

SHLAA CONSULTATION 28 JULY - 1 SEPTEMBER 2014 REPRESENTATIONS

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
185	Comment		072	Clerk - Sue Tarrant	Cummersdale Parish C	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The total number of dwellings in Cummersdale is 114 these development total 68 dwellings, over 50% of the current number of dwellings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Primary and Secondary Education should be reviewed with the cumulative effect of all proposed development throughout the DISTRICT not by Parish/village, an Education Establishment Master Plan should be developed based on a urban / rural split increase in the number of homes 8342/3201 2015-30 between the District and the County Council and this should form part of the local plan NOT a reference to "a strategy" it needs to be definitive. 2. The Morton Development with the allocated sites create a band around the south west of the city totaling over 1300 new homes; there is a requirement for the County Council to ensure that the developers contribute towards primary and secondary education prior to the completion of these new estates. Members are concerned that the rural aspect of Cummersdale will disappear and the village will be absorbed into the City. It is important that the village retains its integrity. 3. Infrastructure - There is a need for a properly developed Infrastructure Master plan and an Infrastructure Schedule covering all larger developments with consideration to the cumulative effects of the large developments added to the smaller ones on the access to the City, Junction Street is at capacity and Peter Lane will be at capacity within 18 months. The infrastructure is required now, not on the completion of the developments. 4. Infrastructure should not be decided on a piecemeal basis as happens now. Any development should be considered as a whole and if different developers are involved, each should be apportioned responsibility for infrastructure according to the needs of their particular part. 5. Local councils should have a robust strategy, integrated with the County Council, to ensure that the developers shoulder their appropriate economic portion. 					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. We continue to work closely with the County Council to ensure that key infrastructure, such as school places, are planned for on a district wide scale and in a strategic way, enabling us to ensure the cumulative impact of new development in the Local Plan is taken into account. This is not, however, a SHLAA issue.					
205	Comment		076		Clerk to Kingmoor Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>There is a paragraph explaining what is SHLAA and we would just like to point out this paragraph: It is important to be clear that the SHLAA will not in itself allocate land for housing development, and that sites identified in the SHLAA will not automatically come forward for development, or be guaranteed planning permission. Likewise, sites that have been ruled out of the SHLAA could still be granted permission should the Local Planning Authority consider it appropriate after a more detailed assessment of a planning application upon its own merits. All we would like to say and point out is what is the point of the SHLAA document?</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	The SHLAA is part of the evidence for the Local Plan. It collects and presents *all* of the sites that have been submitted to the Council to be considered for inclusion within the Local Plan as allocations. We consult on it to ensure that the plan making process is as transparent for possible, by giving people and communities the complete picture of land that is being considered for allocation within their area. The SHLAA continues to provide a rolling catalogue of land, as it continues to be submitted, after the plan is adopted. If it becomes apparent an allocation within the Local Plan is not coming forward for development, and is unlikely to do so, the SHLAA will be used to choose an appropriate replacement allocation to ensure that the housing targets within the Plan will be met.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
202	Comment		075	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to St Cuthbert W	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Priority should be given to the upgrading of the existing road infrastructure, prior to any further development being undertaken in the parish [St Cuthberts Without]				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. This will be addressed as part of the wider strategy for development, where by appropriate infrastructure must be in place before development plans. This is a policy matter, and not a matter the SHLAA can address in much detail.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
043	Comment		024	Emily Hrycan	English Heritage Nort	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm		<p>Our recent involvement, as a statutory body, with various local authorities across the country has indicated there is an opportunity to provide generic advice to inform capacity judgements by guiding how best to identify suitable, deliverable and developable potential sites for housing development and how to shape future 'places' in the area through an efficient process.</p> <p>CLG SHLAA Practice Guidance (July 2007) provides the broad basis by which these studies should be carried out. This letter will help clarify the application of CLG advice in respect of the historic environment and demonstrate how consideration of it needs to shape judgements and decision making during the SHLAA process.</p> <p>We hope our advice will also help to ensure your SHLAA is technically sound in accordance with government planning policy, and can be used as robust evidence in support of any Local Development Document.</p> <p>Stage 2 of the SHLAA process sets out which sources of sites should be included within the assessment. Here it will be necessary to consider filtering out certain sites, such as Scheduled Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens, where housing development within their boundaries is likely to be unacceptable in principle. Other designations, such as listed buildings and conservation areas, may not prevent development altogether depending on the scale and proximity of development but need to be a key part of this filtering process.</p> <p>The setting of designated heritage assets is often a key contributor to their significance and needs to be considered as part of the site identification process. The development of a site near to a designated heritage asset may have a considerable negative impact on its setting and may exclude the site at an early site in the SHLAA process. There is also a need to consider the wider historic environment as described above.</p> <p>By the proper consideration of a site/areas historic environment and contextual features (at stage 5 and 6 of the SHLAA (CLG practice guide, 2007)), where character and physical constraints are assessed, greater certainty of housing supply and more reasonably accurate capacity assumptions will be established.</p> <p>Also at stage 7a of the SHLAA and with reference to paragraph 38 of the CLG practice guide, it is clear that one needs to consider the historic environment as a determining factor in the process of establishing when and whether sites are likely to be developed i.e. their suitability.</p> <p>The extent to which the historic environment affects the principle of deliverability will depend on the particular characteristic of the site/area in question e.g. a modest appropriate infill development in a conservation area may have greater potential (deliverability) than a suggested development within a designated historic park and garden. Therefore, our advice should not necessarily be seen as a constraint on the delivery of more homes but as means to provide greater certainty, clearly identifying at an early stage the likely deliverability of the estimations you may suggest.</p> <p>To determine what aspects of the historic environment should be considered in the assessment of a site's potential the use of the following description might be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All designated historic assets should be considered together with non-designated features of local historic or architectural interest and value since these can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity. This covers buildings, and other structures and features, archaeological remains, historic open spaces and the historic character of the areas rural landscapes and townscapes. - Key features will include: significant known, likely archaeology including Scheduled Monuments; Historic Parks and Gardens; Conservation Areas; Listed Buildings; local listings; World Heritage Sites; rural landscapes and urban townscapes. <p>Environmental analysis should look beyond specific designations and consider their wider setting, along with a general assessment of the landscape and townscape impact of housing development.</p> <p>We strongly advise that you engage conservation, archaeology and urban design colleagues at the local and or county level to ensure you are aware of all the relevant features of the historic environment and that the historic environment is effectively and efficiently considered as part of the SHLAA. They will be able to provide you with the Historic Environment Records for the area including any 'characterisation' study, and ensure a joined-up and robust approach is undertaken (Para 12 CLG practice guide, July 2007).</p> <p>Whilst it is appreciated that the SHLAA cannot in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development or not, we hope our recommendations help to ensure your estimations of housing potential are reasonably accurate having due regard to the important determining factors such as the influence of the historic context. (Stage 6, CLG practice guide, 2007).</p>				
OfficerComm		Noted - the impact of sites upon heritage and the historic environment has been considered throughout the SHLAA assessment process.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
089	Comment		054	Simon Artiss	Barratt Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	I haven't reviewed this but this needs to reflect NPPF and NPPG as well as recent appeal decisions in terms of robustness. Sites need to be attractive to the market to be deliverable and we will review site opportunities here when we can. If you know of any SHLAA sites that remain available (ie. Not with another house builder) I would be interested in discussing. Viability remains a material consideration of significance.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Viability was a key consideration when assessing sites. Please consult our Viability Assessment, produced earlier this year, for more information on how viability assessment was carried out on SHLAA sites.					
186	Comment		073	Viv Sealby	Clerk to Burgh by Sand	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	It is good to have development for the sustainment of the Parishes. It provides an opportunity to look at the infrastructure of rural areas (Transport, Drainage, Electric, Gas, Phone and Broadband provision) All of these are important but particularly water and Drainage. The mix of the population within parishes has changed so it is important to look at development of the villages as a whole and not individual plans. Observations					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The SHLAA, however, is designed merely to look at the merits of individual sites and provide the evidence for the Local Plan when choosing allocations. It is in the Local Plan that strategic decisions on housing proposals are made, taking into account the wider impact upon and setting of villages and neighbourhoods.					
161	Comment		067	Nigel Holmes		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	How many houses do we require? Would it not make more sense to use empty city centre offices or brownfield sites such as Caldew Riverside for housing rather than destroy the very essence of our existing villages by over development? Wetheral alone could face at least 300 more houses from these proposals. That's twice the present number in Gt Corby. So why not a lateral thinking to help those who do want to live in the countryside? Inverness is contemplating creating a new small town/village on a route with good communications. See www.tornagrains-newtown.co.uk It's said to be visionary. Why can't we be too? Will our councillors please fulfil their earlier commitment to 'ensure we effectively act upon the views of the people'.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Sites within the SHLAA are not planning proposals. They are merely assessments of the raw potential for housing development of land that has been submitted to us to consider including within the Local Plan. Please refer to the Local Plan to see how much housing (and its location) has actually been proposed for settlements across the district.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
177	Comment		071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>1) Primary Education; schools in Wetheral Parish are at capacity, based on the 2011 census there are 415 children 5-9 years old. The current school places total 495. This is Great Corby, Cumwhinton & Scotby. (Not all of the pupils are within the catchment of the schools and many travel in from other parts of the city) The cumulative effect of the housing allocations in the whole parish including the developments with planning consent total 467 new homes plus recent housing development in Scotby of 45 total 512 new homes.</p> <p>Using a rough calculation based on the County Council Planning Policy 2013. (Calculation of Pupil yield dwelling model) Using this model of 1,000 units/50%- 500 dwellings. Therefore the estimated pupil yield of primary school children 100 and secondary school children 70. This would not trigger a new school as the threshold is 150, however the County Council can consider cases where the pupil yield is below that level, the District Council should insist that the County Council do consider the effect and ensure that all developers within the Parish contribute (£106) to the provision of a new school in Wetheral village within the next 5 years. This should be included in the local plan.</p> <p>Primary and Secondary Education should be reviewed with the cumulative effect of all proposed development throughout the DISTRICT not by Parish/village, a strategy should be developed based on an urban / rural split increase in the number of homes 8342/3201 2015-30 between the District and the County Council and this should form part of the local plan NOT a reference to " a strategy" it needs to be definitive.</p> <p>2) Would it make sense to create new villages close to roads with regular bus services ?</p> <p>It seems we need a little tangential thinking over rural housing for otherwise we risk destroying the very thing those who wish to live in the countryside are seeking. The essence of our existing villages could be lost by development on this scale. Wetheral alone could face at least 300 more houses from these proposals. That's twice the present number in Gt. Corby. So why not a little lateral thinking ? Inverness is contemplating creating a new small town/large village on a route with good communications, the A96. So what about the A69 ? Such a new village would surely appeal to builders and the scale is such that planning requirements could be incorporated to secure cycle routes to the city and other benefits. Could we suggest something similar here ? See www.tornagrains-newtown.co.uk It's said to be visionary. Why can't we be too ?</p> <p>Comments from Meeting 1.9.14</p> <p>(a) At each settlement where sites are developed the 106 etc monies should be spent on affordable housing including extra-care bungalows within the settlement itself.</p> <p>(b) Wetheral needs a Primary School again, especially with the recent and planned future increase in numbers of homes for the village</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted - whilst it is acknowledged that there is an infrastructure issue regarding primary school places within this part of the district, this is not something that can be considered by the SHLAA, with no show-stopping issues raised by the County Council when consulted on these sites. This issue will be addressed within the Local Plan.					
009	Comment		007	Miss Carla Jackson	Natural England	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm	Generic advice given when assessing SHLAA's given covering: Landscapes; Biodiversity; Geological Conservation; Best & Most Versatile Agricultural Land; Public Rights of Way and Access					
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. The potential impact of sites on natural assets has been considered as part of the SHLAA process.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
153	Site Proposal	Land at Croft House, Cargo	065	Mr David Dixon		A014
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>I am writing on behalf of my Client, Mr. David Dixon, in connection with the SHLAA July 2014 public consultation.</p> <p>My Client owns Croft House and the adjoining land to the north of Cargo. The boundaries of the land within my Client's ownership are identified, in red, on the enclosed plan.</p> <p>Although I have identified all of the land within my Client's ownership I am aware that the north western portion of land is located within the flood zone. With the exclusion of this land, my Client confirms that the remainder of his land is available to be developed and they would like to see this land brought forward as a housing site. I consider that the development of the land for residential purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - complies with the thrust of the policy objectives contained within the National Planning Policy Framework; - does not raise any significant highway related issues; - is physically well related to the village; - could be developed without adversely affecting the living conditions of the occupiers of any adjoining residential properties; - would have limited visual impact upon the wider landscape; and - could help redress the imbalance associated with the disproportionately lower level of residential land located to the north of the City when compared with the significantly higher level of employment land; an issue that was identified within the Carlisle Employment Sites Study, dated June 2010, undertaken by DTZ on behalf of Carlisle City Council. This issue was also highlighted in a report, dated 17th June 2013, from the Director of Economic Development to the Council's Executive titled "Local Plan – Land Allocations" (Report No. ED/14/13). <p>Taking into account the above points the identification of the land as a potential housing site within the SHLAA would be wholly appropriate.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site will be included for assessment within the SHLAA.					
138	Site Proposal	3 Sites at Brampton: Site 1 - Land to the East - 3.5 HA Site 2 - Land to the North East - 16 HA Site 3 - Land to the North - 3.5 HA	063		Castlesteads Estates	A006
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	3 sites submitted with supporting text and maps					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration.					
040	Site Proposal	Low Wood bank Farm, Brisco, Nr Carlisle CA8 1LY	021	Mr Les Robley		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Development proposal as part of Carlisle South Site Plan and pro-forma submitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration of their potential to contribute to Carlisle South.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
041	Site Proposal	Greenmarsh, Brisco, Carlisle	022	Ian Powley		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Development proposal as part of Carlisle South Site Plan and pro-forma submitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration of their potential to contribute to Carlisle South.					
039	Site Proposal	Red Cat House, Durdar, Carlisle	020	Sidney Nicholson		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Development proposal as part of Carlisle South Site Plan and pro-forma submitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration of their potential to contribute to Carlisle South.					
160	Site Proposal	land/Property at Swallow Hilltop, Carlisle	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The new site I now put forward for residential development is land/property at Swallow/Hilltop, the boundaries of which are identified on the plan which is enclosed. It is considered that the land/property has considerable potential for residential development and the Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration and support to this potential.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site will be considered through the SHLAA process.					
038	Site Proposal	Lough Farm, Brisco, Carlisle	019	Gordon Park		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Development proposal as part of Carlisle South Site Plan and pro-forma submitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration of their potential to contribute to Carlisle South.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
065	Site Proposal	Land to the west of the Hall and playing fields Crosby on Eden	037	Messrs Patinson		A007
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site, which is identified on the plan attached, is situated on land at Crosby on Eden and is approximately 4.8 ha in area. My clients would be grateful if you could consider the merits of all or part of the site for residential development.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. This site will be included for consideration within the SHLAA.					
037	Site Proposal	Langdale, Saw Pit Wood, Brisco, Carlisle	018	John Bell		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Development proposal as part of Carlisle South Site Plan and pro-forma submitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration of their potential to contribute to Carlisle South.					
035	Site Proposal	New Site: South West Edge abuts North west edges of CA23 & OC46	016	JR & JA Workman		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	In response to your current SHLAA update consultation, please find attached a submission in respect of land at South Carlisle. The submission comprises the following: - Written report in support of the inclusion in the SHLAA update of land located to the south of Harraby and between the railway and the M6. - Appendix NA1 – Carlisle South promotion land - Appendix NA2 – Carlisle South master plan. We would welcome the opportunity of discussing the merits and subsequent delivery of the sites with you at your earliest convenience.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Site will be added to the SHLAA for consideration, informed by supporting information.					
078	Site Proposal	Farmland to the South of Carlisle [around Brisco]	047	Messrs Coulthard		A011
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Map enclosed					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted - sites will be mapped and considered for their potential to contribute to Carlisle South as part of the SHLAA process.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
034	Site Proposal	New Site: north edge abutting southern edge of CA27E	016	JR & JA Workman		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>In response to your current SHLAA update consultation, please find attached a submission in respect of land at South Carlisle. The submission comprises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written report in support of the inclusion in the SHLAA update of land located to the south of Harraby and between the railway and the M6. - Appendix NA1 – Carlisle South promotion land - Appendix NA2 – Carlisle South master plan. <p>We would welcome the opportunity of discussing the merits and subsequent delivery of the sites with you at your earliest convenience.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. This site will be added to the SHLAA for consideration.					
044	Site Proposal	Triange of land adjacent to Buffs Croft/Grahams Croft, Warwick on Eden	025	Sue Tarrant	Clerk to Wetheral Paris	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Access Available					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Site will be added to the SHLAA for consideration.					
011	Site Proposal	Land located between Brunstock and Houghton Hall Garden Centre	009	Mr A Wannop		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The submission comprises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Written report in support of the inclusion in the SHLAA update of land located between Brunstock and Houghton Hall Garden Centre. - Appendix NA1 – site area edged in red. - Appendix NA2 – site analysis by Eden Environment. - Appendix NA3 – site context by Eden Environment - Appendix NA4 – photographic images and captions. <p>We would welcome the opportunity of discussing the merits and subsequent delivery of the site with you at your earliest convenience.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site will be added to the SHLAA for assessment.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
165	Site Proposal	Wilstan, Wood Lane, Brisco, Nr Carlisle, CA4 0RF	069	Creena Oglanby		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Maps and supporting documents in relation to site for consideration within the south Carlisle Region					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Site will be added to the SHLAA for consideration.					
066	Site Proposal	Land at Harker [opposite Harker Industrial Estate]	037	Messrs Patinson		A007
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site, which is identified on the plan attached, is situated in the settlement of Harker and is approximately 8.3 ha in area. The site is well related to the existing built form of the settlement and is situated opposite land which has been identified as suitable for housing development in the Carlisle Local Plan Preferred Options (Stage 2) document. Harker is a sustainable location, benefitting from a number of services and facilities, residential development and employment opportunities. In the context of the above my clients would be grateful if you could consider the merits of all or part of the site for residential development.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. This site will be included for consideration within the SHLAA.					
006	Site Proposal	West of Kingmoor Park Harker Industrial Estate	004	Brian Tweedale		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Site map submitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Site will be included for consideration as part of the SHLAA.					
069	Site Proposal	West of Kingmoor Park, Harker Estate, Harker	039	Mr B & Mrs M Tweedale		A009
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Justification of Site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the additional population to the Harker area will encourage better local services to the area 2. the site lies within 1 mile of J 44 of the M6, giving great accessibility North & South, as well as having a number of routes to the centre of Carlisle 3. the site is at present agricultural but is dominated by Kingmoor Park derelict brownfield site and the Harker substation. 4. the additional population to the Harker area will support the local infrastructure and services, such as refuse collection 5. no sites of natural heritage or conservation importance will be affected 6. the area is confined within physical boundaries of a railway line, existing houses and the motorway, a corridor to the South and the Kingmoor Park Brownfield site it's enclosure in the development plan will enforce a definite settlement boundaries. 					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Site will be included for consideration within the SHLAA.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
045	Site Proposal	Fields to the left and right of the access to the village of Aglionby from the A69	025	Sue Tarrant	Clerk to Wetheral Paris	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Site will be added to the SHLAA for consideration and assessment.				
180	Site Proposal	Cotehill- suggest a ribbon development from High Cotehill to Low Cotehill and behind the church.	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		A need has been established for low cost housing in particular for the elderly, to include extra care bungalows.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The SHLAA does not consider housing type, merely suitability for general residential development. The principle of small scale housing development within Cotehill is acceptable, however more information is required before this site can be considered for development - namely a location plan, showing the boundary of the site, and confirmation that the landowner is interested in making the land available for development. Until this information is received this land cannot be included for consideration within the SHLAA.				
046	Site Proposal	Former School at Cotehill	025	Sue Tarrant	Clerk to Wetheral Paris	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		would be suitable for small scale development				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Site will be added to the SHLAA for assessment - though anticipated to be below the 0.4Ha threshold, probably more appropriate to be considered through the planning application process.				
179	Site Proposal	Aglionby – fields to left and right of the access to the village from the A69.	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		See Previous comments Re OC49 - rep ref 176 - (concerns re overdevelopment of site & access from highway)				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - this site will be included for consideration in the SHLAA				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
178	Site Proposal	Warwick on Eden – triangle of land adjacent to Buffs Croft/ Grahams Croft.	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Access available. Bungalows similar to adjoining development Buffs Croft, to include extra care bungalows.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - this site will be included for consideration in the SHLAA				
064	Site Proposal	Site at The Old School House , Cotehill	036		Chatsworth Settlement	A006
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		The site is approx 0.11 HA and is located within the centre of the village. It currently houses a vacant school and school yard and provides no amenity value to the area and is in desperate need of redevelopment. Further background information given Summer14				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The site will be included for assessment within the SHLAA. However, at 0.11Ha it is below the threshold and could not be considered a 'strategic' site. It may be more appropriate to pursue this site through the planning application process.				
047	Site Proposal	Field No NY4656 2141 (60 on map 2) adj Warwick on Eden	026	Mr James R Carr	Trustee for JR Carr	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Two maps enclosed - Map 2 shows potential access from Graham's Croft and Buff's Croft. This field is on the ownership of the JR Carr No 1 Trust of the Trustees of which are willing to see the area developed. They would also be willing to accept a stipulation that bungalows only should be built which would then be in keeping with the existing houses in Graham's Croft and Buff's Croft. Wetheral PC have already discussed this site.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. Site will be added to SHLAA for consideration.				
042	Site Proposal	Oakland House, Brisco, Nr Durdar, Carlisle	023	Sandra Bell		A005
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Development proposal as part of Carlisle South Site Plan and pro-forma submitted				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Sites will be added to the SHLAA for consideration of their potential to contribute to Carlisle South.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
181	Site Proposal	A further site in the village of Cotehill – former school would be suitable for small scale development.	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - this site will be included for consideration in the SHLAA				

BL03

090	Comment	Land at Blackwell	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ordinary Watercourse				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged.				

139	Support	Land at Blackwell	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as part of the Carlisle South Urban Expansion.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status				

BR01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
025	Comment	land North of Old church Lane [adj Red Barn] Brampton	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

BR03

024	Comment	land adj Garth House, Brampton	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

BR08

147	Support	West og Kingswater Close, Brampton	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

BR10

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
057	Comment	Land off Edmundson Close, Brampton	033	Brian and Leonerd Tweddle		
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Have always said that the site is unsuitable for development, see previous submission such a very important visual amenity of Brampton incorporation trees with a preservation order; people in the new houses would be able to look directly into our bedrooms, which is an invasion of privacy, in law they would be tantamount to being peeping toms.				
		There should be more warning and publicity about planning. Adjacent property owners should be informed individually well in advance in writing - not everyone has a computer.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - site status remains unchanged. It is not considered to have potential for housing development. Adjacent property owners are notified by post as and when planning applications for development are received and publically consulted upon. This site is not subject to a planning application, and therefore extensive (and subsequently costly) notification of neighbouring properties is not considered appropriate, or indeed practical.				
056	Comment	Land off Edmundson Close, Brampton	032	David & Shelagh Hurd		
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Have always said that the site is unsuitable for development, see previous submission such a very important visual amenity of Brampton incorporation trees with a preservation order; people in the new houses would be able to look directly into our bedrooms, which is an invasion of privacy, in law they would be tantamount to being peeping toms.				
		There should be more warning and publicity about planning. Adjacent property owners should be informed individually well in advance in writing - not everyone has a computer.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - site status remains unchanged. It is not considered to have potential for housing development. Adjacent property owners are notified by post as and when planning applications for development are received and publically consulted upon. This site is not subject to a planning application, and therefore extensive (and subsequently costly) notification of neighbouring properties is not considered appropriate, or indeed practical.				
058	Comment	Land off Edmundson Close, Brampton	034		Alan & Shirley Jones	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Have always said that the site is unsuitable for development, see previous submission such a very important visual amenity of Brampton incorporation trees with a preservation order; people in the new houses would be able to look directly into our bedrooms, which is an invasion of privacy, in law they would be tantamount to being peeping toms.				
		There should be more warning and publicity about planning. Adjacent property owners should be informed individually well in advance in writing - not everyone has a computer.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - site status remains unchanged. It is not considered to have potential for housing development. Adjacent property owners are notified by post as and when planning applications for development are received and publically consulted upon. This site is not subject to a planning application, and therefore extensive (and subsequently costly) notification of neighbouring properties is not considered appropriate, or indeed practical.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
063	Comment	Land off Edmondson Close, Brampton	035	HS Cartmell		A001
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	We continue to support the future development of Site BR10 for future residential development and we would welcome further detailed discussions with the relevant planning officers in due course with regard to progressing the site through the Local Plan process, even if the site boundary is reduced to overcome any concerns which have been raised as part of the SHLAA update.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Following the concerns raised regarding access, independent access advice was sought from White Young Green, on behalf of our client, which concludes that "having considered the three potential access points to the potential residential development site it is my conclusion that a suitable vehicle access to serve a residential development of around 80 to 100 homes can be formed onto Tarn Road, Edmondson Close could provide access to between 5 and 7 homes and that Tree Gardens is not a suitable vehicle access location. Edmondson Close and Tree Gardens could be used as pedestrian/ cycle access points or for emergency vehicle access points". The letter by White Young Green is attached for reference.			
GenComment	Additional Comments Submitted Regarding: Location/sustainability; Landscaping; Housing Need; Potential to Reduce Site Boundary.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Having visited the site, it is considered to be unsuitable for housing development due to its potential impact upon neighbouring properties and unsuitable topography. Its status remains unchanged within the SHLAA.					
029	Comment	Land off Edmondson Close, Brampton	013	Trevor Wilson		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Regarding site BR10 Land off Edmondson Close, I (and many other nearby residents) responded to the 2012 consultation round which resulted site BR10 being classed as 'No Potential'. Can you please confirm site BR10 continues to be 'No Potential'. Can you please advise whether I am required to respond to the 2014 consultation requesting the site remain as 'No Potential'. If I am required to respond again, please take this email as a response for site BR10 to remain as 'No Potential' for the reasons as stated in web page http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/planning_and_buildings/planning_policy/the_new_local_plan/local_plan_evidence_base/shlaa/brampton.aspx Can you please advise whether you have received any requests since summer 2012 for site BR10 to be considered or reconsidered as a suitable planning site. I note that in the http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/downloads/Consultation_2012_-_Responses.pdf there was request number 009 from SmithsGore for site BR10 to be considered as suitable for planning. I therefore presume that SmithsGore (or perhaps another agency, land owner, builder, or other party) may therefore submit a further request as part of this (2014) consultation for site BR10 to be considered as a suitable planning site. Hence my questions. For completeness, I restate the Site Assessment as per page http://www.carlisle.gov.uk/planning_and_buildings/planning_policy/the_new_local_plan/local_plan_evidence_base/shlaa/brampton.aspx "Site Assessment: This large Greenfield site would be an extension to the new Edmondson Close development on the east side of Brampton. The land is steep and development here would be highly prominent resulting in an adverse impact upon the landscape, there would also be significant overbearing issues on existing properties at the foot of the hill. The highways authority has also voiced major concerns regarding access to the site. As such, this site is not considered suitable for housing development."					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	It is confirmed that the status of BR10 remains unchanged, and continues to be considered to have no potential for housing development					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
036	Objection	land off Edmondson Close, Brampton	017	Gareth O'Brien		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	I would like to register my very strong objection to any possibility of site BR10 being developed as it is totally unsuitable and would destroy our new development at Edmondson Close.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site is considered to have no potential for housing. This remains unchanged.					

BR11

148	Support	Land at elmfield, Brampton	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

BR13

091	Comment	land between Quarry Bank & A69 Brampton	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ground Vulnerability Zone			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

BR14

092	Comment	Greenhill	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ground Vulnerability Zone			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status					

BU01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
094	Comment	Land at highfield	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				
073	Comment	Land at Highfield, Burgh by Sands	042	Joseph Roe		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Advantages: 1)Beautiful site with outstanding views across the Solway Coast AONB and the Scottish hills on the other side. 2)Houses here would be extremely desirable and potentially valuable making this a most attractive site for any developer.				
		Disadvantages: 1)Children would need to negotiate the dangerous cross roads to get to school. There are no pavements at the lower end of North End to provide a safe haven for people to stand and look. The only pavement on North End is a short stretch outside "The Pack" 2)North End is narrow with parking problems and a lot of houses and other buildings right up to the edge of the road. It is also a busy access road for large vehicles to and from farms. Ten houses with 2 cars each would have a significant impact. 3)The junction from North End onto the main road has high walls on both sides providing poor visibility,especially towards the west where emerging traffic has to join or cross the flow from the right. 4)As it's name suggests this is a very prominent site and development would have a significant visible impact. It is the highest point in the village. 5)The development would have a negative impact on the AONB. Approaching from Sandsfield it would be the immediate view at the boundary of the village and the AONB as the view to the west is more open than the view to the east. This is an important tourist route for cyclists on the Coastal Route, birdwatchers from far and wide and Hadrian's Wall walkers taking a detour as well as casual visitors to Burgh Marsh and The Monument. 6)The access from the site onto North End is not good. It would be steep either side of the bungalow and could give rise to cars overshooting onto the road. There is limited scope for contouring to reduce the slope. Whatever the outcome this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to create a planning overview that would influence the quality of life for Burgh residents for decades to come while at the same time safeguarding the unique nature of the area. It is more than simply choosing a site for some nice houses.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The issues you list here are not show stopping constraints. We have consulted widely with the various infrastructure providers and authorities, none of whom have suggested that an issues with the site could not be overcome. The SHLAA cannot remove a site from the assessment simply because a more preferable site				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
187	Objection	Land at Highfield, Burgh by Sands	073	Viv Sealby		Clerk to Burgh by Sand
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>- This prominent site extends into the AONB and as such would have a negative impact on the gateway to the village. This is a tourist route for walkers and cyclist</p> <p>- The access to the site would be difficult because of the steep incline.</p> <p>- Development of the site could affect the the amenity of neighbouring houses.</p> <p>- Mains drainage/sewerage would be a problem and the use of Septic Tanks would be a retrograde step with even more water draining to the back of the site into a culvert and running down the lane into the village opposite the Village Hall (increasing the flooding in that area) and then into the Village Green.</p> <p>- If the site were to be developed certain criteria would have to be adhered to. A mix of housing types and also some lower cost housing being desirable.</p> <p>- The access route would be very narrow with no pavements for children going to School and the road leads to a blind junction in the village that is already difficult for traffic and pedestrians to negotiate.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>Noted. The SHLAA process ensures that each site is discussed with key infrastructure providers, including United Utilities and the Highways Authority. Neither body has raised any major concerns with this site. As such, it is shown in the SHLAA as deliverable. The SHLAA however only provides a broad, strategic overview of a site and its constraints. The issues you raise here may come out if an application is received on the site requiring a more in depth investigation. For now, the SHLAA has not raised any show stopping constraints, and therefore its status remains unchanged.</p>				
027	Objection	Land at Highfield, Burgh by Sands	012	Mrs Jean Grayson		Panorama
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>The building of a bungalow next to Highfield was recently turned down by Carlisle Council because of difficulty of access and road congestion on a country road. Very recently the plan for building on land, also in North End was turned down by the Council partly because of access and also deeming too close to Hadrian's Wall.</p> <p>The road is impassable to walkers when large farm lorries are in the road, and no two vehicles may pass each other in parts of North End. More building would aggravate the traffic problem.</p> <p>The field next to BU01 regularly floods in heavy rain. Where would the water from new houses drain to?</p> <p>We live in an area of great beauty. There are an increasing number of visitors to the village. The approach from the North would be spoilt with more building.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>Noted. Whilst the access for this site is recognised as not being ideal, the Highways Authority have not, at this stage flagged it up as a show stopping constraint. Neither is the impact upon the landscape, the AONB designation or the setting of Hadrian's Wall something that could not be overcome through careful design and planning. The assessment of this site remains unchanged.</p>				
049	Objection	Land at Highfield, Burgh by Sands	028	Robert Grayson		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>I am shocked and disappointed that this site is considered 'deliverable' when its landscape impact in the Solway Coast AONB is acknowledged and an alternative site (BU02) has been identified outside the AONB.</p> <p>I agree with the assessment that it is prominent when viewed from the North and would add that it is more than prominent when viewed from the adjacent development and will block the panoramic views enjoyed by several of the dwellings there.</p> <p>My concerns about access remain.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>Noted. The SHLAA is merely a catalogue of land considered to have housing potential. It is unable to make preferential decisions regarding sites, and therefore if there are two sites considered to have potential with a village that is what it shows.</p> <p>Naturally when considering allocation selection within the Local Plan a whole host of factors come into play, including community support, physical constraints, landscape impact, etc. It is in the Local Plan that a policy decision will be made as to our preferred site for the village.</p> <p>Site BU01 is still considered to have potential as we have no evidence to suggest that development here would be an absolute impossibility. We have consulted with infrastructure providers, including United Utilities and the Highways authority, and they have not raised any show-stopping constraints. The site is considered to be deliverable because it is likely that, should a planning application come forward on it then development would start within 5 years of approval.</p>				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
166	Objection	Land at Highfield, North End, Burgh by Sands	070	Mr & Mrs P Cottam		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	<p>No: There are a number of reasons why we feel this site should not be considered for future development, the main one being access to the site and the unsuitability of the road from the centre of the village to accommodate any further increase in traffic.</p> <p>We have been advised that the site could accommodate ten properties, which means a potential for approximately twenty additional vehicles using the road on a daily basis. (Many residents in the area have 2 or more vehicles)</p> <p>The City Council's own Pre-Consultation comments on scope for new development included in the Rural Masterplanning Final Draft for Burgh by Sands stated "if development of backlands is to be considered for the future (particularly north of the current settlement boundary) it will be important that access is ensured from the main street as the road north from the settlement is narrow, with little opportunity for widening and unlikely to be acceptable from a highways point of view for increase in traffic development. Also, recent development has blocked one way in from the lower part of this road."</p> <p>This document also included two photographs of the road in North End, one of which referred to "properties tight to the edge of a narrow road", with the other stating that "access will be challenging."</p> <p>What these photographs did not show was the number of vehicles which are regularly parked on the road adjacent to resident's properties, limiting still further the already narrow width of the road.</p> <p>Other adverse considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Visibility to the left of Highfield, which is considered to be seriously inadequate, especially in view of the volume and speed of delivery and other vehicles driving from the Sandsfield direction towards the centre of the village. - The same comments apply to the already dangerous lack of visibility, both left and right, for vehicles leaving the Close to enter the road leading into the village, which will be made significantly worse if there is any further increase in traffic. - Similarly, at the cross road where vehicles leaving North End join the main road or cross over towards Amberfield, there is a potentially dangerous 'blind spot' where it is difficult to see traffic, including cyclists, and pedestrians coming from the right. Again, any increase in volume is to be avoided. - The fact that the size of many of the vehicles using North End to access farm properties have greatly increased in recent years, making access and passing extremely difficult (our own boundary hedge has been damaged on two occasions this year by vehicles attempting to avoid oncoming traffic). 			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Whilst your comments on this site are noted, the SHLAA also takes advice for each site from the Highways Authority who, for site BU01, have not suggest that there would be any insurmountable constraints that would stop development coming forward here. As such its status within the SHLAA remains unchanged. Further details surrounding its access and potential traffic impact would need to be looked at in more detail at planning application stage, should an application come forward on the site.</p>					
052	Support	Land at Highfield, Burgh by Sands	030	Michael Edwards		
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	<p>It was pleasing to see from the latest Site Assessment that access to the proposed development is achievable without the demolition of the bungalow Highfield. This decision clarifies the situation and would go a long way to resolving earlier objections. It would be even clearer if both the bungalow Highfield and the relevant part of the garden area surrounding Highfield which would not to be included in the site of the proposed development were removed from the Burgh by Sands Local Plan Preferred Options (Stage 2) Policy Map. This would assist in helping to maintain the character of the area but also the transitional zone from the Village to open countryside. Can serious consideration be given to this request?</p>			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted - it is understood that whilst this could technically be achievable, the interested parties in this land have not submitted a plan ommitting the current dwelling from the proposed SHLAA site. It would not be appropriate for the SHLAA to redraw boundaries for sites without this input.</p>					

BU02

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
072	Comment	Land South of Amber field, Burgh by Sands	042	Joseph Roe		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Advantages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)Very close to the school. Children and parents will not have to negotiate the dangerous cross roads at Byre End. 2)Amberfield is a relatively wide road with few parking issues. The road could also be widened to the west side as part of the development. 3)Relatively safe access onto the main road at the cross roads with reasonable visibility both ways. 4)The site could be part of a wider "community core" of the village incorporating the school, village hall, playing field, pub and post office. The Parish Council have been trying for some time to negotiate a permissive footpath linking all these community facilities together avoiding the cross roads and to provide a safer route to school on foot for children and families from the west end of the village. This site is in a field which could be part of the route of such a path and this could be a condition of any plan. 5)Further development of family homes on this site would complement other recent development at Ludgate and King Edwards Fauld. <p>Disadvantages: None spring to mind at present.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site has been considered to be deliverable in the SHLAA.					
079	Support	Land south of Amberfield, Burgh by Sands	030	Michael Edwards		
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	The site assessment by your officers for the Amberfield site is rightly presented in a very positive light and recognises it is a product of community discussion.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Over the past few years many of the developments in the Village have been is based on the principle of establishing an integrated 'Heart of the Community' approach with the facilities in the Village acting as core components, creating links with other key facilities in the community – Primary School, Parish Church, Parish Hall, Playground for Children, Bed and Breakfast accommodation, Post Office, Heritage and Tourism Group and a Green with associated Wildlife Area. The principle of 'Heart of the Community supported by these facilities create stakeholders which assist the Village in its efforts to foster and help safeguard a vital and vibrant rural community increasingly in danger of becoming isolated and marginalized as a result of poor public transport and the gradual effects of rural decline.</p> <p>In the context of the above Site BUO2 AMBERFIELD would be part of the wider "heart of the Community" principle of the village incorporating the school, parish hall, green and associated Wildlife Area, pub, parish church and post office. Ideas have been discussed in the Village to link up these facilities by negotiating a permissive footpath linking all these community facilities together avoiding the cross roads and to provide a safer route to school on foot for children and families from the west end of the village. These safety issues highlighting the absence of adequate pavements through the centre of the Village have been well chronicled in the local media. The Amberfield site is located in a field which could be part of such a path and this could be a condition of any planning application. It should also be noted that the Amberfield site was the site favoured for housing development during the consultation and discussion the Rural Masterplan..</p> <p>Consultation, questionnaires, meetings have taken place fostering the development of a Heart of Community principle where local residents are working together to consider their needs for the future and developing ideas and actions to achieve their shared ambitions. The Amberfield Site offers the most appropriate and "Village Friendly" housing development to include in the Draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as opposed to an offers of land elsewhere in Burgh which have appeared "out of the blue" and with little if any discussion.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The status of this site remains unchanged within the SHLAA. Further details regarding its potential integration within the existing building should be discussed at later stages in the planning process, should the site come forward for development.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
050	Support	Land south of Amberfield, Burgh by Sands	028	Robert Grayson		
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	I am delighted that this site has been assessed as deliverable. Its limited landscape impact contrasts favourably with BU01, as does the strong community support for it. The proximity to the village school is a safety consideration in this site's favour, in contrast to the hazardous route to school which young families would have to take from BU01. In light of the above and my separate comments on BU01, I would ask the Council to redesignate BU01 as unacceptable.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. However, site BU01 is still considered to have potential as we have no evidence to suggest that development here would be an absolute impossibility. We have consulted with infrastructure providers, including United Utilities and the Highways authority, and they have not raised any show-stopping constraints. The site is considered to be deliverable because it is likely that, should a planning application come forward on it then development would start within 5 years of approval.					
028	Support	Land South of Amberfield, Burgh by Sands	012	Mrs Jean Grayson	Panorama	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	There are numerous and varied properties for sale in Burgh by Sands. I support this proposal as it would provide housing for young people, with school aged children.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					
188	Support	Land south at Amberfield, Burgh by Sands	073	Viv Sealby	Clerk to Burgh by Sand	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a much larger site and could accommodate all the housing needs of the village. - It is close to the School and would be easily accessed in safety. - There would be an opportunity to widen the road and provide a footpath to accommodate families walking to School. - Further development of lower cost family homes would compliment existing housing at Ludgate and King Edwards Fauld. - The sewerage infrastructure and drainage would be easier. The site drains directly into a watercourse in the SW corner. 					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in site status in the SHLAA.					

CA05

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
060	Objection	Land between Carlisle/Newcastle and Carlisle/Settle railway lines, Durranhill, Carlisle	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	<p>The site has been discounted as having 'no potential' with a comment that 'the site is well located in terms of access and to open space [Keenan Park] and the local primary schools and shops. However the constrain imposed by the narrow and low tunnel underneath the Carlisle Settle railway is unlikely to be resolved rendering the site unsuitable for development'.</p> <p>It is highlighted one again that the issue of access has been satisfactorily addressed - details have been sent to the authority on 4 separate occasions - July & Sep 2008, Jan 2011 and Sep 2013. This information has clearly and unambiguously stated that the access to the site is wholly suitable for traffic, on a shared surface road, associated with a development of 30 homes or equivalent to this being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a nursing home [82 beds] - 114 units of sheltered accommodation - 147 retirement flats. <p>It is in this context of the above that the Authority ought to review their assessment/status of the site as set out in the SHLAA.</p>			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Despite evidence presented to the Council, our own discussions with the Highways authority, and our own assessment of the site lead us to continue to conclude that this site is unsuitable for development, with the narrow tunnel under the railway bridge equalling a major, insurmountable constraint. The site status remains unchanged within the SHLAA. This does not preclude the owner/agent submitting a planning application which may attempt to address this issue.					

CA07

054	Support	land at Garden Village, Carlisle	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in status of site in SHLAA.					

CA08

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
018	Comment	Land/Property at Burgh Road, Carlisle	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

CA14

080	Support	Former belah School, Carlisle	048	Chris Gowlett	Persimmon Homes La	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>We support Carlisle City Council in the removal of this site from the SHLAA. It is necessary for the site to be redeveloped as a school to help ease the growing demand for primary education provision in north Carlisle.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted and agreed. This was removed at request from Cumbria County Council stating that it was no longer available for housing development. Discussions regarding its future intended use should be taken up with Cumbria County Council, as the land owner.					

135	Support	Former Belah Aschool	061	Adam McNally	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>We support Carlisle City Council in the removal of this site from the SHLAA. It is necessary for the site to be redeveloped as school to help ease the growing demand for primary education provision in north Carlisle.</p> <p>The main part of site was last used as education and there has been no intervening use. A school at this site would offer a wide potential catchment yield in north Carlisle area given its geographic location within the heart of north Carlisle. It will offer safe routes to school. A proposal for housing would only exacerbate the need for education provision and eliminate the most sustainable site option to meet future education needs. The site is owned by Cumbria County Council, the Lead Education Authority who have a duty to provide education.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	acknowledged.					

CA15

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
123	Support	42 - 55 Lansdowne Close	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Resubmission of previous comments by PC: support in principle the development of the site.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted.					

CA22

005	Comment	Land Adj to Crindledyke Estate	004	Brian Tweedale		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Site map resubmitted					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site remains within the SHLAA.					

068	Comment	land at Crindledyke	039	Mr B & Mrs M Tweedale		A009
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Justification of the site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the additional population to the area will encourage better local services, such as more bus routes to this newly developed area. 2. the developer would be willing to contribute to local road infrastructure costs 3. the developer would be willing to discuss the local primary school 4. the developer would be willing to do soft landscaping works of the Western boundary of the site 5. no sites of natural heritage or conservational importance will be affected. 					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The Council accepts the positive aspects to this site, and it continues to remain within the SHLAA. It has been assessed as being developable, meaning that whilst its potential to provide new housing is recognised, it is unlikely that it would be brought forward for development within the first 5 years of the new plan period.					

119	Objection	Land Adj to Crindledyke	053		Kingmoor Park Proper	A013
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No: The site should be classified as deliverable, for reasons set out in the covering letter, rather than developable.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Please see the attached covering letter.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Disagree - whilst the site does not suffer any major physical constraints that would prevent it coming forward, it does suffer from being remote from the built form of the city. It is recognised that as Story's development at Crindledyke is built out this remoteness will be reduced. However, this is anticipated to be a slow process, and it is unlikely that this site will become suitable for development within the next 5 years. This is, however, long term potential. As such, the site will remain classified developable within the shown.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
196	Objection	land adj to Crindledyke Estate	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>Object to the inclusion of this site sue to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concerns over road infrastructure; - the scale of site and the likely high density of housing on the site being considered too large; - another large development recently being undertaken within one mile radius; - the lack of availability of school places; - the visual impact of the area; - this site being situated in open countryside and visible from the wider area. 				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>This is a large site, that would need to be strategically planned should it ever come forward for development. The issues surrounding the scale of the site are recognised, hence it is considered 'developable' rather than 'deliverable', as it would take a long-term planning approach before it could be realised. There are, however, no show-stopping constraints regarding infrastructure or topography, so it would not be appropriate to exclude the site from the SHLAA. Its status remains unchanged.</p>				

CA23

081	Comment	land at Carelton Farm, Carlton road, Carlisle	048	Chris Gowlett	Persimmon Homes La	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	No - Site capacity is higher, at 180.			
GenComment		<p>Planning application has been submitted for this site. Delivery of the first units expected to be in 2015.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>Noted. Anticipated site yield will be updated to 180. Once permission has been received and construction underway, this site will be removed from the SHLAA, as it will no longer be a potential site - instead it will be an actual site.</p>				

CA24

124	Objection	Land at Windsor Way, Carlisle	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Resubmission of previous comments by PC: oppose development of the site, the area already believed to be overdeveloped.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>Noted. There are constraints facing this site, due to its size and location, however it is still considered suitable for development and careful planning should be able to secure sensitive and appropriate design.</p>				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
o82	Support	Land at Windsor Way, Carlisle	o48	Chris Gowlett	Persimmon Homes La	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		We support the inclusion of this site as deliverable. The site will be able to deliver units across the first half of the plan period.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. Site status is unchanged.				

CA30

129	Comment	Land adj West House	o58	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Resubmission of previous comments by PC: To remain alert to development proposals and ensure that the Parish Council is fully engaged in any future consultation process.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The Parish Council would naturally be consulted on any application for development of this site.				

CA35

145	Support	Land at Garden Village,	o64	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status				

CA37

144	Support	Land at Hebden Avenue	o64	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status				

CA38

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
141	Comment	Land at Beaumont Road, Carlisle	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes are aware of the flooding issues associated with this site. However, this has been reviewed and it is considered that provision can be made for the storage of any potential flood water on site therefore protecting potential residential units from flooding and avoiding exacerbating flood risk elsewhere.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The majority of this site is Flood Zone 3B, with the unflooding part of the site consisting of a narrow strip with no clear, suitable means of access. These constraints continue to exclude it from the SHLAA. If the landowner is still interested in pursuit of this site then claims to have overcome the flooding constraints would need to be tested through the planning application process.					

CA39

143	Support	land at Greymoorhill	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

CA40

142	Support	Land at High Crindledyke Farm	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	This site benefits from having outline planning consent. Story Homes remain committed to this site's development and as such we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

CA50

209	Objection	Middle Farm	076		Clerk to Kingmoor Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Middle Farm - the roads around Crindledyke are up to their limit with traffic. It is nice to have some green space mixed in with housing.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Green space is important. Landscaping issues would be explored at later stages in the planning process. The highways authority have not ruled this site out due to traffic issues, as such its status in the SHLAA remains unchanged.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
195	Objection	Middle Farm	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Object to the inclusion of this site sue to: - concerns over road infrastructure; - the scale of site and the likely high density of housing on the site being considered too large; - another large development recently being undertaken within one mile radius; - the lack of availability of school places; - the visual impact of the area; - this site being situated in open countryside and visible from the wider area.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		This is a large site, that would need to be strategically planned should it ever come forward for development. The issues surrounding the scale of the site are recognised, hence it is considered 'developable' rather than 'deliverable', as it would take a long-term planning approach before it could be realised. There are, however, no show-stopping constraints regarding infrastructure or topography, so it would not be appropriate to exclude the site from the SHLAA. Its status remains unchanged.				

CA54

130	Comment	Land at Greymoorhill	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Resubmission of previous comments by PC: To remain alert to development proposals and ensure that the Parish Council is fully engaged in any future consultation process.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The Parish Council would naturally be consulted on any application for development of this site.				

208	Objection	land at Greymoorhill	076		Clerk to Kingmoor Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		The remaining land at Greymoorhill that belongs to Carlisle City Council/the people – this should remain green space or recreation use. With Carlisle being such a historical area for Roman remains, why are we considering building right up to an old roman road that has had not a lot of archaeological investigations?				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		This land does not suffer from any significant physical constraints. The potential impact the site could have on the historic environment is not considered to be a show-stopper, as it could be mitigated against and even provide a means to enhance it. As such, its status in the SHLAA remains unchanged. This site has since been put forward as a potential allocation within the Local Plan. More detailed discussion regarding its suitability should have been picked up through previous consultations. Alternatively, should an application come forward on this site, then it is at that staged that detailed assessment of its implications upon the historic environment will be considered.				

CA60

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
033	Support	Land at Beverley Rise, Harraby, Carlisle	016	JR & JA Workman		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Agree that site is deliverable within years 1-5 albeit it the council's concern regarding noise transmission from the M6 corridor to the east can be adequately and appropriately mitigated at the detailed design stage via a combination of structural planting, to include acoustic mounds and /or fencing. The site is no nearer to the M6 than other existing housing along the motorway corridor and the site adjoins existing housing with direct access to a range of local amenities in very close proximity.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Within SHLAA site CA60, the council has previously identified emerging housing allocations CARL4 and CARL14 in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2013 Preferred Options – Stage Two. This iteration of the Plan also identified the balance of SHLAA site CA60 as an alternative housing allocation. The whole of SHLAA site CA60 remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF. The council is therefore actively encouraged to carry the whole of SHLAA site CA60 forward as a housing allocation, which can be phased accordingly in accordance with details to be discussed and agreed.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status in the SHLAA.					

CA61

118	Objection	Land Opposite Rosehill Industrial Estate	055		Property Capital PLC	A013
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No: The site should be classified as deliverable, for reasons set out in the covering letter, rather than developable.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Please see the attached covering letter.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Agreed. In light of information provided it is recognised that the potential commercial use on this site is no longer viable. As such it will be reclassified as a deliverable site in the SHLAA.					

004	Support	Land Opposite Rosehill Industrial Estate	003		Client of Eric Young &	A002
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	CA61 appears in your Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Our client owns a significant portion of this site. The land has been allocated for employment uses and specifically to facilitate a previous plan to relocate the existing Auction Mart. There are no current plans for the mart relocation as far as we are aware and there is no contractual arrangement in place or discussions ongoing which could facilitate such. Our client's land is therefore available for development. The land has had an employment allocation for a considerable number of years and has been available for purchase. Following that availability we believe that there is no demand at this location for this use. We have discussed a reallocation for residential use and we can advise that our client would support such a redesignation.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site will be reclassified as Deliverable in light of this confirmation that the proposed employment use is no longer viable. Housing may well be the most suitable development option for this site.					

CA64

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
017	Comment	Hilltop Heights	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. However, significant consideration has been given to this site and its status within the SHLAA. We now feel that in isolation it cannot be considered suitable. The surrounding uses are not currently compatible with or attractive to residential development. There are also issues with access as the site currently stands. We are aware that the hotel site itself has been submitted to the SHLAA, and this will be assessed in due course - though recent news regarding its sale has raised questions of availability as the new owner's intentions have not been made clear to us. This site may have potential as part of a larger development including the hotel, but until more information has been made available to us, it has been reclassified as unsuitable.					

CA70

203	Comment	Carleton Clinic	075	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to St Cuthbert W	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	the maintaining of the green space between site CA70, CA23 & OC46 is considered essential for residential amenity;					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted and agreed - however, the SHLAA does not go into that kind of detail. Residential amenity and green space are protected through policy. Should any applications come forward for development then this will be an important consideration at that stage. No change in SHLAA status.					

CA71a

083	Comment	Allocation at Morton	048	Chris Gowlett	Persimmon Homes La	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The smaller site (103 units) has planning permission and construction has started.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. This has been removed from the larger site. As construction has already started there is no point in including it within the SHLAA.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
016	Comment	allocation at Morton	010		Church Commissioner	A004
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>I write on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England (the Commissioners), in respect of their site at South Morton (Bounded by Wigton Road, Peter Lane and Dalston Road, Carlisle) that currently benefits from an existing planning permission (application number 09/0413) for residential (maximum 825 dwellings), employment (40,000 m2 floorspace) and public open space purposes as well as associated works. Although we do not wish to formally respond to the current consultation processes in respect of the Draft City Centre Development Framework and the Carlisle SHLAA - 2014 Update (Consultation Draft) documents, we would query the boundary of site CA71a ("Allocation at Morton") as shown on the Morton map on page 25 of the SHLAA document (map attached for reference).</p> <p>This map does not correspond to the boundary of the site for which the Commissioners have previously obtained planning consent. In addition, the boundary for CA71a appears to incorporate land to the east of the Commissioners site which we are aware is within the control of Persimmon Homes and has been subject to a separate planning permission for 103 dwellings. As such, the boundary shown for CA71a appears to be inaccurate and we would request that, as the SHLAA is updated, the entry for CA71a be amended accordingly.</p> <p>For clarification, I have attached the current approved Phasing Plan for the Commissioners site that shows the extent of the potential development.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged - site plan will be amended.					

146	Support	Allocation at Morton	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in part of this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site. However, it appears that part of the site which is within our control appears to have been omitted and we therefore respectfully request that it is added to the CA71a allocation. The land in question is shown edged in red (indicative boundaries) on the plan below. A plan has been provided along with this document which represents our legal interest. [map included]</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Land will be included for consideration within the SHLAA.					

CA72

003	Comment	Durranhill	003		Client of Eric Young &	A002
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>With regard to CA72 as you are aware part of this site has already been developed by Persimmon. We are currently in detailed discussions which are likely to lead to the early progress towards a planning applicationj for the remainder of this site, all of which is in our client's ownership.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status at this time.					

CA73

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
074	Objection	Land off Brisco Road, Brisco	043	Philip Whitelock		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No - road too small my livestock			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Traffic too bad at moment road is not up to it. Also ducts under road for water need cleaned out at my house and up road. The ducts are for 7cwt lorries 35 cwt lorries come down road not meant for them.					
ProcessComm	Green Belt					
OfficerComm	Noted. The issue with the road has not been flagged by the Highways Authority as something that would prevent development coming forward on this site. Any issues could likely be overcome through the potential development of the site.					
048	Objection	land off Brisco Road	027	Donald Ismay	Brookside	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	I am concerned that the potential development of the site CA73 for housing will have a deleterious effect on my property. The potential development in a Green Belt area will adversely affect the value of my property and the presence of a large housing estate will affect my quality of life and that of my family.			
			This property is a Grade II listed building, but the building of a large housing estate adjacent to the property makes a mockery of the Listed Building process.			
			While I recognise the need for housing, I believe that developing this Greenfield site would have a detrimental effect on the environment. For example the hedgerows which have been in situ for hundreds of years and local diverse wildlife would be lost in perpetuity. My current garden has hedgehogs, squirrels and goldfinches and visiting common pipistrelle bats, all of which would be adversely affected by a development of this nature. The local population of pheasants, kestrels, buzzards will also suffer.			
			There are Brownfield sites which can be developed preferentially to this Greenfield site, for example the St Ninian's Rd /south side adjacent to the railway was previously mooted as a housing area.			
			The Brisco road is already used as a shortcut and a 'rat-run' between Carlisle, M6 J42 and Durdar. It is narrow, winding and currently has a 60mph limit. A housing development would increase the volume of traffic along the road. There have already been a number of Road Traffic Accidents on this stretch of road due to speed and road conditions in the twelve years I have lived here. Increased traffic would necessitate road widening and consequent damage to the wider environment.			
			Building on what is now a field would affect the water run-off into the beck at Cammock bottom and potentially lead to increased flooding.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Concerns are noted and recognised. Clearly the impact that development could have on a listed building and its setting is a serious concern for any proposal for development, but it would not rule out any or all development completely. The SHLAA merely looks at land for its potential to provide housing, without actually deciding that this is where housing will go. The SHLAA rules out only those sites that are affected by absolute, show-stopping constraints that could not be overcome through the development process. None of the issues you list are considered to be show stoppers, and therefore the site remains within consideration in the SHLAA. Any issues around landscape impact, biodiversity impact, impact upon a listed building, and traffic impact could be addressed and accounted for in detail should a planning application come forward upon this site.					
	Whilst your point that brownfield land should be developed first before greenfield land is recognised and agreed, the issue for Carlisle is that there are only a few suitable and deliverable brownfield sites left that could contribute to our housing needs. Whilst you state there are brownfield sites that could be built on, we struggle to ascertain where these sites are - with most already having been regenerated through successful brownfield first policies of previous plans. The reality is that greenfield land is now having to be considered in order to meet the housing needs of the city and district.					

CA74

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
098	Comment	Land adj Border Terrier	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None		
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				

CA75

097	Comment	Newtown Industrial Estate, Carlisle	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - within 250m of a historical landfill [engine lonning Tip]		
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				

CA76

026	Comment	Land South of Chertsey Mount, Carlisle	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status.				

099	Comment	land South of Chersey Bank	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ground Vulnerability Zone		
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. Information added to site.				

CASo

096	Comment	Land adj Lansdowne Crescent, Carlisle	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
-----	----------------	--	-----	-----------------	--------------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment Environment Agency Constraint Assessment:
 - Within 8 metres of a Main River
 - Ordinary Watercourse
 - Flood Zone 2

GenComment

ProcessComm

OfficerComm Noted. No change in site status

CUDo1

023	Comment	Land adj Garthside, Cummersdale	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
-----	----------------	---------------------------------	-----	----------------	----------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is:
 - suitable for residential development
 - available for residential development
 - viable for residential development
 it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development.
 The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm Noted. No change in site status.

182	Comment	Land adj Garthside, Cummersdale	072	Clerk - Sue Tarrant	Cummersdale Parish C	
-----	----------------	---------------------------------	-----	---------------------	----------------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment 14 Dwelling – Cummersdale village 14 homes- support the small scale development but must be in keeping with the village. Small buildings/bungalows for the elderly.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm Noted. No change in site status within the SHLAA.

CUDo3

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
183	Comment	Land off Caldew Road, Cummersdale	072	Clerk - Sue Tarrant	Cummersdale Parish C	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	19 Dwellings – Cummersdale village: Concerns regarding access. A small cul-de-sac arrangement may be appropriate.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Access, whilst identified as a slight constraint, has not been flagged as a show stopper by the Highways Authority on this site. No change in site status within the SHLAA.					

CUD04

100	Comment	Land West of The Oval Cummersdale	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged					

184	Objection	Land West of the Oval, Cummersdale	072	Clerk - Sue Tarrant	Cummersdale Parish C	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	35 Dwellings- the scale of the development indicated would be an unacceptable intrusion on to the country side. The scale is out of context with the rural master plan and the village its self. The development appears to cut across an existing bridle way and concerns are raised regarding the access to the development. Once the access road is in place this would allow potential further development. The Parish Council had approached the land owner adjacent to the Common- Cumbria County Council to purchase a strip of land to extend the football pitch to create a regular sized pitch. The Parish Council were told that at this time the land was not available. (16.01.14) The council was then made aware of the potential development; the concern is that green space cannot be extended for recreational as requested by the villagers.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted, and agreed. The site has been reclassified as having no potential, due to its potential impact upon the settlement and its setting.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
-------	--------	-------------	------------	---------	--------------	-------

061	Objection	Land west of The Oval, Cummersdale	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
-----	------------------	---------------------------------------	-----	----------------	----------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

The site is identified as being developable [6-15 yrs after Local Plan adoption] with a comment that '...it won't seek to fill out the western side of the village and frame the public park. There are concerns that it would have a negative impact upon the setting of the village and the careful planning and design that would need to go into the site would likely knock it back into 6 - 10 year period of the plan'.

In the context of the above it is emphasised that the indicative proposals which have been put forward includes landscaping proposals which could, following discussions with the local planning authority be further enhanced if required.

In the context of the preceding the site ought to be identified as deliverable as it is:

- suitable for residential development
- available for residential development
- viable for residential development

It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of all/part of the site as set out above.

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment

ProcessComm

OfficerComm

Noted. However, serious consideration has been given to this site as we update the SHLAA. Whilst we are aware of the proposed mitigation and landscape screening methods you propose, we feel that the real issue with the site lies with the location of its access, which is clearly located outside of the edge of the village. This is not something that could be mitigated against, and we feel it leads to an unacceptable level of encroachment into the open countryside. This is an issue that would affect this site regardless of the scale of proposals eventually brought forward. It is on these grounds that we have concluded that the site would not be suitable for development, and its status within the SHLAA has been adjusted accordingly

CUW02

022	Comment	Land to rear of The Chapel, Cumwhinton	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
-----	----------------	---	-----	----------------	----------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment

The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is:

- suitable for residential development
- available for residential development
- viable for residential development

it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm

Noted. No change in site status.

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
167	Comment	land West of How Croft, Cumwhinton	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Concerns regarding surface drainage, flowing across the B6263 to overloaded gullies. An attenuation tank would be required. Consideration to be given to top "ribbon" development on the opposite side of the B6263 to balance the housing. The chapel could be demolished to improve the access to the site 25 dwellings (NB Affordable housing to include extra care bungalows)					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted - however, unless the landowner contacts us we will be unable to include any new sites within the SHLAA, as we need to know that they are actively being made available for potential development, which only the landowner can confirm.					
	Whilst drainage is recognised as an issue on this site it is not considered to be an insurmountable constraint that could be addressed without increasing the risk of surface water flooding elsewhere. The site's status within the SHLAA remains unchanged.					

CUW04

149	Comment	Land East of Peter Gate, Cumwhinton	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	This site has been discarded by the Council due to issues with road congestion at school pick up and drop off times and for this reason the Council believes that access to the site would be an issue. However, Story Homes believe that the site should be included as a developable site as there is a willing landowner and developer, the site is available now for residential development and there are no other known constraints which would preclude its development. The congestion and access issues referred to by the Council could be overcome, as the site's development could offer the opportunity to alleviate some of the congestion by making some parking space available for school users. Story Homes continue to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Disagree - the access to this site is severely constrained due to the narrowness of the road and its intensive use during school start and finish times. It would be wholly inappropriate to add to these issues with new development in this location. As such, this site continues to be regarded as unsuitable for development within the SHLAA.					

CUW05

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
071	Comment	Land between Beech Tree Farm and Swallow Barn, Cumwhinton	041	Executors of Mrs M Coulson		A001
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Local Plan Preferred Option The site, situated north of the B6263 at St John's Hall, has been identified as a Preferred Option housing site (CUMW 2) in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015 – 2030 Preferred Options Consultation - Stage Two. In the document, the site is considered suitable for development of up to 20 residential units. In line with the NPPF, it is important that the Council recognise the important role rural settlements have to play in supporting rural communities. We fully support this allocation on the basis that smaller rural villages play an integral part in servicing the local community and it is vital the provision is made for their growth over the forthcoming plan period to ensure their continued contribution to their local communities. Cumwhinton is considered a wholly suitable location for new development given its range of existing services and close proximity to Carlisle and the M6 motorway.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Additional comments made with regard to: Site Context; Location/Sustainability; Site Constraints; Housing Need. Conclusion In conclusion, we continue to support the future development of Site CUW5 (as identified in the SHLAA) for future residential development and we would welcome further detailed discussions with the relevant planning officers in due course with regard to continued promotion of the site through the Local Plan process. Our client is keen to work closely with the Council in delivering this site and if any further information is required please do not hesitate to contact us.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. However, it has come to our attention that this site suffers from significant surface water flooding issues that have, to date, not been overcome. This issue, coupled with our assessment of the potential landscape impact of this prominent site, which was always a cause for concern, has led us to conclude that the site does not have potential for housing development within the SHLAA.					
101	Comment	Land between Beech Farm & Swallow Barn	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ordinary Watercourse [Culvert through Site]			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged					
168	Comment	Land to the North of St Johns Hall	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Concerns regarding drainage, members would prefer to see a smaller housing development on this site with additional houses being built on other available land e.g. land adjacent to Holme Meadow. See 2002 flooding report by Alistair McLellan, drainage engineer Carlisle CC) 20 dwellings (NB Affordable housing to include extra care bungalows)					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged and agreed. Surface water flooding issues on this site are considered to be severe enough to rule it out of the SHLAA. It also has considerable landscape impact concerns. It will be reclassified as having no potential within the SHLAA.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
077	Objection	Land between Beech Tree Farm and Swallow Barn, Cumwhinton	046	Mrs J Taylor		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		I wish to object to the proposal of this field being considered for future housing development . This field acts as a large soak-away to avoid local rain water flooding / pooling on the adjoining road (B6263)and flooding in the local homes in this area during periods of heavy rainfall. This area of Cumwhinton is the lowest part of the settlement and as such can attract surface water pooling / flooding because the under-road drainage system is soon overloaded as surface water runs off the surrounding fields flowing down the road into this area. Any building etc on this field will remove this valuable function resulting in enhanced flooding in the homes of people living in the centre of the village. Please deem this site as unsuitable for future housing development and investigate other possible sites on the edges of the village				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. Consultation has flagged up issues with this site, particularly regarding the issue of surface water flooding on the land. We feel that this flooding issue, coupled with concerns regarding the site's potential landscape impact, mean that the site cannot be considered to have housing potential within the SHLAA. As such its status has been changed to "no potential"				
053	Objection	Land between Beech Tree Farm & Swallow Barn, Cumwhinton	031	G & C Little		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		With reference to your proposed SHLAA site, Land between Beach Tree Farm & Swallow Barn, Information from our parish council Shows a proposal of 20 off new builds right behind my property, which is a small cottage next door to village hall. This in its self rings massive alarm bells concerning the already flood situation. We have lived at the cottage for the past 15 years and in that time more than 50 new builds have been completed in this village with no input from the council or the utilities to upgrade an already inadequate drainage system to cope with all extra down flow. As we live at the lowest point of the village, we and our neighbours bare all the brunt of the flooding on at least 10 off separate occasions to date, which in this day & age is not acceptable. If we had not taken the action of buying ourselves a 3" water pump to help alleviate some of the problem we would have been under water & sewerage several times. I would also like to point out, if you take this land for building it takes away the opportunity to correct another existing problem of parking at the village hall, which also doubles up as our church. Therefore you leave me no alternative to raise a 100 percent objection to this outrageous proposal, I cant believe your committee could even consider building more houses on an already flood area.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted, and agreed. The concerns regarding flooding issues on this site are recognised. It is felt that these issues, coupled with wider concerns around the visual impact of this site upon this open and prominent part of the village, should rule this site out from further consideration in the SHLAA. It will be reclassified as having no potential.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
076	Objection	Land between Beech Tree Farm and Swallow Barn, Cumwhinton	045	Mr & Mrs M Higginbotham		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>My wife and I wish to register our strong objections to the proposal to consider this field for future housing development. This centre area of Cumwhinton is the low part of the settlement and as such has a long history of surface water pooling and flooding in nearby homes during periods of heavy rainfall. The rainwater runs off the surrounding fields, flows into the under highway drainage system, this is quickly overloaded and the water floods over the verges. The nearby beck is also easily overloaded resulting in the surface water overflowing its banks adding to the overloaded drainage system enhancing the localised flooding problem. The natural way for the floodwater to drain away from this area is into this field – which acts as a giant soak-away minimising the road pooling of the overflowing surface water. Over the last few years the control measures added to improve the overflow from the road into the field (additional holes made in the bottom of the wall between the field and the B6263 road) has improved the flood prevention with only some garages being flooded not the homes but the whole situation is still precarious. Therefore as there are some sites around the edges of the settlement to be considered and are likely to have lower risk relating to the flooding problems we are hopeful that logic and common sense will be applied - resulting in this site being deemed as unsuitable for future housing development.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. Consultation has flagged up issues with this site, particularly regarding the issue of surface water flooding on the land. We feel that this flooding issue, coupled with concerns regarding the site's potential landscape impact, mean that the site cannot be considered to have housing potential within the SHLAA. As such its status has been changed to "no potential"</p>					
154	Objection	Land between Beech Tree Farm and Swallow Barn, Cumwhinton	066	Wendy Daley		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>I ask that my concerns regarding this land being allocated for residential development be seriously taken into consideration.</p> <p>My concerns are that the map of Cumwhinton does not show areas of surface water flooding. The houses in this area are under threat of flooding every time there is heavy rain. Myself and my neighbours struggle to keep water out of our houses during heavy downpours as the current Highways drainage system gets quickly inundated and the water floods down the road and over verges, and then up household drains. This happens at least once a year. We have had to call Cumbria Fire and Rescue Service out at least five times in the time I have been living here (7 years). In 2002 work was carried out by the City Council to alleviate some of this problem by boring holes into the field wall to allow flood water to be able to flow off the road into this very area of land that has been allocated for residential development! The drains in this area of allocated land also bubble up and create a stream though the whole of the field (photo attached). Building houses here with the current state of the Highways drainage system appears very foolhardy, it would increase the problem of flooding for current houses and problems for the new houses being built.</p> <p>From a personal point we have a highways run off drain on our land which drains into this area of land if the field drains block then we have even greater problems, there are no plans of where all the drains in the field are the highways department have jetted and cleared the drains for us in the past. My concern is that a developer will not look into how all the drains affect this run off drain and will not want the cost of investigating all of the problems associated with this system.</p> <p>Another point regarding the drainage in this area is that the gully beside Swallow Barn is constantly blocked even in very dry weather this highlights the inadequacy of the current system. I think that the Highways drainage system needs to be surveyed for the village and brought up to date to cope properly with all new housing developments, and the large amount of run off water from field drains further up the village.</p> <p>Any new development on this land must have strict planning conditions to ensure that the flooding problems are not exacerbated for the current houses that are in the area.</p> <p>I have attached photos of the field allocated for development that shows the drains being unable to cope with heavy rain and one from my own back door to illustrate the flooding we experience when the field drains fail.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Acknowledged and agreed - consultation has brought to light the surface water flooding issues on this site. This, coupled with the significant adverse impact development here would have on this open aspect to the village, have led us to conclude that the site is not suitable for residential development. It will be reclassified in the SHLAA as having no potential.</p>					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
075	Objection	Land between Beech Tree Farm and Swallow Barn, Cumwhinton	044	Mrs D Heeley-Creed		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>I have read with great concern the proposal to develop and build houses on the land between Beech Tree Farm and Swallow Barn. Although I have not been subject to flooding my neighbours in front have and during the last flood in 2002 the water was worryingly close to my property.</p> <p>During heavy rain fall the road is still subject to standing water. This is due to the fact that this is the lowest part of the village and water naturally wants to gravitate to this point. The water than drains onto the proposed building site and this could cause further flooding problems for any properties that are built on there. During heavy rain this causes a great deal of stress on the existing house owners in the village who have been subject to flooding in the past and 1 particular property was flooded in December 2013 and they have had to go to the expense of installing a pump !</p> <p>The proposed access to this site is directly opposite mine and my neighbours private drive and the traffic issues in Cumwhinton are already a problem and this would cause further issues with access to the road. The village is subject to farm traffic, private vehicles, school times are especially busy, and heavy building traffic.</p> <p>The amenities in Cumwhinton are not adequate now and with extra houses being built it would put additional strain on the amenities we have.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Consultation has flagged up issues with this site, particularly regarding the issue of surface water flooding on the land. We feel that this flooding issue, coupled with concerns regarding the site's potential landscape impact, mean that the site cannot be considered to have housing potential within the SHLAA. As such its status has been changed to "no potential"					

CUW06

102	Comment	Land east of Holme Meadow, cumwhinton	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ordinary Watercourse [Culvert through Site]			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged					

DA01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
o86	Objection	land at Townhead Road, Dalston	o52	Mr & Mrs MB Millar		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	In relation to this site you assert that there has been little in the way of recent housing development. Carlisle CC is fully aware that 121 new houses are being built in the village despite 500 odd people objecting to them. Your statement is misleading. Enough is enough and there should be no more house building in Dalston apart from the odd infill housing.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Dalston is currently spending much time and effort in developing its own plan - what credibility will it be given? It is supposed to inform the future of our village. Is it a waste of time?					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted - this site has been included within the SHLAA for a number of years, and the site description for this site was written before housing at townhead road was approved. The statement you refer to can be deleted to reflect recent development within the village.					
<p>The SHLAA is not the development plan, and just because a site is included with housing potential does not mean that it will be built, or even that it is guranteed planning permission. The SHLAA serves as a catalogue of land that has been put forward by landowners/developers as available. It informs the choice of allocations in the Local Plan. It will also serve as a key piece of evidence for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, should it wish to consider making its own housing allocations.</p>						
136	Objection	land at Townhead Road, Dalston	o62	Bryan Craig		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	I understand from previous correspondence that the 121 dwellings presently being developed by Story Homes between Townhead Road and Station Road satisfied the need for large scale development in Dalston Village and that the remaining sites identified under the SHLAA were being removed.					
<p>With the exception of a small site at Buckerbank OCO7 where there is presently good argument against it being sustainable then it could be argued that the present levels of development satisfied the SHLAA.</p>						
<p>I would therefore like to know why this previously unsustainable site (DAO1) and (OCO7) have been added back into the SHLAA covering the Local Plan period 2015 –2030.</p>						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Disagree - The SHLAA assesses each site on its own merit to see if it is worth including within the Local Plan. Strategic issues such as housing need and preferred sites do not factor into the SHLAA. This is done in the Local Plan, using the SHLAA as evidence. The impact of the approval for 121 new houses is not considered within the SHLAA. But it will influence the allocation selection process.					
133	Objection	Land at Townhead Road, Dalston	o6o	Pauline Dalton		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Development here would present problems of access. It is not clear where access is contemplated, but Nook Lane is a narrow rural lane and any access through the Madame Banks estate would only cause more congestion in already congested streets</p> <p>Townhead Road is narrow and the current increase in traffic from the construction of The Grange is proving to cause problems, especially at the junction with the main road. This will only get worse when the Story estate is complete and it is my opinion that this road could not sustain a considerable increase in traffic.</p> <p>I draw your attention to the fact that 121 houses are being built in Dalston. This means a considerable increase in the population of Dalston in the next three years and will certainly affect the rural nature of the village. Any further development of any scale would threaten the character and infrastructure of the village. I draw your attention to my previous e-mail regarding development at Buckabank and remind you of the importance of the rural nature to Dalston residents and the considerable traffic problems already existing.</p> <p>I also want to reiterate my previous remarks about Dalston's percentage share of the rural allocation, the 2013 Housing Needs Survey and the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. There is a balance to be struck in Dalston between allowing enough growth to sustain services and the village's vibrant core whilst also ensuring that the rural, village character is preserved. The Council considers the recent Story approval for 121 dwellings to be enough for the village for the emerging plan period and as such has not allocated additional sites within the emerging Local Plan. However, the SHLAA does not make these sort of policy decisions and can merely assess the raw potential of each site that has been submitted to us. DAO1 is largely unconstrained, and the Highways Authority have not suggested that the access issues there would be a show-stopper to development. As such, its status within the SHLAA remains unchanged.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
131	Objection	Land at Townhead Road, Dalston	059	David A H Wilson		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>1. General:</p> <p>a) The updated SHLAA allocation focusses on Greenfield sites, including some within Conservation Areas.</p> <p>b) For the sake of communities, of sustainability and of revitalization, new building should focus on Brownfield sites. This may not suit developers so well, but it would represent responsible planning. Currently, in Dalston as elsewhere (for example, Wetheral), the SHLAA threatens greenfield areas of agriculturally productive land which is highly valued by local communities for amenity and environmental reasons: destruction of it would be fundamentally opposed to the concept of sustainability.</p> <p>2. Dalston and Buckabank:</p> <p>a) Dalston is currently suffering the creation of a bland, 121-unit estate of generic 'off-the-shelf', 'executive' housing units on an agriculturally productive greenfield site within its Conservation Area. This large-scale development was comprehensively opposed by the local community as well as by its Parish Council – without effect.</p> <p>b) Over 90% of the community in Dalston continue to fear the erosion of the historic village characteristics of the place they value. There are now several sources of evidence to substantiate this fact, which should have meaning if the government's 'Localism' agenda is to be taken seriously.</p> <p>c) The negative effects of such development (either already approved or envisaged as in your Draft) will involve unsustainable infrastructure pressures affecting health services, road safety, drainage, and educational provision. In the educational 'free market' many Dalston children are currently bussed out while others are driven in daily by their parents to occupy severely limited school places.</p> <p>d) The updated SHLAA allocation now suggests the possibility of even more development in another sensitive area, and also in Buckabank.</p> <p>e) If the current 121-unit development is taken as an example, there will be no financial benefits to the local community – all fees and profits accruing to the City Council will go exclusively into general funds.</p> <p>f) At the time of approval for the development referred to in a) above, Dalston was continuing to draw up its Neighbourhood Plan. No further detailed planning policies affecting Dalston should be approved until this Neighbourhood Plan is completed. In the meantime, Dalston has access to a bespoke Housing Needs Survey: this has far more relevance to community needs.</p> <p>g) Approval for large-scale development in Dalston was given last year when the City council had already exceeded its forward Housing Land Supply requirements.</p> <p>h) Dalston (and, within it, Buckabank) has already suffered approval for development excessively beyond the recommendations in the current Carlisle and District Local Plan, which proposes a distribution of development to be shared in Brampton, Longtown and the broader north-west.</p> <p>i) Please remove "DAO1- Land at Townhead Road" and "OCO7 - Land at Buckabank, Dalston" from your catalogue of 'deliverable' sites; please spare other Greenfield and Conservation Area sites from 'deliverable' status; and please begin – for the sake of revitalization and good, professional planning – to target Brownfield sites.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>1. A) - The SHLAA simply reflects the land that has been submitted to the Council by landowners/land agents. It has made an assessment of each site on its own merits regarding its suitability for housing development. It cannot and does not apply any particular focus on certain types of sites. The high level of greenfield land reflects the fact that there is relatively little suitable brownfield land remaining. The fact that a site may be located within a conservation area does not preclude development of that site.</p> <p>B) Current and emerging policy does encourage a brownfield first approach. This is however irrelevant to the SHLAA, which does not make an policy decisions regarding land, merely assessing each site on its own merit as to its suitability.</p> <p>2. A site's inclusion within the SHLAA is not an allocation or a development proposal. It is merely an assessment of its raw potential for residential development in the future. The reasons you state above will be considered within the Local Plan, when we come to look at policy decisions and housing allocations. The issues you raise do not however impact upon the physical suitability of the land and therefore its status remains unchanged within the SHLAA.</p>					
055	Support	Land at Townhead Road, Dalston	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in status of site in SHLAA - though site address may be changed from Townhead Road to Nook Lane.					

DU01

140	Support	467 Durdar Road, Carlisle	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes has a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as part of the Carlisle South Urban Expansion.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

DU03

059	Support	land at Durdar Farm	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site which is partly developed and partly undeveloped, is identified as having potential for residential development as part of the Carlisle South Urban expansion. The Authority's positive assessment of the site is noted as one which confirms its potential being: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development All clearly positive attributes which support the allocation of the land for residential development					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. This site will be considered for its potential as part of Carlisle South.					

HN01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
o84	Objection	Land adj the Whins, Heads Nook	o49	Mr David Watson		A012
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No: The information presented in the latest SHLAA assessment is incorrect and now outdated. See 'specific comments' below.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	No: A portion of the site was granted outline planning permission in March 2014 for the erection of 5 residential dwellings (REF: 13/0792). The area subject to planning permission is located along the eastern boundary of the site; bordering the existing 'Whins' development. The remainder of the land remains greenfield and subject to SHLAA assessment			
GenComment	<p>Response to the last SHLAA assessment:</p> <p>1. 'The site faces an insurmountable constraint in that its access onto the main road would not be achievable without compromising highway safety due to junction positions...'</p> <p>See comments from Mr. Richard Hayward, (Development Manager, Highways and Transportation), below.</p> <p>'assuming the development is for less than 20 dwellings, Allenheads Lane could be upgraded to a 4.8m width Shared Access Way (the same standard as the estate road serving the prospective development), subject to that road's authority being willing to accept the upgrading and adoption (or if as previously advised the number of dwellings is less than 5 so the road can be a Private Shared Driveway); given it is within a 30mph restricted area and the junction is the same side as The Whins the recommended junction spacing would be 20m, so I certainly would not be recommending the Planning Authority to turn it down...'</p> <p>(E-mail comms. June 2013, regarding development of the first portion of the site residential development). Planning has already been granted on a portion of the site. The issues above raised in the last SHLAA assessment have been overcome as a result.</p> <p>2. 'United Utilities have also identified infrastructure capacity issues in the village which are unlikely to be addressed in the near future...'</p> <p>The information stated here is completely incorrect and misleading. United Utilities have informed that the existing infrastructure has sufficient capacity to accommodate further residential development in the village in the future. The Treatment Works have also recently been upgraded to accommodate any further residential expansion. Thus no issue for any future development on the site.</p> <p>3. 'This greenfield site currently serves as access to a waste water treatment plant and is severely constrained by the utility and highway issues. Beyond the need to maintain this access and the bad neighbour issues of the adjacent waste water works...'</p> <p>The recent granting of planning permission did not identify the close proximity of the water treatment works as being an issue during the application stage. Indeed, a parcel of land in the village of Rockcliffe (REF: RO01 - Land Adj Rockcliffe Memorial Hall), has also been identified as being 'Developable' through the last SHLAA assessment; even though it is in similar close proximity to a larger water treatment works than the one that serves Heads Nook.</p> <p>Based on the above, this site should be considered for having development potential. All previous comments identified in the last SHLAA assessment have either been resolved or were incorrect in the first instance. The recent granting of planning permission on a portion of the same site thus proves that there is potential also for the remainder of the site.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Disagree. This site achieved planning permission, despite it's no potential status in the SHLAA. It is not considered suitable for strategic housing development, and therefore will continue to be shown as having no potential. We consulted both United Utilities and the Highways Authority directly as part of the SHLAA assessment. To suggest that our assessment of the utilities capacity within the village is either wrong or misleading is not accepted. This was one of the few villages that United Utilities were clear that their networks were at capacity. We have not received any further information from UU to indicate that things have changed. Likewise, we have not received any further information directly from the Highways Authority that would make us change our minds regarding the access to this site. Our understanding was that further development, beyond the limited numbers approved, would not be acceptable in terms of access. The site is still considered to be unsuitable for development.					

HO01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
125	Objection	Houghton	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Resubmission of previous comments by PC: oppose development of the site. Development even of 30% of the site would be a significant enlargement of the overall footprint of Houghton; and would have an adverse impact upon the retained rural character of the village; would impose significantly greater demands upon the village's infrastructure services; and, notwithstanding the nearby presence of the M6, would be a significant intrusion into open countryside. Development of any part of the site would set a precedent for further development.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. However, the SHLAA merely assesses the physical suitability of a site. There are no significant physical constraints on this site, that would prevent it from being developed. We are aware of development pressures within Houghton however. This is a strategic issue that is considered through the allocation process within the Local Plan.					

HO02

126	Objection	Land at Hoghton Road, Houghton	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Resubmission of previous comments by PC: oppose development of the site.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No development proposals have been received on this site. It is still technically suitable for development however, and therefore its status within the SHLAA has not changed.					

150	Support	Land at Houghton Road	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes continues to have a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

HO03

151	Support	Hadrian's Camp, Houghton	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Story Homes has a legal interest in this site and are committed to its development for the purposes of delivering housing. As such, we support its inclusion within the SHLAA as a deliverable site.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. No change in SHLAA status					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
127	Support	Hadrian's Camp, Houghton	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Resubmission of previous comments by PC: Support, in principle, the strictly limited development of no more than 2 ha to the north of the site, the housing to be of low density and to include affordable housing.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Site status unchanged.					

LOo8

103	Comment	land at Lochinvar Close, Longtown	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Within 8 metres of a Main River - Flood Zone 3 - Flood Zone 2			
GenComment	[could not permit building over or within 8 m of the Lochinvar Mail River culvert, either side. Southern portion of site is in Zone 3 and in flow path should inlet of culvert block. EA looking at options for re-culverting of this main river]					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status					

MRo1

106	Comment	Land at Monkhill Road	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged					
189	Comment	Land at Mokhill Road, Moorhouse	073	Viv Sealby	Clerk to Burgh by Sand	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	- There would be access problems with this site. - If this site was developed a suitable mix of houses would be desirable.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Housing mix is something that would be addressed should this site come forward for development. No change in status within the SHLAA.					

MR02

105	Comment	Land north of Low Moorhouse Fauld	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
-----	----------------	--------------------------------------	-----	-----------------	--------------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment Environment Agency Constraint Assessment:
- Ordinary Watercourse

GenComment

ProcessComm

OfficerComm Acknowledged

162	Objection	Land North of Moorhouse Fauld, Moorhouse	068	Gail Ferrier		
-----	------------------	---	-----	--------------	--	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment

I have just been informed by another village resident of this site being offered for development and would like to make the following comments about it and MR03

- Both sites are adjacent to a sharp bend in the round which also has a junction entering at its apex – further junctions as sites of entry to these sites would add to an already dangerous road
- The current main entry point for MR03 is a narrow lane which is not wide enough for more than one vehicle, its exit onto the road is blind to the right because of a small Grade 2 listed clay building (which we own and restored in the last 10 years). This building, being clay, needs regular (almost yearly) maintenance that can only be done by partially blocking the lane – were this to become used to access MR03 by the proposed 30 residents this would become very difficult to achieve. At the movement it is used very rarely (I have seen the farmer there 4 or 5 times in 14 years and a man who dumps soil etc. On the site with the farmer's consent maybe 12 times over the same period).
- The proposal is for a total of 55 houses (30 on MR03 and 25 on MR02) , this would double the size of the village which is small and its only amenities are a pub and a post box. The bus service is woefully bad and set to worsen.
- Whilst there are primary schools and churches in nearby locations (Burgh-by –Sands , Monkhill, Thurstonfield and Kirkbampton) all of these would need to be accessed by driving to them. The road is not wide enough between or through the villages to allow for a cycle or walkway and this road is not pleasant to cycle or walk down because of frequent lorries. When two of these meet at certain points they can barely pass each other as it is. Currently parents with children at Kirkbampton school all drive to drop them off and collect them. There are no secondary schools nearby and all of those require some sort of transport to get to them. This idea is not eco-friendly and should not be considered as an option when there are more suitably placed alternatives.
- Because the amenities and buses are so sparse anyone living in this location will need at least one car (most of the current residents where two people are working, or one works whilst the other looks after kids, have two). If you are struggling to buy a house the last thing you need is that additional expense so putting so-called affordable housing in this sort of village location is counter intuitive (as well as the eco-friendly aspect)
- I cannot say much about MR02 but I do know that MR03 is extremely wet , with a high water table. This is also true of land designated MR04 that is not considered viable as development land, as far as I can see only because of its size, but I have no doubt that were MR02 and MR03 to be approved that that land would be sold to increase the size of MR03. A nearby field recently received planning permission for a chicken farm but had provisos attached because of the recognised poor drainage there so I guess the whole area is much the same.
- The village has now been connected to mains sewerage but there are frequent problem with the system – as it seems to struggle with the current level of waste I am uncertain if it could cope with any more – let alone such a massive increase.
- My final comment may not hold much sway with people who seem determined to build all over the green belt but our home is part of the Courtyards development that Fred Story did in the 90s. This has always been considered a bit of a prestigious development and English Heritage saw fit to list our house (and our neighbours) as Grade 2*. We restored the old wash house which is now almost entirely returned to a clay building. It had been allowed to get into a terrible state by its previous owner in spite of its listed status (grade2) and the Council kindly gave us some money toward restoring it. If MR03 is developed and the lane used as access this will run about 12 feet from our back door and will remove essentially all privacy from our home. It would also run hard against the wash house gable end and I would worry about the detrimental effect of traffic on two sides – I already worry what adverse effect the heavy vehicles on the main road may have given that these old buildings do not have traditional style foundations.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm These sites are not planning proposals. They have merely been assessed for their raw potential to provide housing development, as requested by the landowner/agent who submitted it to the SHLAA. The SHLAA provides the evidence of available land for the selection of allocations within the Local Plan. Neither MR02 or MR03 have been put forward as allocations. The SHLAA recognises issues with access and the impact these sites would have on the highway. Unlike MR01, MR02 and MR03 have been classified as "developable" rather than "deliverable" which reflects the fact that there are constraints that would have to be overcome before development here would be suitable - this is based on advice from the Highways Authority. As such, the sites will remain as developable in the SHLAA.

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
190	Objection	Land North of Low Moorhouse Fauld, Moorhouse	073	Viv Sealby		Clerk to Burgh by Sand
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		- This is the site of a former pond so there might be drainage issues. - There would be access problems with this site and there would be a need for further road improvements as it is situated between two bends in the road.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. Issues with this site are refelected in its 'developable' status, rather than being considered deliverable. Though this issues are not considered severe enough to rule out the possibility of development entirely. No change in site status within the SHLAA.				

MR03

104	Comment	Land at Moorhouse Courtyards	051	Jilly Dougherty		Environment Agency
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged				

191	Objection	Land at Moorhouse Courtyards, Moorhouse	073	Viv Sealby		Clerk to Burgh by Sand
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		- This is a wet site and is a designated wildlife area (a Historic Meadow) - The increased Traffic would affect adjacent buildings. - There would be access problems with this site as it is situated between two bends in the road and there would be a need for further road improvements. - If this site was developed a suitable mix of houses would be desirable.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. Issues with this site are refelected in its 'developable' status, rather than being considered deliverable. Though this issues are not considered severe enough to rule out the possibility of development entirely. No change in site status within the SHLAA.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
163	Objection	land at Moorhouse Courtyard, Moorhouse	o68	Gail Ferrier		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>I have just been informed by another village resident of this site being offered (MRO3) for development and would like to make the following comments about it and MRO2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Both sites are adjacent to a sharp bend in the round which also has a junction entering at its apex – further junctions as sites of entry to these sites would add to an already dangerous road The current main entry point for MRO3 is a narrow lane which is not wide enough for more than one vehicle, its exit onto the road is blind to the right because of a small Grade 2 listed clay building (which we own and restored in the last 10 years). This building, being clay, needs regular (almost yearly) maintenance that can only be done by partially blocking the lane – were this to become used to access MRO3 by the proposed 30 residents this would become very difficult to achieve. At the movement it is used very rarely (I have seen the farmer there 4 or 5 times in 14 years and a man who dumps soil etc. On the site with the farmer's consent maybe 12 times over the same period). The proposal is for a total of 55 houses (30 on MRO3 and 25 on MRO2) , this would double the size of the village which is small and its only amenities are a pub and a post box. The bus service is woefully bad and set to worsen. Whilst there are primary schools and churches in nearby locations (Burgh-by –Sands , Monkhill, Thurstonfield and Kirkbampton) all of these would need to be accessed by driving to them. The road is not wide enough between or through the villages to allow for a cycle or walkway and this road is not pleasant to cycle or walk down because of frequent lorries. When two of these meet at certain points they can barely pass each other as it is. Currently parents with children at Kirkbampton school all drive to drop them off and collect them. There are no secondary schools nearby and all of those require some sort of transport to get to them. This idea is not eco-friendly and should not be considered as an option when there are more suitably placed alternatives. Because the amenities and buses are so sparse anyone living in this location will need at least one car (most of the current residents where two people are working, or one works whilst the other looks after kids, have two). If you are struggling to buy a house the last thing you need is that additional expense so putting so-called affordable housing in this sort of village location is counter intuitive (as well as the eco-friendly aspect) I cannot say much about MRO2 but I do know that MRO3 is extremely wet , with a high water table. This is also true of land designated MRO4 that is not considered viable as development land, as far as I can see only because of its size, but I have no doubt that were MRO2 and MRO3 to be approved that that land would be sold to increase the size of MRO3. A nearby field recently received planning permission for a chicken farm but had provisos attached because of the recognised poor drainage there so I guess the whole area is much the same. The village has now been connected to mains sewerage but there are frequent problem with the system – as it seems to struggle with the current level of waste I am uncertain if it could cope with any more – let alone such a massive increase. My final comment may not hold much sway with people who seem determined to build all over the green belt but our home is part of the Courtyards development that Fred Story did in the 90s. This has always been considered a bit of a prestigious development and English Heritage saw fit to list our house (and our neighbours) as Grade 2*. We restored the old wash house which is now almost entirely returned to a clay building. It had been allowed to get into a terrible state by its previous owner in spite of its listed status (grade2) and the Council kindly gave us some money toward restoring it. If MRO3 is developed and the lane used as access this will run about 12 feet from our back door and will remove essentially all privacy from our home. It would also run hard against the wash house gable end and I would worry about the detrimental effect of traffic on two sides – I already worry what adverse effect the heavy vehicles on the main road may have given that these old buildings do not have traditional style foundations. 				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>These sites are not planning proposals. They have merely been assessed for their raw potential to provide housing development, as requested by the landowner/agent who submitted it to the SHLAA. The SHLAA provides the evidence of available land for the selection of allocations within the Local Plan. Neither MRO2 or MRO3 have been put forward as allocations. The SHLAA recognises issues with access and the impact these sites would have on the highway. Unlike MRO1, MRO2 and MRO3 have been classified as "developable" rather than "deliverable" which reflects the fact that there are constraints that would have to be overcome before development here would be suitable - this is based on advice from the Highways Authority. As such, the sites will remain as developable in the SHLAA.</p>				

MR04

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
164	Comment	land North of Moorhouse Courtyard, Moorhouse	o68	Gail Ferrier		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>For some reason the address attached to this is given as Townhead Rd , Dalston This is clearly wrong when you look at the map I note that this is not deemed developable because of its size but that the land around it is and is being considered. I have already made a list of comments about that land (MRO3) but would add some here that are relevant to any development on this land and the land around it</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All 3 sites (MRO2, MRO3 and MRO4) are adjacent to a sharp bend in the road which also has a junction entering at its apex – further junctions as sites of entry to these sites would add to an already dangerous road 2. The current main entry point for MRO3 is a narrow lane which is not wide enough for more than one vehicle, its exit onto the road is blind to the right because of a small Grade 2 listed clay building (which we own and restored in the last 10 years). This building, being clay, needs regular (almost yearly) maintenance that can only be done by partially blocking the lane – were this to become used to access MRO3 by the proposed 30 residents this would become very difficult to achieve. At the movement it is used very rarely (I have seen the farmer there 4 or 5 times in 14 years and a man who dumps soil etc. on the site with the farmer’s consent maybe 12 times over the same period). This could be widened by the use of some of MRO4 – I have no doubt that should MRO3 be approved that this land would quickly become part of the deal for this purpose. 3. The proposal is for a total of 55 houses (30 on MRO3 and 25 on MRO2) , this would double the size of the village which is small and its only amenities are a pub and a post box. The bus service is woefully bad and set to worsen. 4. Whilst there are primary schools and churches in nearby locations (Burgh-by –Sands , Monkhill, Thurstonfield and Kirkbampton) all of these would need to be accessed by driving to them. The road is not wide enough between or through the villages to allow for a cycle or walkway and this road is not pleasant to cycle or walk down because of frequent lorries. When two of these meet at certain points they can barely pass each other as it is. Currently parents with children at Kirkbampton school all drive to drop them off and collect them. There are no secondary schools nearby and all of those require some sort of transport to get to them. This idea is not eco-friendly and should not be considered as an option when there are more suitably placed alternatives. 5. Because the amenities and buses are so sparse anyone living in this location will need at least one car (most of the current residents where two people are working, or on works whilst the other looks after kids, have two). If you are struggling to buy a house the last thing you need is that additional expense so putting so-called affordable housing in this sort of village location is counter intuitive (as well as the eco-friendly aspect). 6. I cannot say much about MRO2 but I do know that MRO3 and MRO4 are extremely wet , with a high water table. A nearby field recently received planning permission for a chicken farm but had provisos attached because of the recognised poor drainage there so I guess the whole area is much the same. 7. The village has now been connected to mains sewerage but there are frequent problem with the system – as it seems to struggle with the current level of waste I am uncertain if it could cope with any more – let alone such a massive increase. 8. My final comment may not hold much sway with people who seem determined to build all over the green belt but our home is part of the Courtyards development that Fred Story did in the 90s. This has always been considered a bit of a prestigious development and English Heritage saw fit to list our house (and our neighbours) as Grade 2*. We restored the old wash house which is now almost entirely returned to a clay building. It had been allowed to get into a terrible state by its previous owner in spite of its listed status (grade2) and the Council kindly gave us some money toward restoring it. If MRO3 and MRO4 are developed and the lane used as access this will run about 12 feet from our back door and will remove essentially all privacy from our home. It would also run hard against the wash house gable end and I would worry about the detrimental effect of traffic on two sides – I already worry what adverse effect the heavy vehicles on the main road may have given that these old buildings do not have traditional style foundations. If you bother to list the buildings I believe you should make some effort to look after them. 				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged - the address typo has been corrected. Comments on this site have been noted. Its status within the SHLAA remains unchanged.				

OC07

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
137	Comment	Land at Buckabank, Dalston	062	Bryan Craig		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>I understand from previous correspondence that the 121 dwellings presently being developed by Story Homes between Townhead Road and Station Road satisfied the need for large scale development in Dalston Village and that the remaining sites identified under the SHLAA were being removed.</p> <p>With the exception of a small site at Buckerbank OCo7 where there is presently good argument against it being sustainable then it could be argued that the present levels of development satisfied the SHLAA.</p> <p>I would therefore like to know why this previously unsustainable site (DA01) and (OCo7) have been added back into the SHLAA covering the Local Plan period 2015 –2030.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	The SHLAA assesses each site on its own merit to see if it is worth including within the Local Plan. Strategic issues such as housing need and preferred sites do not factor into the SHLAA. This is done in the Local Plan, using the SHLAA as evidence. The impact of the approval for 121 new houses is not considered within the SHLAA. But it will influence the allocation selection process.					
067	Comment	Land at Buckabank, Dalston	038	Stephen & Richard Brough		Aoo8
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	We confirm that the site is still available for development and have made various representations to the council regarding the site under the public consultations and we ask that these comments are considered in any future decisions.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. Site status within the SHLAA remains unchanged.					
134	Objection	Land at Buckabank, Dalston	060	Pauline Dalton		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Development here would present problems of access. It is not clear where access is contemplated, but Nook Lane is a narrow rural lane and any access through the Madame Banks estate would only cause more congestion in already congested streets</p> <p>Townhead Road is narrow and the current increase in traffic from the construction of The Grange is proving to cause problems, especially at the junction with the main road. This will only get worse when the Story estate is complete and it is my opinion that this road could not sustain a considerable increase in traffic.</p> <p>I draw your attention to the fact that 121 houses are being built in Dalston. This means a considerable increase in the population of Dalston in the next three years and will certainly affect the rural nature of the village. Any further development of any scale would threaten the character and infrastructure of the village. I draw your attention to my previous e-mail regarding development at Buckabank and remind you of the importance of the rural nature to Dalston residents and the considerable traffic problems already existing.</p> <p>I also want to reiterate my previous remarks about Dalston's percentage share of the rural allocation, the 2013 Housing Needs Survey and the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. Discussions with the Highways Authority have not suggested that access and highway capacity here would be a major constraint on developing this land. Development would be limited owing to the low density, rural aspect of the settlement, which would also limit the amount of traffic generated by it.</p> <p>The SHLAA assesses each site on its own merit to see if it is worth including within the Local Plan. Strategic issues such as housing need and preferred sites do not factor into the SHLAA. This is done in the Local Plan, using the SHLAA as evidence. The impact of the approval for 121 new houses is not considered within the SHLAA. But it will influence the allocation selection process.</p>					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
120	Objection	Land at Buckabank, Dalston	056	Chris Drouet		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>It is with some surprise that after representations from Dalston Parish Council concerning this land in the preferred options consultation, where it was removed, it has now re-appeared! This land was to be designated as a Local Green Space under paragraphs 76, 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework! The site assessment is incorrect, as stated below this site could not be considered sustainable for either private or affordable housing.</p> <p>“The Dalston Parish Housing Needs Survey 2013” shows that there is a need over the next 5 year period for 81 homes, 26 of which should be affordable (rented, discounted or shared ownership), and all should be in a sustainable location. Whilst the survey should be re-visited in 5 to 10 years, it can be extrapolated that the need for new housing in Dalston Parish over the next 15 years would be 16 homes per year, 5 of which would need to be affordable. This would be a maximum right across the whole parish.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the recent development of 121 houses in Dalston Village, the perceived housing need will be fulfilled for the complete period of The Plan. None of these houses address the true housing need for the affordable homes mentioned above or takes into consideration that there is a need for small scale development within the outlying hamlets of the parish.</p> <p>This site is more than the 400m stated as the recommended distance any dwellings should be from the services they may require to be sustainable. Any dwellings built on this site could not be described as sustainable and also not "green" as their owners would have to use some form of private transport to reach the services of Dalston at a distance of over 1 mile by road. Dalston is a thriving village and with the recent approved development mentioned above, its services can be viewed as being sustained for the complete period of the plan.</p> <p>The area known as Buckabank is not an historical area of habitation but just a small cluster of houses following the line of a road. This proposed site is an area of rural beauty and part of The Cumbrian Way. As a secluded river valley, in a designated Conservation Area, and adjacent to the River Caldew that is a SSSI, any intrusion of 15 houses would ruin this beauty and take away the possible shared enjoyment of many visitors as well as residents. As stated in “The Carlisle Green Infrastructure Strategy” (Draft Local Plan), green spaces are to be protected ultimately for the sake of their own natural value, but also for the well-being and good health of the districts’ citizens and visitors. In the “Dalston Neighbourhood Plan Launch Survey” of residents in Dalston Village, 72% replied that they wanted the rural character of the village retained. This was considered by the residents to be the issue that concerned them the most! This confirms that the residents of Dalston view the areas around the village as local amenities providing recreation and tranquillity for the community. Finally, any road access to this site would be extremely dangerous as the only place of connection with a road would be after a narrow “S” bend, at the bottom of a hill, right on a bend which includes another junction. It should be concluded that this area should be removed from the draft local plan “site allocation for residential development” at Buckabank for the reasons stated above.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>The points raised here are mostly strategic, and are the sort of things taken into account when choosing allocations within the Local Plan. The SHLAA does not consider housing need, nor whether other, more suitable sites exist within a settlement. It's sole purpose is to assess the raw potential of land that we have been asked to consider including within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Site OCo7 has been in the SHLAA for many years. It has not at any point been deleted. It was at one point allocated within an early draft of the Local Plan, and then subsequently deallocated, which is where I think there's been confusion. Its continued inclusion within the SHLAA does not mean that it will be allocated, nor does it guarantee that planning permission would be granted should an application on the site be received.</p>				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
132	Objection	Land at Buckabank, Dalston	059	David A H Wilson		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>1. General:</p> <p>a) The updated SHLAA allocation focusses on Greenfield sites, including some within Conservation Areas.</p> <p>b) For the sake of communities, of sustainability and of revitalization, new building should focus on Brownfield sites. This may not suit developers so well, but it would represent responsible planning. Currently, in Dalston as elsewhere (for example, Wetheral), the SHLAA threatens greenfield areas of agriculturally productive land which is highly valued by local communities for amenity and environmental reasons: destruction of it would be fundamentally opposed to the concept of sustainability.</p> <p>2. Dalston and Buckabank:</p> <p>a) Dalston is currently suffering the creation of a bland, 121-unit estate of generic 'off-the-shelf', 'executive' housing units on an agriculturally productive greenfield site within its Conservation Area. This large-scale development was comprehensively opposed by the local community as well as by its Parish Council – without effect.</p> <p>b) Over 90% of the community in Dalston continue to fear the erosion of the historic village characteristics of the place they value. There are now several sources of evidence to substantiate this fact, which should have meaning if the government's 'Localism' agenda is to be taken seriously.</p> <p>c) The negative effects of such development (either already approved or envisaged as in your Draft) will involve unsustainable infrastructure pressures affecting health services, road safety, drainage, and educational provision. In the educational 'free market' many Dalston children are currently bussed out while others are driven in daily by their parents to occupy severely limited school places.</p> <p>d) The updated SHLAA allocation now suggests the possibility of even more development in another sensitive area, and also in Buckabank.</p> <p>e) If the current 121-unit development is taken as an example, there will be no financial benefits to the local community – all fees and profits accruing to the City Council will go exclusively into general funds.</p> <p>f) At the time of approval for the development referred to in a) above, Dalston was continuing to draw up its Neighbourhood Plan. No further detailed planning policies affecting Dalston should be approved until this Neighbourhood Plan is completed. In the meantime, Dalston has access to a bespoke Housing Needs Survey: this has far more relevance to community needs.</p> <p>g) Approval for large-scale development in Dalston was given last year when the City council had already exceeded its forward Housing Land Supply requirements.</p> <p>h) Dalston (and, within it, Buckabank) has already suffered approval for development excessively beyond the recommendations in the current Carlisle and District Local Plan, which proposes a distribution of development to be shared in Brampton, Longtown and the broader north-west.</p> <p>i) Please remove "DAO1- Land at Townhead Road" and "OCO7 - Land at Buckabank, Dalston" from your catalogue of 'deliverable' sites; please spare other Greenfield and Conservation Area sites from 'deliverable' status; and please begin – for the sake of revitalization and good, professional planning – to target Brownfield sites.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		<p>1. A) - The SHLAA simply reflects the land that has been submitted to the Council by landowners/land agents. It has made an assessment of each site on its own merits regarding its suitability for housing development. It cannot and does not apply any particular focus on certain types of sites. The high level of greenfield land reflects the fact that there is relatively little suitable brownfield land remaining. The fact that a site may be located within a conservation area does not preclude development of that site.</p> <p>B) Current and emerging policy does encourage a brownfield first approach. This is however irrelevant to the SHLAA, which does not make an policy decisions regarding land, merely assessing each site on its own merit as to its suitability.</p> <p>2. A site's inclusion within the SHLAA is not an allocation or a development proposal. It is merely an assessment of its raw potential for residential development in the future. The reasons you state above will be considered within the Local Plan, when we come to look at policy decisions and housing allocations. The issues you raise do not however impact upon the physical suitability of the land and therefore its status remains unchanged within the SHLAA.</p>				

OC14

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
007	Objection	Grieshill Farm, Harker	005	Alison Heine		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm		Why is the site at OC14 Grieshill Farm Harker rejected because it is next to the motorway and would suffer from poor amenity when this is precisely the location chosen for Gypsy-Traveller sites at Harker and Hadrian's Park. If this type of location close to the motorway is not suitable for bricks and mortar accommodation it most certainly should not be put forward for families living in caravans. The double standards shown by the City Council are hard to comprehend.				
OfficerComm		The proximity to the motorway was not the main reason for this site being rejected - it was mostly due to its location away from other residential areas, which would render it unsuitable for a new housing estate, the motorway issues were just an additional constraint placed upon the site. Motorway proximity in itself is not a reason to reject development completely, and other sites, that are otherwise unconstrained but which lie adjacent to it elsewhere in the SHLAA have not been discounted. This is essentially a constraint that can be overcome provided that the development can be adequately screened from the motorway. Different issues are raised when considering land for traveller sites, whereby being well related to existing settlements is not such a crucial issue, hence it would be more suitable in this location. The problems caused by motorway proximity could be addressed through good design and screening at a planning application stage. This is not, however, an issue for the SHLAA.				

OC18

194	Support	Land as harker Road End	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment			
GenComment		This site is considered acceptable for housing purposes, due to being located next to other housing.			
ProcessComm					
OfficerComm		Acknowledged. No change in site status within the SHLAA.			

OC23

088	Comment	Harker Industrial estate, Harker,	053	Kingmoor Park Proper	A013
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment			
GenComment		Please see the attached letter. It is important to note that there is an additional parcel of land immediately adjacent to the west of the current allocation which would increase the size and therefore residential capacity of the site. KPPL would wish to see this part of the site included within the allocation. The additional piece of land extends to 4Ha, and would therefore increase the total site area to 14Ha. The site would therefore be capable of accommodating in the region of 450 homes.			
ProcessComm					
OfficerComm		Noted. It is recognised that this site has limited employment potential. The site is considered deliverable within the SHLAA. The neighbouring greenfield site has been included on the lists of sites to be considered as part of the next SHLAA update.			

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
206	Objection	Harker Industrial Estate	076		Clerk to Kingmoor Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Kingmoor Parks land was originally sold for employment use, this relates to OC23 and OC53 [rep 207]. The reason given in the document for changing it to housing is that a lot of the buildings were falling into disrepair. Does this mean that all industrial estates that go into disrepair can go for housing for example Willowholme?			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	When it becomes apparent that an industrial site is no longer fit for purpose, then yes, residential development can be considered a viable alternative. Obviously this must be subject to strategic planning, to ensure an adequate supply of employment land is available within the district (but that is not for the SHLAA to consider). When the alternative is to leave a site, in an otherwise pleasant rural location, to rot and fall into disrepair then housing development may often be the only viable way to save it.					
197	Objection	Kingmoor Park Industrial Estate	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The development of this site is not supported. The PC wishes it to remain as land designated for employment purposes only. However, the PC is aware that an outline planning application is to be submitted in the near future for c. 300 homes on this site..					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted - however, if demand/interest in employment uses wanes on this site then options must be considered in order to avoid leaving a derelict employment site to decay within the rural area. Housing development here would help address this issue.					

OC30

013	Comment	North Stile Farm, Linstock	009	Mr A Wannop		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Whilst the village is deemed by the council to have limited service provision, controlled growth via additional homes can only seek to address this in a positive manner. Furthermore, It is felt that the proximity of the Houghton Hall Garden Centre, with its wide range of food/goods, should be recognised in any assessment. This would be in addition to the site's acknowledged proximity and connections with Houghton and Carlisle. This site should be read in the context of sites OC31 and OC32.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF. The clustering of sites OC30-OC32 (inclusive) has significant merit in that this approach provides controlled and sustainable growth on a group of sites that constitute classic rounding off of the settlement with no incursion into the wider countryside. The council is actively encouraged to carry sites OC30-OC32 (inclusive) forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan. At circa 1.25ha in area, it is considered that the council's capacity yield of 10 units is perhaps conservative.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

OC31

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
015	Comment	South ellengrove, Linstock	009	Mr A Wannop		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Whilst the village is deemed by the council to have limited service provision, controlled growth via additional homes can only seek to address this in a positive manner. Furthermore, It is felt that the proximity of the Houghton Hall Garden Centre, with its wide range of food/goods, should be recognised in any assessment. This would be in addition to the site's acknowledged proximity and connections with Houghton and Carlisle. This site should be read in the context of sites OC30 and OC32.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF. The clustering of sites OC30-OC32 (inclusive) has significant merit in that this approach provides controlled and sustainable growth on a group of sites that constitute classic rounding off of the settlement with no incursion into the wider countryside. The council is actively encouraged to carry sites OC30-OC32 (inclusive) forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan. At circa 3.2ha in area, it is considered that the council's capacity yield of 10 units is perhaps conservative.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

OC32

014	Comment	North Rose Dene, Linstock	009	Mr A Wannop		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Whilst the village is deemed by the council to have limited service provision, controlled growth via additional homes can only seek to address this in a positive manner. Furthermore, It is felt that the proximity of the Houghton Hall Garden Centre, with its wide range of food/goods, should be recognised in any assessment. This would be in addition to the site's acknowledged proximity and connections with Houghton and Carlisle. This site should be read in the context of sites OC30 and OC31.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF. The clustering of sites OC30-OC32 (inclusive) has significant merit in that this approach provides controlled and sustainable growth on a group of sites that constitute classic rounding off of the settlement with no incursion into the wider countryside. The council is actively encouraged to carry sites OC30-OC32 (inclusive) forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan. At circa 1.43ha in area, it is considered that the council's capacity yield of 10 units is perhaps conservative.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

128	Comment	North Rose Dene, Linstock	058	Michael Fox	Chairman Stanwix Rur	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Resubmission of previous comments by PC: Oppose full development of the site, but to consider upon individual merit applications for limited small scale developments to include affordable housing.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in SHLAA status					

OC33

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
012	Comment	Land Adj to Croft House, Brunstock Lane, Brunstock, CA6 4JE	009	Mr A Wannop		A003
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	It is felt that the proximity of the Houghton Hall Garden Centre, with its wide range of food/ goods, should be recognised in any assessment. This would be in addition to the site's acknowledged connections with Houghton and Carlisle.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF. This representation should be seen in the context of the adjoining site, which is the subject of a separate representation and enclosures in support of its inclusion in the SHLAA and subsequent allocation. The council is actively encouraged to carry the site forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan. At circa 0.75ha in area, it is considered that the council's capacity yield of 4 units is perhaps conservative.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No changed in site status.					

OC35

198	Objection	former Harker Garden Centre, Harker	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The development of this site is not supported. The PC wishes it to remain as land designated for employment purposes only. However, the site is considered more suitable than some others for housing due to being located next to other housing.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Whilst it would be preferable for the employment use to be retained, the Council has been asked to consider the site's potential for residential development within the SHLAA. As it is generally unconstrained, it is considered to have some long term potential, should the employment use here cease/prove unviable. Status remains unchanged.					

OC45

001	Comment	land at Talkin	001		Trustees of AT Haylan	A001
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	We note that the Council consider that there is no housing potential in respect of the Site Reference OC45 in the 2014 SHLAA. The Councils Site Assessment states "This greenfield site is located in Talkin. Talkin has a limited range of services and is not located close to any services. As such development on this site could not be considered a sustainable location under the NPPF."			
	As such we would like to submit an amended site boundary to be considered as part of the SHLAA process. Please see attached for reference. This site is considered suitable for small scale residential development as it fronts on to the main road of the village. It is considered that high quality sensitively design properties would not have an adverse impact on the existing settlement and would offer a greater housing choice for the local residents.					
	We should be pleased if these comments would be taken into account during the preparation of the Local Plan and would ask that we are kept informed of all future consultations during the Local Plan					
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Amended site will be considered - however, as it is below 0.4Ha it is unlikely that it will be carried forward within the SHLAA due to its small size. It may be more appropriate to seek planning approval.					

OC46

204	Objection	Poplar House, Carleton	075	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to St Cuthbert W
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment			
GenComment	this site is an extension over what was previously, the settlement boundary and an identified green field site. The extension over this boundary and that of Sewell's Lonning, is not supported.				
ProcessComm					
OfficerComm	Noted. This site has been identified as having long term potential to contribute towards an urban extension to Carlisle south. Carlisle south will be extensively masterplanned, so for now it is difficult to say how, when, or even if this land will be developed. The SHLAA is being used here merely to highlight available land that could have the potential to contribute beyond 2025.				

OC48

175	Support	Aglionby Grange	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment			
GenComment	PC Support				
ProcessComm					
OfficerComm	Acknowledged - however, as we have come to reassess and update sites, this site's status is up for debate, with issues around whether Aglionby Grange can be considered a sustainable and suitable 'settlement' where new development should be allowed. It may be that this site will be excluded from future versions of the SHLAA.				

OC49

176	Comment	Behind Manor Croft, Aglionby	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment			
GenComment	Whilst members support this site they have concerns re highway access at this point: 13 dwellings – Members query is this overdevelopment of this site ?				
ProcessComm					
OfficerComm	Noted - highway access has not been raised as a significant constraint by the highways authority. Site status remains unchanged.				

OC50

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
217	Comment	Land adj to Wreay School	o83	RP Dixon	Secretary of The Twelv	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>as a body we have no concern over building homes on this field, but we would like consideration to be given to the drainage situation. There is a continuing problem with the road flooding between the school and church and we have also had problems with the culvert to the west of School House. We have dug out the culvert and at the moment is running freely. Where will the drain from this development go - 1. into the road drains or 2. into the stream? Will there be a sewage treatment plant for these houses or will they be connected to the treatment plant below the Plough Inn which has plenty of capacity?</p> <p>The twelve men believe that an increase in houses in Wreay may well benefit the village. However the infrastructure is a bit of a problem. Access from the west is by a single track road for 2/3 rds of its length and from the north via a narrow [and dangerous] bridge at Low Hurst. These are likely to be the two main roads into the village and therefore any increase in traffic should be taken into consideration. There is no regular bus service so all development will lead to more cards on these roads.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. The impact upon heritage is the greatest concern for this site however, beyond waste water capacity, road capacity or flooding issues (neither of which was raised as an issue by the relevant responsible body).</p> <p>Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.</p>					

213	Objection	Land adj to Wreay School	o80	Steve	Bookcase Carlisle	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>Proposal that the field between Wreay Church and the mortuary chapel, might be suitable as a housing site. The site assessment makes mention of the significance of the listed buildings, but suggests a sensitive development might be possible.</p> <p>Any development would destroy one of the most important cultural landscapes in the county.</p> <p>Sarah Losh's church at Wreay and the associated buildings are of national importance and the landscape which unites them was equally part of Sarah Losh's concept when she built them.</p> <p>There must be no possibility of this going ahead.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.</p>					

OC51

093	Comment	Land at Ellers Mill	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	<p>Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Within 8 metres of a Main River - Flood Zone 2</p>			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted - no change in site status					

OC53

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
087	Comment	Heathlands Industrial Estate,Harker	053		Kingmoor Park Proper	A013
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Please refer to submitted covering letter and separate Delivery Statement – to be submitted in due course.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		The status of this site has changed since it was last discussed on the phone with a rep from How Planning. Further analysis of this site, along with the other Kingmoor estate at Low Harker, and the greenfield land at Middle Farm, has led us to conclude that the site cannot be considered deliverable in its current state. The site is relatively well used and in beneficial employment use, there would therefore need to be major clearance and likely remedial work required before it could be brought forward. There are also issues regarding the overall plan for this area, which would want to see a comprehensive, master planning exercise carried out to ensure that the land at Middle Farm as well as this Heathlands estate can be brought forward in a logical and rational fashion, ensuring that it can form a logical progression from the ongoing development at Crindledyke. As it currently stands, the site would be too isolated to be developed, even as part of a master plan. It will likely need to wait until further completions at Crindledyke bring this land and the land at Middle Farm closer into the built form of the city. This therefore leads us to conclude that the land is developable, rather than developable.				
095	Comment	heathlands Industrial Estate, Harker	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted, no change in site status				
070	Comment	Heathlands Industrial Estate	040		Kingmoor Park Proper	A010
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Firstly could you please clarify whether you deem this site to either be Deliverable or Developable. Within the text on your website you state that the site is Deliverable whereas the corresponding map to the right indicated the site is Developable (with light blue shading). Can you please confirm which is correct, we have assumed that you deem the site to be Deliverable as per the text.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		The Heathlands Industrial Estate is classified as developable, as per the map. The mapping system is the most up to date reflection of the SHLAA as most of the work for the assessment is done through the GIS, it should be taken as the correct assessment whenever inconsistencies may arise with the website text.				
193	Objection	heathland Industrial Estate	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		The development of this site is not supported. The PC wish it to remains land designated for employment purposes only.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted - however, if demand/interest in employment uses wanes on this site then options must be considered in order to avoid leaving a derelict employment site to decay within the rural area. Housing development here would help address this issue.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
207	Objection	Heathlands Industrial Estate	076		Clerk to Kingmoor Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	Kingmoor Parks land was originally sold for employment use, this relates to OC23 [Rep no 206] and OC53. The reason given in the document for changing it to housing is that a lot of the buildings were falling into disrepair. Does this mean that all industrial estates that go into disrepair can go for housing for example Willowholme?			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	When it becomes apparent that an industrial site is no longer fit for purpose, then yes, residential development can be considered a viable alternative. Obviously this must be subject to strategic planning, to ensure an adequate supply of employment land is available within the district (but that is not for the SHLAA to consider). When the alternative is to leave a site, in an otherwise pleasant rural location, to rot and fall into disrepair then housing development may often be the only viable way to save it.					

OC59

117	Comment	Land north & East of Village Hall, Wreay	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Within 500m of an IPPC Authorisation			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged					

214	Objection	land North and East of Village Hall, Wreay	080	Steve	Bookcase Carlisle	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Proposal that the field between Wreay Church and the mortuary chapel, might be suitable as a housing site. The site assessment makes mention of the significance of the listed buildings, but suggests a sensitive development might be possible. Any development would destroy one of the most important cultural landscapes in the county. Sarah Losh's church at Wreay and the associated buildings are of national importance and the landscape which unites them was equally part of Sarah Losh's concept when she built them. There must be no possibility of this going ahead.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
-------	--------	-------------	------------	---------	--------------	-------

211	Objection	land North and East of Village Hall, Wreay	078	Mr & Mrs M Jones		
-----	------------------	---	-----	------------------	--	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment We are writing to object to the proposal to develop the above site. As residents of Wreay, we take an active part in village life and are involved in the Church, the Friends of St Marys Church, Wreay and the Twelve Men of Wreay. We were very surprised to see the inclusion of the above field in the plan, and that a consultation process was taking place. Both ourselves and other residents have not been made aware of this by the Council or the Parish Council and whilst doubtless you fulfilled the legal requirements in publicising the process many of the residents don't know anything about it. The centre of the village consists of around 25 dwellings and the consultation document shows the development of an in-fill site by Wreay School for up to 10 dwellings. This would be proportionate to the present level of housing but any greater numbers will materially and detrimentally alter the dynamics of the village. Site OC59 is at the heart of a historically sensitive landscape designed by Sarah Losh around 175 years ago, encompassing two Grade 2 listed buildings (one of which is Grade 2*) and two buildings of significant historic interest. The importance of Sarah Losh and her architecture is internationally recognised and this is confirmed by Pevsner, Simon Jenkins and a number of other high profile individuals. The proposed development of the site would inextricably destroy the symmetry created by Sarah Losh and would split the range of buildings she built namely, the Chapel of Rest, Cemetery, Sexton's Cottage (Candlemass Cottage), the Dames School (Wreay Syke Fold), St Mary's Church, the Mausoleum, the Bewcastle Cross, the Village School and the Schoolmasters House (Pompeian Cottage). All these buildings are visible from each other and as such, it is a site of significant historical, architectural and cultural importance, part of a planned landscape that should not be spoilt by residential development. The Losh heritage, in particular St Mary's Church attracts around 5000 visitors each year from both the UK and across the globe. They contribute substantially to the local economy and a development which potentially could double the size of the village and destroy the Losh estate will adversely impact on the income streams presently generated to the detriment of both Wreay and Carlisle. We feel very strongly that the proposal to develop the site OC59 should not go ahead and be removed from the plan.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm Noted. Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.

215	Objection	land North and East of Village Hall, Wreay	081	Helen Abate and Adolfo Gonzalez		
-----	------------------	---	-----	---------------------------------	--	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment We should like to point out that if this land is sold to property developers for housing it would be to a great disadvantage to the Village of Wreay. Narrow roads and access in and out of the proposed site would be two of our main concerns. Maintaining vehicle discipline to the said area would be difficult and potentially dangerous. Also Wreay, we feel, would be spoilt with potential noise pollution and, also in this area, to cramped for decent sized accommodation.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm Noted - we have consulted with Cumbria Highways on all the sites within the SHLAA, where they have identified show stopping constraints on the highway network or with the access to a site we have removed that site from the SHLAA. They have not indicated any such issues with this site in Wreay.

The site has, however, been discounted due to the impact it would likely have upon the historic core of the village and setting of Sarah Losh's historic, planned estate.

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
212	Objection	land North and East of Village Hall, Wreay	079	Tony & Patricia Harrison		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>We are writing to object to the proposal to develop the above site at Wreay. We have lived in Wreay for over 40 years and take an active part in village life. We are involved with the Church, the School, Village Hall and the Twelve Men of Wreay.</p> <p>It came as a shock to the majority of people to discover that a consultation process was already taking place without the knowledge of the residents. We know that you have been sent letters about the history of the village and in particular that area between the 2 Grade 2 listed buildings the Church and the Chapel of Rest so we will not repeat this information.</p> <p>We do however feel very strongly that the proposal to develop the site should not go ahead.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.</p>					
210	Objection	land North and East of Village Hall, Wreay	077	Raymond Whittaker	Chair of Friends of St	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>This is a site of significant historical, architectural and cultural importance, part of a planned landscape that should not be spoilt by residential development.</p> <p>The site in question lies to the north of the Grade II* Listed St Mary's Church and Mausoleum and to the south of the Grade II Listed Chapel of Rest and Wreay Cemetery. On its eastern boundary, the ancient route known as Waygates, there is Candelmas Cottage which was the former sexton's cottage and Wreay Syke Cottage, formerly the Dame's School. All these buildings, along with others in the village of Wreay were designed, funded and built under the direction of Sarah Losh in the 1830's and 40's.</p> <p>The Friends society was founded 5 years ago in recognition of the growing local, national and international interest in Sarah Losh and her legacy. St Mary's and Sarah Losh have been featured in a number of guides and publications. Simon Jenkins in his book '1000 Best Churches' gave St Mary's a 4* rating and in a related television programme included the church in his top 10. In 2002 the Prince of Wales made a private visit. In 2007 Songs of Praise was broadcast from St Mary's. More recently the acclaimed historian and biographer, Jenny Uglow, published her book 'The Pinecone', which tells the story of the Losh family and their importance on a national stage. This book was very favourably reviewed in all the national broadsheets as well as abroad in the New York Times. This degree of publicity has encouraged visitors from across the globe and currently in excess of 5000 people visit the church each year along with numerous pre-booked guided tours for larger groups. Sarah Losh is acknowledged by scholars as an outstanding, creative genius, considerably ahead of her time.</p> <p>The village of Wreay has the look and feel of a planned estate village which is entirely down to the work of Sarah Losh. She was responsible for donating the land for the new cemetery which lies to the north of Site OC59 with the belief that burials should be a distance from the church so that all, including non-conformists, could be buried. To service the burials she designed and built the Grade II Chapel of Rest in 1835 – a replica of one of the earliest Christian chapels in England close to Perranporth. This building proved to be a trial run for the Grade II* St Mary's Church itself which was completed in 1842 and replaced an older dilapidated building. These two significant buildings visually relate to each other across the field that has been identified in the SHLAA review. Sarah Losh even went to the extent of diverting the road around the new church thereby creating the village green and ensuring that a road does not cut across and divide St Mary's from the Chapel of Rest and its cemetery.</p> <p>The Friends are currently in discussion with the Heritage Lottery Fund and hope to obtain a grant in order to refurbish the Chapel of Rest as a visitor centre to tell the wider story of Sarah and her legacy. This will be linked to St Mary's by a self guided walk that takes in her other creations including the sexton's cottage, the former Dames' School for the girls of the parish, the present Wreay CE School which was originally the boys' school and men's meeting room and Pompeii Cottage, a re-creation of a Pompeian house all of which either front onto the identified site or sit close by. Sarah created a landscape of great historic and cultural significance that has been recognised on a national and international level. Her influence goes far beyond St Mary's Church itself. Development of housing within the identified field would destroy the very heart of this landscape and the carefully designed context within which the listed buildings and buildings of historic significance are set. I would therefore ask that Site OC59 is not considered as an appropriate residential site and does not become part of the new Development Plan.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.</p>					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
216	Objection	land North and East of Village Hall, Wreay	o82	Mrs Sue Emery	Parochial Church Coun	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The area Site OC59 is part of a historically sensitive landscape within the village and was designed by a local resident – Sarah Losh around 175 years ago, with two Grade 2 listed building (one a Grade 2*) and also two buildings of significant historic interest. These buildings have great historical importance in the form of Sarah Losh and her architecture – which is internationally recognised. This has been confirmed in several publications – not least Simon Jenkins book ‘England’s Thousand Best Churches’</p> <p>The proposed development would completely destroy the area created by Sarah Losh and split the buildings which consist of, the Chapel of Rest, Cemetery, Sexton’s Cottage (Candlemass Cottage), the Dames School (Wreay Syke Fold), St. Mary’s Church, the Mausoleum, the Bewcastle Cross, the Village School and the Schoolmasters House (Pompeian Cottage). These buildings are visible from each other and form a site of significant historical, architectural and cultural importance. This would be greatly destroyed by the introduction of a residential development.</p> <p>The site attracts many visitors throughout the year – local, national and international. The loss of these visitors should the site of the buildings be split by the introduction of a residential development would have a great impact on the income both to Wreay and wider community.</p> <p>There is at present a plan to restore the Chapel of Rest to a visitor education centre for the which the PCC have pledged support. This project would severely be hampered by the imposition of a development between the buildings listed above.</p> <p>It is felt strongly by the PCC that this development – site OC59 should not proceed and therefore removed from the plan.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. Whilst the SHLAA had considered it possible that landscaping and good design could be used on this site to minimise the impact upon the listed buildings present in isolation, it is becoming obvious that the wider context of the listed buildings as part of a planned, historic landscape would make it highly difficult to design an appropriate housing scheme on this land. As such, these constraints have the potential to be show-stoppers and the site will be discounted from the SHLAA.</p>					

OC60

107	Comment	Land at tower Farm	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Ground Vulnerability Zone			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status					

OC64

030	Comment	Red Cat House, Newbiggin Road, Durdar	014	Mr S Nicholson		A003
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>This brownfield site remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF in addition to it falling within the proposed Carlisle South Broad Location for Growth Area. The council is therefore actively encouraged to carry the site forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. This site will be considered for its potential to contribute towards the Carlisle South Broad Location for Growth Area. Assessment of its housing potential will be taken as part of a comprehensive masterplanning exercise to be undertaken once the Local Plan has been adopted in 2016.</p>					

RO01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
155	Objection	Land at Rockcliffe Memorial Hall, Rockcliffe	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No - See comments			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	No - see comments			
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being developable [6-15yrs after local plan adoption] with the comment 'within flood zone 2 mitigation measures may affect deliverability'. This comment wholly disregards the information which has been put forward previously in 3 consultation responses these being dated 12 September 2013, 18 November 2013 and 02 April 2014. In the consultation responses referred to there is clear evidence, prepared by Binham Yates and Partners, that neither the 1:200 year flood level [8.03 m AOD] of the 1:1000 years flood level [8.66 m AOB] encroaches onto any part of this site.</p> <p>It is in the context of the preceding that the local planning authority are urged to reclassify the site as deliverable as it is wholly clear that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Disagree - whilst it is appreciated that consultants, instructed by the landowner/agent for this site, have investigated flooding issues here, it must be accepted that they are not the authority on these issues. The flooding issues on this site will continue to be considered using evidence provided by the Environment Agency. To date, they have not provided any new information regarding the flood risk for this site, and it therefore stands as assessed.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not an appropriate stage to start challenging assessments with detailed studies and assessments. It is a strategic piece of background evidence, and it cannot get bogged down with the finer details of development proposals. It is suggested that if you want to test the consultant's report/challenge the flood risk assessment of this site, it is done through a planning application for development where details can be considered in full.</p> <p>No change in site assessment within the SHLAA.</p>					
199	Support	Land adj Rockcliffe Memorial Hall, Rockcliffe	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The development of this site is supported if the development is of low density housing, due to the visual impact this will have when entering the village.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					
RO02						
201	Comment	Land at Lonning Foot, Rockcliffe	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	To determine the designation of the site - as although listed as unsuitable for development, to the PC's knowledge, outline planning permission has recently been granted.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Exclusion from the SHLAA does not rule out planning approval should an appropriate application be submitted, addressing the broad issues identified in the SHLAA. An application has been received on the site and it currently being considered - no decision has yet been published however. This is a stage beyond the SHLAA, so the assessment in the document will be rendered moot.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
156	Objection	Land at Lonning Foot, Rockcliffe	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm		No - See comments		
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment		No - See comments		
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being discounted with the comment 'Access too narrow - widening only possible by taking land from existing gardens'. This comment wholly disregards the information which has been put forward previously in 3 consultation responses these being dated 12 September 2013, 18 November 2013 and 02 April 2014. and recent email correspondence with the Highway Authority in respect of application Ref No 14/038</p> <p>It is in the context of the preceding that the local planning authority are urged to reclassify the site as deliverable as it is wholly clear that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Disagree - discussions with Cumbria Highways have indicated that the road is currently too narrow to support the levels of development required to be considered a strategic site through the SHLAA. Essentially it was suggested that the only way of widening that lane would be to take land from the front gardens of the existing properties opposite the site - this is clearly not something that will happen simply to allow this undeveloped site to be built. Site status remains unchanged.</p>					

RO04

002	Support	Land North of Rockcliffe School	002	Mr Coad		A001
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>We write on behalf of our client, Mr Coad, who owns Site RO04 to support the Council's assertions that the site is suitable, available and deliverable for residential development. We have undertaken technical works associated with this site which supports the future development of the site and these can be made available to the Council if deemed necessary.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Acknowledged. There is no need for further information on this site for the purposes of the SHLAA at this time, its status remains unchanged.</p>					

RO06

108	Comment	Land at Rockcliffe, site C	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment:		
				- Ordinary Watercourse		
				- Flood Zone 3		
				- Flood Zone 2		
				- Ground Vulnerability Zone		
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	<p>Noted. No change in site status</p>					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
200	Objection	Land at Rockcliffe, Site C	074	Andrea McCallum	Clerk to Rockcliffe Pari	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>Firstly, to determine the designation of this land due to it's inclusion in the plan as developable AND of no potential. Secondly, to object to the inclusion of the site due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site is considered too large and out of keeping for a rural community such as Rockcliffe; - the site projects outside the natural village boundary into open countryside; - foul drainage systems are thought to be at capacity; - concerns raised over the existing road structure and its ability to cope with extra traffic. 				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		The site has been excluded. Status remains unchanged.				
157	Objection	Land to the side/rear of the telephone exchange Rockcliffe	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No - See comments			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	No - See comments			
GenComment		<p>The site is identified as being discounted with the comment 'poor access - improvements required would make this unviable'. This comment wholly disregards the information which has been put forward previously in 3 consultation responses these being dated 12 September 2013, 18 November 2013 and 02 April 2014. and recent email correspondence with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>In the consultation responses referred to there is clear evidence that there are no constraints to bringing this land forward for residential development. It is in the context of the preceding that the local planning authority are urged to reclassify the site as deliverable as it is wholly clear that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Disagree - the comments we have received from the Highways Authority indicate that this site would be undevelopable without major investment into the road network to address the junction issues opposite the site. We feel that this would make development unviable. This, coupled with other concerns such as the potential impact of backland development here on the existing properties and on the village setting lead us to continue to conclude that this site has no potential within the SHLAA. Solutions and viability should be explored in more depth via a planning application.				

RO07

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
158	Objection	land adjancet to Memorial Hall Rockcliffe	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No - See comments			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	No - See comments			
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being discounted with the comment 'below 0.4'. This comment wholly disregards the fact that the site RO07 is to be considered alongside site RO01 as set out in the consultation responses dated 12 September 2013, 18 November 2013 and 02 April 2014.</p> <p>In the consultation responses referred to there is clear evidence that the site is wholly suitable for residential development and that, as set out in information prepared by Bingham Yates and Partners, flood risk is not a constraint.</p> <p>It is in the context of the preceding that the local planning authority are urged to reclassify the site as deliverable as it is wholly clear that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. The site will be included as part of RO01 and deleted as an individual site to avoid confusion. The assessment of the site will stand as developable, due to flood issues as highlighted in the assessment of RO01.					

SCo4

021	Comment	Site off Broomfallen Road, Scotby	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

SCo9

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
062	Objection	land behind Scotby Road, Scotby	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	The site is identified as being developable [6-15 yrs after Local Plan adoption] with a comment that 'currently no access, this would need to be overcome - owner currently owns house to be cleared for access. In the context of the above it is reaffirmed that the demolition of 5 Holme Close is an integral aspect of the housing site which is being promoted and noting this the site ought to be identified as DELIVERABLE as it is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Disagree - This site is considered to be problematic. Even if access can be achieved through the demolition of an existing building, there would still be major issues with access onto Holme Close. We have concerns that this could be considered over development of a settlement which is generally linear in nature. The issues facing this site, we feel, would constrain it to a point that it would be unrealistic to believe that anything would happen here within the next 5 years, despite the landowner's best intentions. No change in site status.					

SC10

152	Comment	Land at Scotby Road, Scotby	064	Janet Carruthers	Story Homes	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	This site is available now for residential development and there is a willing landowner and committed developer. Although the Council have discarded this site due to access issues, Story Homes believe that access into the site off Scotby Road could be safely provided and are currently furthering investigation in this connection. Story Homes believe that sites SC11 and SC10 are both suitable for residential allocation and together present a suitable and sustainable site for housing delivery throughout the life of the forthcoming Local Plan.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Comments from the highways authority were strong regarding this site - its likely access in such close proximity to the A69 junction is wholly unsuitable. Until we hear differently from the highways authority this site will continue to be considered unsuitable for development within the SHLAA.					

110	Comment	Land at Scotby Road	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Within 250m of a Historical Landfill - Ground Vulnerability Zone			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status					

SC11

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
109	Comment	Land at Hill Head	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - Within 250m of a Historical Landfill - Ground Vulnerability Zone
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				
169	Support	land east of Scotby Road	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Members support this site. With potential to extend into the alternative site proposed; land to the north of Hill Head: 40 dwellings				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status.				

SC13

085	Objection	land to the south of Scotby	050	Rachel Lightfoot	Positive Planning	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				It is noted that the SHLAA considered that the site is disconnected from the settlement pattern of Scotby. However, it is opposite a cluster of housing and within a low area of the valley where it would continue to follow the previously linear development pattern of Scotby. Due to the low nature of the land, the impacts in terms of visual intrusion beyond those in the immediate vicinity would be limited due to the lie of the land. Dwellings here would be able to access services within Scotby and also take advantage of those offered in Cumwhinton. The site is well related to an existing cluster of dwellings and offers the opportunity for a well related, discrete site which could offer an opportunity for some low scale executive housing, working with the land form and complementing the existing housing cluster, offering access within walking distance to schools and village services as well as access to Carlisle and the wider Carlisle area via the M6. In addition, there are no known obstacles in relation to the development of the land in terms of services or highway requirements. The land is not subject to any environmental designations and the development of the land would support the aim of improving rural housing supply and supporting the rural area.
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Disagree. Despite the presence of housing opposite, this site has a distinctly open setting and feels very much like it is no longer within the village of Scotby. This side of the road has not been developed, and even the housing opposite, it could be argued, it also separate from the village. As such is considered to be part of the open countryside, and is therefore not considered suitable for housing development. Site status remains unchanged.				

SC14

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
159	Objection	land at Town Head Farm, Scotby	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm		No - See comments		
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment		No - See comments		
GenComment	<p>The site is identified as being discounted with the comment '... The landscape impact of development here would be unacceptable. The site is therefore nor considered suitable for development.'</p> <p>It is considered that with careful design and layout, including landscaping, the landscape impact of development on all/part of the site would not be unacceptable. It is in the context of the preceding that the local planning authority are urged to reclassify the site as deliverable as it is wholly clear that the site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development <p>It is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The local planning authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Disagree - this site is so prominent that it would be highly unlikely that a design could be put forwrad that would reduce its impact to acceptable levels. Also, despite its close proximity to Scotby, the site is in an area that has a disinctly rural, and out-of-village feel that further renders it unsuitable for development. No change in SHLAA status.					

SM01

008	Comment	Land Adj fir Ends School, Smithfield	006	John Cornthwaite		
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	<p>I have referred to the Council's web site and it would appear that the Council's policy with which I am in agreement is unchanged in respect of Smithfield in that limited development would be permitted along the Skitby Road from Fir Ends School.</p> <p>You may understandably wonder why a 90 yr old concerns himself with Smithfield [history of the land, and current ownership with links to the village given]. They are concerned with your comments regarding the future of the village and would be prepared to sell the field to the Council for Social Housing which I understand is below market price, in memory of their grandfather if it would assist the future viability of the village. I am 90 yrs old next year & was involved in the sale of the land enabling the building of Fir Ends School some 50 yrs ago and have no inclination to become involved, but if the idea interests you, I could pass it on to the other owners who I believe would react favourably.</p>					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged. There is no change in status of the site, the potential use for small scale affordable housing would likely be supported in principle, this would have to be pursued through the planning application process.					

TH02

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
-------	--------	-------------	------------	---------	--------------	-------

010	Objection	OS No 6942, Chapel Lane, Thurstonfield	008	Mervyn Lister	FM Lister & son	
-----	------------------	--	-----	---------------	-----------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

SHLAA call for sites; Carlisle Local Plan; Site references AO14 and O65:
 On checking your website today, we note that although, when we wrote to you on 13th September 2013 we asked for the area of the site reference TH02 to be amended by reducing the proposed area, that does not appear to have been done.
 The following comments apply to the reduced area of 1.0 hectares.
 Your published statement that the site is "steeply sloping" is patently not true, and we request that you re-examine that point.
 Second, it is hard to see, how anyone could conclude that housing development on the site could be regarded as "highly prominent in the landscape", for the reasons set out in our letter to you dated 11.09.2013 of which we attach a copy. That being so, the bald statement to that effect which is published on the web site as a conclusive remark, is really only a subjective assessment, which we do not consider is capable of being substantiated. We ask you to re-visit that too.
 If the factual elements of the proposed allocation (size and steepness) have not been properly taken into account, it seems reasonable to assume that the remaining content of our letter of 11.9.2013 has been ignored too, in which case we ask that you do read it closely before coming to a decision.
 In the Preferred Options Consultation we registered Objections numbered 0174 and 0175 which we still urge you to take into account, and in the Preferred Options Consultation Stage Two we submitted representations on 9.4.2014 which were given the reference numbers 20500E Objection and 20501 E Objection

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment

ProcessComm

OfficerComm

Noted. The site plan can be amended accordingly. This will not, however, change its status. As you suggest, planning is indeed a subjective process. Officers have visited this site and have concluded, in their professional opinion, that the difference in levels between this site and the neighbouring properties is too great and would lead to unacceptable levels of over looking and over dominance. That conclusion still stands. The SHLAA is perhaps not the best place to challenge this, as it does not, and cannot go into the finer details of design and site layout - nor does discounting from the SHLAA rule out planning permission being achieved on the site. If you feel you can put forward an acceptable site, that would not impact upon existing properties, and would not be overly prominent within the village setting, then it would be better to pursue that through the planning application process, starting with initial pre-application advice from a development management planner. Site status remains unchanged within the SHLAA.

TH04

111	Comment	Hill Farm	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
-----	----------------	-----------	-----	-----------------	--------------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

Environment Agency Constraint Assessment:
 - None

GenComment

ProcessComm

OfficerComm

Acknowledged

192	Comment	Hill Farm, Thurstonfield	073	Viv Sealby	Clerk to Burgh by Sand	
-----	----------------	--------------------------	-----	------------	------------------------	--

AgreeAssess AssessComm

InfoCorrect InfoComment

GenComment

- The development of this site was agreed and is ongoing.
 - A Section 106 is needed for this site.

ProcessComm

OfficerComm

Acknowledged. Once development has commenced this site will be removed from the SHLAA.

TH05

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
112	Comment	Land at Brookside House	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: Within 8 m of a Main river - Ordinary Watercourse - Flood Zone 3 - Flood Zone 2 - Ground Vulnerability Zone				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				

WB02

031	Comment	Corby Hill Road, Warwick Bridge	015	Lucy Adamski/Mr Hutchinson		A003
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		To be read in conjunction with Rep No 032 Site WB09 This site remains deliverable immediately in the context of the NPPF, which the council acknowledges given its proposed allocation for new housing development via draft allocation WARW1 in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2013 Preferred Options – Stage Two. SHLAA site WB02 should be seen as one part of a wider site encompassing SHLAA site WB09 – land off Hurley Road (please see separate representation) on the basis that both land owners have agreed a joint promotion via North Associates, in association with Taylor & Hardy. Given that the two sites are now one SHLAA site being promoted as a single deliverable entity, it is requested that a single SHLAA reference number be allocated for the whole site then this is clear going forward. The council is therefore actively encouraged to take both sites forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The SHLAA sites will be combined as one site - to be referenced as WB02. Please note that whilst the site may be considered as a whole in the SHLAA, this does not necessarily mean that any allocations taken forward from this site will incorporate the whole site. The Council reserves the right to make a policy decision as to what scale and size of development is appropriate for the village.				

WB05

113	Comment	Land at Troutbeck	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: Within 8 m of a Main river - Ordinary Watercourse - Flood Zone 3 - Flood Zone 2 - Ground Vulnerability Zone				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				

WB06

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
114	Comment	Land to the South of Warwick Bridge	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: Within 8 m of a Main river - Ordinary Watercourse - Flood Zone 3 - Flood Zone 2 - Ground Vulnerability Zone			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status				

WBo9

032	Comment	Land off Hurley Road, Warwick Bridge	015	Lucy Adamski/Mr Hutchinson		A003
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		<p>To be read in conjunction with Rep No 031 Site WBo2</p> <p>We fully endorse the council's inclusion of site WBo9 as a deliverable addition to the current SHLAA update consultation. The site should be seen as one part of a wider site encompassing SHLAA site WBo2 - Corby Hill Road (please see separate representation) on the basis that both land owners have agreed a joint promotion via North Associates, in association with Taylor & Hardy.</p> <p>Given that the two sites are now one SHLAA site being promoted as a single deliverable entity, it is requested that a single SHLAA reference number be allocated for the whole site then this is clear going forward.</p> <p>This site is deliverable immediately as part of site WBo2 in the context of the NPPF, which the council acknowledges given the inclusion of site WBo2 as draft housing allocation WARW1 in the Carlisle District Local Plan 2015-2013 Preferred Options – Stage Two.</p> <p>The council is therefore actively encouraged to take both sites forward to formal allocation in the emerging Carlisle District Local Plan.</p>				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. The SHLAA sites will be combined as one site - to be referenced as WBo2. Please note that whilst the site may be considered as a whole in the SHLAA, this does not necessarily mean that any allocations taken forward from this site will incorporate the whole site. The Council reserves the right to make a policy decision as to what scale and size of development is appropriate for the village.				

WE01

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
121	Comment	Land adj Wheatsheaf Gardens, Wetheral	057	Alan Hubbard	National Trust	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No: Individually and in combination sites WEO1 and WEO2 would result in a significant southerly extension of the settlement of Wetheral. Whilst the Trust considers that some development in/around Wetheral is possible, would help to support local services and would not unduly impact upon the surrounding areas it is concerned about the overall extent of sites WEO1 and WEO2. In particular the sites would bring built development very close to both the site of the old Priory and Wetheral Woods, potentially to the detriment of the character and setting of both.			
			Nonetheless a limited amount of development might be satisfactorily accommodated on the northern and western parts of the combined site subject to a) careful consideration of building design and materials, and b) appropriate landscaping treatments, especially to the south and east of any new development.			
InfoCorrect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		comment made by owner of nearby land made available for public enjoyment.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Whilst these sites would increase the size of the village, their potential impact upon the setting of Wetheral and Priory Woods is not considered to be significant. Screening, sensitive design and appropriate landscaping can be included within development should they come forward for development - this would need to be explored at the application stage.				

173	Comment	land adj Wheatsheaf Gardens, Wetheral	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		20 dwellings (NB If developed affordable housing to include extra care bungalows) Wetheral needs a Primary School again, especially with the recent and planned future increase in numbers of homes for the village				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status within the SHLAA.				

WE02

020	Comment	land adj Playing Fields, Wetheral	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. No change in site status.				

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
122	Comment	land adj playing fields, Wetheral	057	Alan Hubbard	National Trust	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	No: Individually and in combination sites WE01 and WE02 would result in a significant southerly extension of the settlement of Wetheral. Whilst the Trust considers that some development in/around Wetheral is possible, would help to support local services and would not unduly impact upon the surrounding areas it is concerned about the overall extent of sites WE01 and WE02. In particular the sites would bring built development very close to both the site of the old Priory and Wetheral Woods, potentially to the detriment of the character and setting of both.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Nonetheless a limited amount of development might be satisfactorily accommodated on the northern and western parts of the combined site subject to a) careful consideration of building design and materials, and b) appropriate landscaping treatments, especially to the south and east of any new development.			
GenComment	comment made by owner of nearby land made available for public enjoyment.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Whilst these sites would increase the size of the village, their potential impact upon the setting of Wetheral and Priory Woods is not considered to be significant. Screening, sensitive design and appropriate landscaping can be included within development should they come forward for development - this would need to be explored at the application stage.					

172	Support	Land adj Playing Field, Wetheral	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Support this but feel that visually it would look better to have WE02 + WE01 and leave 07 undeveloped. The houses would be shielded by the new village hall & be less intrusive than building opposite ie WE07 Wetheral needs a Primary School again, especially with the recent and planned future increase in numbers of homes for the village: 30 Dwellings (NB If developed affordable housing to include extra care bungalows)					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status within the SHLAA.					

WE03

019	Comment	Land Adj Hollmoor Court, Wetheral	011	Margaret Hardy	Taylor & Hardy	
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	The site is identified as being deliverable [0-5 yrs after Local Plan Adoption] and it is in this context that it is reaffirmed that the site is: - suitable for residential development - available for residential development - viable for residential development it is considered that these positive attributes support the allocation in the forthcoming Carlisle District Local Plan of all or part of the land for residential development. The Local Planning Authority are urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the site as set out above.					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status.					

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
170	Support	land adj Hallmoor Court, Wetheral	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Members support this site Wetheral needs a Primary School again, especially with the recent and planned future increase in numbers of homes for the village: 38 dwellings (NB Affordable housing to include extra care bungalows)					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in SHLAA status for site.					

WE07

115	Comment	Land west of Steele's Bank	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment	Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None			
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Acknowledged					

051	Support	Land West of Steele's Bank, Wetheral	029		Church Commissioner	A001
AgreeAssess	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm	We fully support the assessment of Site WE07 in the 2014 SHLAA as being deliverable for residential development and the draft allocation of the site (WETH2) in the emerging Local Plan 2015-2030 (Preferred Options Consultation – Stage 2). As such we would welcome the opportunity to discuss this site in greater detail with the Council in due course. Furthermore, the site is currently considered suitable for delivery during years 6-10 of the Plan period; however, on the basis of the additional information we consider that there is strong potential for the site to be delivered within the first 5 years of the plan period.			
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Additional Comments Submitted: Supporting Information/Technical Reports; Comments from Planning Policy Team; Highways Comments; Ecology; Tree Constraints; Archaeology; Drainage & Flood Risk Assessment and Mining Risk					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. Site status remains unchanged within the SHLAA.					

171	Support	Land West of Steele's Bank, Wetheral	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment	Members support this site and suggest 40 (bungalows to include extra care bungalows) Wetheral needs a Primary School again, especially with the recent and planned future increase in numbers of homes for the village					
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm	Noted. No change in site status within the SHLAA.					

WE08

RepNo	Status	SiteAddress	Consultees	Contact	Organisation	Agent
116	Comment	Land off Plains Road, Wetheral	051	Jilly Dougherty	Environment Agency	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				Environment Agency Constraint Assessment: - None
GenComment						
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Acknowledged				
174	Objection	Land off Plains Road, Wetheral	071	Clerk Sue Tarrant	Wetheral Parish Council	
AgreeAssess	<input type="checkbox"/>	AssessComm				
InfoCorrect	<input type="checkbox"/>	InfoComment				
GenComment		Not supported: A large housing development here is not appropriate. Too far from village ie; for public transport and other village facilities. Would look totally out of keeping – being outside the village boundary Wetheral needs a Primary School again, especially with the recent and planned future increase in numbers of homes for the village: 170 dwellings				
ProcessComm						
OfficerComm		Noted. However, the SHLAA merely looks at the raw potential of a site. This site is not physically constrained, and it is considered that development here would be economically viable. As such it has been shown as deliverable within the SHLAA. It is for the Local Plan to make a decision regarding which sites in Wetheral should be taken forward as allocations, this site was not selected as a preferred option. As the SHLAA does not make policy decisions, however, the site remains deliverable.				