA due to its proximity to Scotby. Considers site to be an established part of Aglionby village. Concern that site is classed as greenfield rather than brownfield. | Agree. Under national policy, this site could now be justified, in that it could support services in nearby Scotby. It also has good public transport connections to Carlisle. Site will be brought back into the SHLAA. The site appears to largely consist of gardens and has therefore been classed as greenfield on this basis. |
| 025 | D Bell | DA03 - not in favour of development on site. Concern over increased traffic and toxic exhaust fumes that may result from development of this site. | Noted. The Highways Authority have looked at this site and have raised no concerns regarding highway capacity within Dalston. Should the site come forward for development, however, we will look closely at the impact increased car journeys will have on the village. |
| 026 | D Bell | DA01 - not in favour of development on site. Concern over increased traffic and toxic exhaust fumes that may result from development of this site. | Noted. The Highways Authority have looked at this site and have raised no concerns regarding highway capacity within Dalston. Should the site come forward for development, however, we will look closely at the impact increased car journeys will have on the village. |
| 027 | A & B Lambert | BR10 - Object to the inclusion of this site due to poor access and highway capacity. | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 028 | R & H Lancaster | BR10 - Object on access, loss of wild life, landscape impact, potential overlooking and drainage grounds | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 029 | R N Allen | BR10 - object on access, landscape impact, impact on conservation area and potential over development grounds. BR10 should be classed as having no potential. | Noted. The Council is aware of significant access constraints on this site. At this stage however we do not feel that this would prevent development coming forward, though we have classed this as a category 2 'Developable' site as opposed to the more likely to come forward 'Deliverable' sites. Other constraints, in line with those mentioned, have also been identified on the site, but again it is not felt that these would put an immediate halt to the potential of this site. Should things progress with the land then each of these issues will be looked at in more detail. |
| 030 | I Little | BR10 - object on access, landscape impact, impact on residential amenity and potential over development grounds | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 031 | Story Homes | <p>Desire to see sites identified within Aglionby</p> <p>New sites in brampton, Scotby and Whetheral.</p> <p>Site CA27W should be brought back into the assessment to mirror development at CA23</p> <p>Site OC40 should be brought back into the study as it could be developed to a low density that would mirror the form of surrounding development.</p> <p>Support inclusion of sites in Linstock, would suggest OC31 would be the most preferable site</p> <p>Desire to see CUW04 considered to have potential within the SHLAA</p> <p>Desire to see DU01 considered to have potential within the SHLAA</p> | <p>Noted. There is one site within Aglionby that has been assessed as suitable in the SHLAA. The Council will consider any new sites that come forward within the village as per the standard SHLAA methodology.</p> <p>Noted. New sites will be assessed within the next round of the SHLAA.</p> <p>Disagree - CA27W would result in unacceptable loss of the open aspect of this part of Carlisle. It would not mirror CA23, which is screened from the road.</p> <p>Disagree - The development of OC40 would not be in keeping with the village. If designed to be of a low enough density as to be in keeping with its surrounding housing numbers on site would be too low to be considered strategic and therefore would not be appropriate to be assessed within the SHLAA.</p> <p>Noted. The SHLAA cannot offer preference over suitable and deliverable sites within a settlement. Options for development in Linstock will be consulted on in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Disagree. The access on this site is not suitable for development.</p> <p>Disagree. The scale of this site would be unsuitable for Durdar.</p> |
| 032 | A Hatcher | WE03 - concern over potential loss of mature trees on site. Also desire to see lower density development to reduce amount of traffic generated by the development. | <p>Noted. The Council tree officer will investigate the potential to apply TPOs to these trees if required.</p> <p>Site density and design will be subject to consideration at later stages of the planning process should this site come forward for development</p> |
| 033 | A Hatcher | WE06 - support exclusion of site from SHLAA. | Noted |
| 034 | A Hatcher | WE01 & WE02 - support inclusion within the SHLAA. Suggestion that options for a combined proposal should be explored. | Noted. Options for combined development proposals would be looked at in more detail should either come forward for development in the future. |
| 035 | H&H | OC43 - site should be brought back into the SHLAA as it is currently rejected on policy grounds, which should not be sufficient to rule it out at this early stage. | Noted. There are other reasons as to why this site would not be suitable, including the loss of woodland, landscape impact and issues around houses fronting onto the A7. Site description shall be updated to reflect this. |
| 036 | Colliers International | CA47 - agree with SHLAA assessment | Noted |
| 037 | B Tweddle | Concern over the lack of publicity surrounding the SHLAA consultation. | Noted. The Council shall look at ways of improving publicity around future SHLAA consultation. Care must be taken to avoid implying significant weight to the document, which does not contain formal planning proposals. |
| 038 | SmithsGore | New site in Linstock | Noted. New sites will be assessed within the next round of the SHLAA. |
| 039 | The Planning Bureau Ltd | Desire to see reference to the need to plan for specialist needs housing for the elderly in the SHLAA. | Noted. The SHLAA does not attempt to specify the use and type of housing land may have the potential for. The emerging Local Plan, however, will have policy specifically designed to ensure the needs of elderly residents are met. |
| 040 | Barton Willmore | BL01 - seek an increase in potential capacity on site. Seek reclassification from developable to deliverable. | Noted and agreed - site capacity has been increased. Regarding site classification, we are awaiting information from United Utilities and Cumbria Highways in order to assess constraints on site. Once the Council is satisfied no constraints are present this site could be reclassified. |
| 041 | Taylor & Hardy | DA04 - Express disappointment at DA04 being assessed as having no potential | Noted. Unfortunately it is considered that DA04 does not relate well to the settlement and therefore cannot be considered suitable for development. |
| 042 | T Wilson | BR10 - Object to inclusion of the site in the SHLAA due to its unsuitable topography, landscape impact, impact on the amenity of nearby residents and access | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 043 | D Smith | BR10 - Object to the inclusion of this site due to poor access and highway capacity. | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 044 | How Planning Ltd | OC23 - Support inclusion within the SHLAA | Noted. |
| 045 | S & P Young | BR10 - Object to inclusion in the SHLAA due to poor access, landscape impact, and impact on residential amenity BR11 - object to inclusion in the SHLAA due to highway capacity in the town and landscape impact. | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. Regarding BR11 - The Cumbria Highways authority were consulted on this site and raised no issues regarding highway capacity within the town. Landscape impact issues here could be mitigated against through good design, such issues would be considered in greater detail should the site come forward for development. It is not felt there is justification enough to remove this site from the SHLAA. |
| 046 | D & A Purvis | BR10 - Object to inclusion of the site in the SHLAA due to landscape impact and access | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 047 | Taylor & Hardy | BR03 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA. Concern that it is suggested that development would likely need to be limited to the southern portion of the site. | Noted. Comments regarding the limiting of development to a certain portion of the site are largely to highlight potential issues of landscape impact should the land reach application stage. It would be at application stage that this could be explored in more detail, should it come forward. |
| 048 | Persimmon | CA24 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA | Noted. |
| 049 | Taylor & Hardy | OC49 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA. | Noted. |
| 050 | Taylor & Hardy | DA03 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA. Concern that it is suggested that development would likely need to be limited. | Noted. Comments regarding the limiting of development to a certain portion of the site are largely to highlight potential issues of landscape impact should the land reach application stage. It would be at application stage that this could be explored in more detail, should it come forward. |
| 051 | Taylor & Hardy | DU03 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA. | Noted. |
| 052 | Taylor & Hardy | CA08 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA | Noted |
| 053 | Taylor & Hardy | CUW02 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA, though some concern over the statement of whether Cumwhinton needs to expand over the plan period. | Noted. Any decisions regarding the expansion and growth of Cumwhinton will be explored in the Local Plan. For now, the SHLAA shows what land is available should growth be planned. |
| 054 | Taylor & Hardy | RO01 - Support inclusion within the SHLAA | Noted |
| 055 | Taylor & Hardy | RO02 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA | Noted |
| 056 | Taylor & Hardy | CA07 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA | Noted |
| 057 | Taylor & Hardy | SC04 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA | Noted |
| 058 | Taylor & Hardy | WE03 - desire to see site considered deliverable rather than developable. | Noted. Whilst constraints on the site are not insurmountable it is considered that the highways issues raised by Cumbria Highways coupled with the likely contamination (and required treatment) of the land may hamper the deliverability of this site in the short term. As such there has been no change to its classification. |
| 059 | Taylor & Hardy | WE02 - request reconsidering site as deliverable. Updated site plan showing access onto road included. | Agreed. Now that access can be demonstrated this site is considered to be deliverable. |
| 060 | Taylor & Hardy | BR01 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA. Concern that it is suggested that development would likely need to be limited. | Noted. Comments regarding the limiting of development to a certain portion of the site are largely to highlight potential issues of landscape impact should the land reach application stage. It would be at application stage that this could be explored in more detail, should it come forward. |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 061 | Taylor & Hardy | DA01 - Support inclusion in the SHLAA. Concern that it is suggested that development would likely need to be limited. | Noted. Comments regarding the limiting of development to a certain portion of the site are largely to highlight potential issues of landscape impact should the land reach application stage. It would be at application stage that this could be explored in more detail, should it come forward. |
| 062 | Taylor & Hardy | CA05 - disagree with assessment of site as having no potential. Consider access is achievable and that the site remains brownfield as opposed to green. | Noted and disagree. The assessment on this site still stands. The access is not suitable for development and improvements likely to prove unviable. |
| 063 | Taylor & Hardy | SC09 - Agree with SHLAA assessment, but concern over the mentioning of access issues | Noted. Whilst it is appreciated that access may be possible on to Holme Close, this would involve the demolition of an existing dwelling. Therefore, the assessment of the site currently lacking suitable access is valid. |
| 064 | Bell Ingram Design | Details of a major Ethylene pipe route that could have constraints for the following sites due to proximity: LO01, LO02, LO03, LO07, OC30, OC32, SC02, SC05 Pipe would run through SC02, all others are in close proximity | Noted. This will be used when assessing ultimate suitability of sites when it comes to selecting options for allocations. |
| 065 | Taylor & Hardy | LR01 - Disagree with assessment of this site as having no potential. Request it be reconsidered. | Noted. Unfortunately it is still felt that Low Row is not a sustainable location for new development given its lack of services and isolation from any Local or Key Service Centres. As such the assessment of this site remains unchanged |
| 066 | J Cornthwaite | SM01 - Support assessment in SHLAA. Notification of change of address. | Noted. Our consultation database has been updated. |
| 067 | Persimmon | New site submitted adjacent to CA24 | Noted. This site will be considered in the next SHLAA updated. |
| 068 | Mr & Mrs Springate | BR10 - Object to inclusion of site in the SHLAA | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 069 | E Ridpath | BR10 - Object to inclusion of site in the SHLAA | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 070 | C Robinson | BR10 - Object to inclusion of site in the SHLAA | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 071 | D & S Hurd | BR10 - Object to inclusion of site in the SHLAA | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 072 | P Jackson (Burgh By Sands Parish Council) | TH02 - Object to site's inclusion in the SHLAA due to the potential impact it could have on the village of Thurstonfield, also highlights the unsuitable topography of the site and the impact houses here would have on existing properties. | Noted. This site has been reassessed. It is felt that Thurstonfield is not a suitable location for this level of new development and therefore the inclusion of a potential site in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is not appropriate. This site is now considered as having no potential for the purposes of the SHLAA. |

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 073 | G & L O'Brien | BR10 - Object to inclusion of site in the SHLAA | Noted. The Council is aware of significant constraints on this site. We have listened to local concern and have reevaluated this site. It is felt that concerns are justified and that this site could not be developed without significant detriment to the landscape and amenity of neighbouring properties. The site has therefore been reassessed to be unsuitable for housing development and classed as having no potential in the SHLAA. |
| 074 | W Smithson | CUD01 - Preferred site within the village as it would have least traffic impact | Noted |
| 075 | P O'Dowd | CUD01 and CUD03 supported. Would not want to see CUD02 developed | Noted |
| 076 | J & J Sinclair | CUD01 - Preferred site as it would have the least impact on the village. Concern that CUD02 would have poor access and create significant problems for the village. CUD03 is considered possible, though road would need widened and could increase traffic passing the school. | Noted |
| 077 | Anonymous Cummersdale Resident | Would support CUD03 | Noted |
| 078 | J Faulder | Concern that low water pressure on Caldew Road is a significant issue. Would hope that CUD03 would see a widening of the road to allow access, CUD02 is considered unsuitable due to narrow access. CUD01 would be preferred site. | Noted. Issues around water pressure would be addressed at later stages in the planning process, should any of the sites come forward for development |
| 079 | J & S Perryman | Only suitable site in Cummersdale is CUD01 as it would have least impact on the village | Noted |
| 080 | R Burrell | Concern that extra housing in Cummersdale is not needed given the granting of premission for major development at Morton. CUD01 would be preferred site and most suitable for the village. CUD02 would be unsuitable due to the narrow access and lack of scope for improvement. CUD03 would be possible though it would have an impact on the village setting it could be used to secure widening of the road next to it. | Noted. The amount of housing that would be suitable in Cummersdale over the next 15 years will be addressed in the Local Plan to be consulted upon in early 2013. |
| 081 | B Dockerty | CUD02 would not be suitable due to narrow access. | Noted. |
| 082 | D Cradduck | CUD02 would not be suitable due to narrow access and lack of services in the village | Noted |
| 083 | A Prestwell | Oppose sites CUD01, CUD02 and, in particular, CUD03, due to the impact upon the village particularly in terms of traffic impact. | Noted |
| 084 | S Nicholson | CUD01 would be the best site for Cummersdale as it would have the least impact in terms of traffic on the village. | Noted |
| 085 | D Cloat | CUD02 - highly unsuitable site due to poor access. CUD01 would be suitable and have the least impact on Cummersdale in terms of traffic. CUD03 would be possible as it would bring Caldew Bank more into the village, but the road would require widening. | Noted |
| 086 | Anonymous Cummersdale Resident | Concern that extra housing in Cummersdale is not needed given the granting of premission for major development at Morton. CUD01 would be preferred site and most suitable for the village. CUD02 would be unsuitable due to the narrow access. | Noted. The amount of housing that would be suitable in Cummersdale over the next 15 years will be addressed in the Local Plan to be consulted upon in early 2013. |
| 087 | E Austin | CUD01 would be the best site for Cummersdale as it would have the least impact in terms of traffic on the village. CUD02 would also be suitable as it could be accessed from outside of the village via a road opposite Peter Lane. CUD03 would be the least suitable site as it would involve traffic going through the village, particularly past the school. | Noted |

| | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 088 | J Crosbie | Supports the idea of new housing in Cummersdale to safeguard existing services and possibly encourage the opening of a village shop. CUD01 is a suitable site with few infrastructure problems and well related to the village. CUD02 would be unsuitable as it would result in the loss of access to an important public bridleway. CUD03 is suitable and could provide the opportunity to widen a dangerous road. Housing should be a mix of affordable family homes and larger properties. | Noted. Housing mix on sites, should they come forward, will be addressed at later stages of the planning process. |
| 089 | W Smith | CUD01 - would be preferred site as it would have least impact on the village. | Noted |
| 090 | L & C Asbridge | CUD01 would be preferred site for Cummersdale as it would have least impact upon the village. CUD02 would not be a suitable site for housing development due to poor access. CUD03, whilst having potential, would not be the preferred option. | Noted |
| 091 | A & F Sanderson | CUD01 is a suitable site. CUD02 is unsuitable. CUD03 would be in danger of creating ribbon development, though not wholly unsuitable. | Noted |
| 092 | R Duncanson | CUD01 is the most suitable site for Cummersdale as it would cause the least disruption to the village | Noted |
| 093 | B Mardon | Generally against any new building within Cummersdale, CUD01, CUD02 and CUD03 all unsuitable due to the increase in traffic and impact upon the landscape and loss of farmland. | Noted |
| 094 | E Dickins | CUD01 and CUD03 - concern potential residents would be subjected to excess noise from the Pirelli factory and other nearby industrial uses. CUD02 would be preferable as it would have no noise or traffic issues. | Noted |
| 095 | T & D Jackson | CUD01 would be preferred site for Cummersdale as it would have least impact upon the village. CUD02 would not be a suitable site for housing development due to poor access. CUD03 is also unsuitable due to the impacts on residential amenity and wildlife. | Noted |
| 096 | A Pearson | CUD01 would be preferred site for Cummersdale as it would have the least impact upon the village. | Noted |
| 097 | R & L Dixon | CUD01 would have the least impact on the village and traffic would be minimal. CUD02 is unsuitable. Site CUD03 would add to traffic problems on Caldew Road, there are also drainage issues in this part of the village. Question the need for more housing in the village. | Noted. The amount of housing that would be suitable in Cummersdale over the next 15 years will be addressed in the Local Plan to be consulted upon in early 2013. |
| 098 | I Story | CUD01 would have best access and least impact upon Cummersdale. | Noted |
| 099 | S & K Soars | Sites CUD01 and CUD03 are suitable for the village. CUD02 is wholly unsuitable due to poor access. | Noted |
| 100 | A & T Story | CUD01 would be preferred site for Cummersdale as it would have least traffic impact upon the village. | Noted |
| 101 | G Norman | CUD01 would be preferred site for Cummersdale. | Noted |
| 102 | Anonymous Cummersdale Resident | CUD01 is the only suitable site for Cummersdale. | Noted |
| 103 | D & C Story | CUD01 is the most suitable site for Cummersdale as it would cause the least disruption to the village | Noted |
| 104 | A Pale | CUD01 would be preferred site for Cummersdale. | Noted |
| 105 | E Edgar | CUD03 is unsuitable for housing development as it would not relate well to the settlement, have unacceptable landscape impact, result in the loss of trees, hedgerows and wildlife, would potentially overload utility and road infrastructure. CUD01 would be the preferred site for the village as it would have least impact. | Noted |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 106 | Cumbria County Council | <p>Include reference in methodology to CCC input on biodiversity, landscape and the historic environment, education, social care, and transport.</p> <p>Issues with junction capacity, particularly in north Carlisle around J44 of the M6. CNDR has released some capacity, but issues would still need to be addressed should sites come forward.</p> <p>Locationally specific assessment of transport and highways within the district provided - exploring the additional capacity created by the CNDR, junction constraints and the potential to create a new link road to the south through a masterplan approach.</p> <p>Information provided on school capacity across the district and the potential impact of SHLAA sites being developed.</p> <p>Concern that it is not clear how some of the ecological data provided by CCC has been considered/included.</p> <p>HO03 - Concern that status of county wildlife site has not been taken into account.</p> <p>Request that the County Archaeological officer is consulted on sites with the potential to impact upon the historic environment.</p> | <p>Noted. Methodology will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. Junction and highway capacity issues would be considered in more detail for individual sites should they come forward for development.</p> <p>Noted. These issues will be taken into consideration as we progress further through the planning process.</p> <p>Noted. This information shall be useful evidence when considering the most sustainable location for new housing allocations.</p> <p>All sites have been subjected to rigorous assessment, including the consideration of ecological data provided to the Council by CumbriaCC. In most cases this data was recorded only on the working GIS database for our own reference, unless it had significant implications for the assessment of the site.</p> <p>Noted - the site description for this site will be updated to include mention of the CWS designation. The designation was considered in site assessment however and housing potential was significantly constrained accordingly. Should this site come forward for development the consideration of ecology on site will be of prime importance.</p> <p>Noted. This is standard practice on proposals for development, particularly those within historically sensitive areas. Should any of the SHLAA sites come forward they will be subject to the same process.</p> |
|-----|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|