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Introduction

This document is an addendum to the Statement of Compliance with Duty to Co-operate published in May 2013. This addendum includes copies of meeting notes and agendas from the preferred options stage with neighbouring Local Authorities and Statutory Undertakers. It also includes information on the collaborative work undertaken regarding the identification of Housing Market Areas across Cumbria.

Finally, copies of correspondence received during the publication of the pre-submission draft consultation have also been included.
Cumbria Housing Market Areas

The Cumbria Housing Group is a forum that discusses and co-ordinates housing activity in Cumbria on behalf of the six District/Borough Councils, National Park, Cumbria County Council and representatives of Registered Providers. As part of the Cumbria Housing Strategy, published in 2006, 20 Housing Market Areas were identified and agreed. This was followed in 2008/09 by the Research and Development Group (a sub task group of the Cumbria Housing Group) preparing Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) for the 20 Housing Market Areas. Updates of the original SHMA work have been undertaken by individual Local Authorities since, however the common approach has been maintained in terms of using POPGROUP and other standard forms of data generated by the Cumbria Observatory run by Cumbria County Council.

The HMAs are broadly contained within Planning Authority boundaries with the exception of the Lake District National Park which encompasses areas in a number of Districts. Allerdale Local Plan Area overlaps with the National Park in a small number of areas comprising of very sparsely populated areas of countryside, therefore, in practice the boundaries of the HMA’s correspond with the plan area. Across Cumbria as market areas are agreed, contained, and as there are no critical constraint in terms of land supply or infrastructure capacity it has been agreed between authorities that the objectively assessed housing need can be delivered within individual plan areas. Therefore, there are no strategic cross boundary issues in relation to housing delivery.
Preferred Options - Agendas and meeting notes June 2012 onwards
1. Update on current position and future work programme

2. The Strategy
   • Level of growth
   • Spatial Strategy
   • Housing
   • Economy
   • Transport
   • Natural and Built Environment

3. Development Management policies

4. Infrastructure Delivery plan

5. Duty to Co-operate/future joint working

6. A.O.B
Allerdale Local Plan – Cumbria County Council Consultation Meeting
Tuesday 15 January 2013 – 10am
Executive Meeting Room, Allerdale House

Agenda

1. Local Plan timetable and progress
2. Cumbria Council Comments
   - Growth Level
   - Any other issues
3. Cumbria County Council Draft Planning Obligations Policy
4. Local Plan Infrastructure Requirements
5. AOB
1. Spatial Strategy (role of Caldbeck)
2. Housing and economic strategy (main principles)
3. Nuclear New Build and National Grid
4. Strategic cross boundary issues
5. Site allocations
Cross boundary issues

Housing

The Park agreed with the reference to their adopted policy CS18 and housing SPD as part of the Allerdale’s preferred option for the spatial strategy. However, re-wording of the detail of the policy is required to accurately reflect its requirements. The National Park to provide suggested wording.

Cockermouth has a role in terms of addressing the affordable housing in of adjacent Parishes in the National Park. This should be covered in ABC’s current S106 agreement but need to check this.

Renewables / Energy

The Park will judge them on a case by case basis. Maybe potential to refer to the requirement under S62 of the Environment Act for LA’s to take account of the need to preserve the remit of the National Park designation, as a paragraph at the front of the Core Strategy. (see page 4 text in The Park’s Core Strategy for example) A buffer zone around the National Park was not considered appropriate.

Nuclear New Build- the National Park is supporting the site as it is adjacent to an existing complex but the impact of the supporting infrastructure will require closer examination depending on the proposals.

Comments on NSIP policy- possible opportunity to revise the title of this policy to major infrastructure projects instead? (Look at National Park’s policy CS02 for an example)

Transport

Policies/strategy that includes improvements to the A66 will draw an objection from the National Park. Do not see the merit if the upgrade especially balanced against the environmental impact.
1. Underlying principles
2. Level and distribution of growth
3. Core Strategy policies
4. Development Management Policies
5. Sustainability Appraisal and HRA
6. Future engagement
Detailed written comments will be submitted

Main points raised were

Mention of water resource would be an important consideration in the climate change policy (more detailed comments to follow) also protection of wildlife corridors

NE4- Air, soil and water quality – EA may suggest in their comments that a stand alone policy on water quality may be required.

BE3- reference to circular 3/99 would be helpful

BE7 bullet point four- needs reference to pollution to water environment

To be discussed at the meeting on 9 July the requirement for a Water Cycle Study given the water resource issue.

NE3- use bullet point five of NE1 in this policy as well

BE25- need to reference back to NPPF and technical annexe, table D3. Suggest removal of bullet points

BE26- needs to be stronger than considered. Need to add additional bullet point to separate foul and surface water drainage.

BE27- see comments on BE25.

Comments from Forestry Commission-

NE3- need to mention Ancient Woodland defined as woodland before 1600. Also a requirement to safeguard AW when development within 500metres.
Agenda
Duty to Co-operate Copeland Borough Council
11am
Thursday 21 June 2012
Allerdale House

Spatial Strategy
Level of growth
Employment/tourism/retail
Transport
Nuclear/Grid
Developer contributions
Cross boundary issues
Proposed Level of growth

The preferred option is based on the forecasting and scenario work developed from the shared evidence base, as part of the West Cumbria Economic Blueprint. The level of growth both for housing and employment are designed to meet the anticipated need and demand for the Allerdale plan area over the next 15 years. However both the Core Strategies of Allerdale and Copeland have built in flexibility to accommodate changes to the West Cumbria economy, especially emerging sectors supported through the West Cumbria Economic Blueprint.

Employment land supply and strategy

Both Core Strategies adopt the same approach in terms of employment supply in terms of aiming to maintain a flexible land supply to accommodate emerging sectors as well as providing for existing business. As part of both strategies there is a recognition of an over supply of poor quality sites which can be tackled by de-allocation and improving the quality of remaining employment sites.

In terms of Cockermouth there is a need to identify more employment land in the town to need local business needs and to reduce the level of commuting from the town.

It was agreed that a greater emphasis is required in the documents to define the complementary roles of Lillyhall and West Lakes Science and Technology Park especially in terms of the education and skills role. Also it would be useful to define the roles of Derwent Howe and Whitehaven Commercial Park. (possible topic paper is required)

Gypsy and Traveller policy

Reference could be made to cross boundary working to make provision for the travelling community in line with Copeland’s policy point c policy SS3 (Housing Needs, Mix and Affordability)

Affordable Housing
To aid clarity it would be useful if HMA was included in the break down of the % requirements as it could be confused with the towns especially when applied to the rural areas.

**Skills policy**

Both approaches in the two Core Strategies are complementary and reflect the importance of developing skills as part of the West Cumbria Economic Blueprint. Reference to policy ER11 and para 4.11.4 in Copeland’s submission draft Core Strategy.

**Retail policy**

It would be useful to recognise in the Core Strategy the role of Whitehaven in the retail hierarchy for West Cumbria, particularly the complementary role between Workington and Whitehaven.

**Renewable Energy**

Both Core Strategies adopt a criteria based and complementary approach using a joint evidence base.

**Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.**

Support for the approach of an overarching policy (EC8). In discussion it was concluded that the content of EC9 would be better placed in the supporting text rather than in a stand alone policy. An additional policy may be required to cover major projects outside the MIPU system but determined locally.

Suggested rider when mentioning NSIP “in so far as they affect Allerdale” so that the roles are identified.

**Policy TR2-** reference to Nuclear New Build doesn’t really fit in this policy.

Landscape Character Assessment – there maybe an opportunity to work jointly on some aspects of this evidence base.

Sequential test in relation to PDL- make sure it strikes a balance between enabling development but at the same time ensuring that appropriate brownfield sites are considered ahead of Greenfield ones.
Minutes of Local Plan Discussion with United Utilities Plc

Monday 2\textsuperscript{nd} July 2012
Derwent Room, Allerdale House
1.30pm

Present:

Julie Ward (JW)    Allerdale Borough Council
Wilson Lui (WL)    Allerdale Borough Council
David Sherratt (DS)   United Utilities Plc
Martin Williams (MW)   United Utilities Plc

1. Levels of Growth

1.1 JW explained the level of growth envisioned in the \textit{Core Strategy Preferred Options} document and how they reflect housing requirements from available evidences.

1.2 JW explained that the housing target of 304 units (or 4560 units over the plan period) represents a rate which is deliverable yet positively planned and addresses the housing requirement of the area.

2. Water Supply & Waste Water Treatment

2.1 JW highlighted concerns from Environment Agency regarding the supply of water in Allerdale. DS confirmed these concerns as a result of changes in abstraction levels.

2.2 JW explained Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 was the preferred option in relation to new developments. DS welcomed the preferred option.

2.3 MW explained that United Utilities (UU) would like to see SUDs being use on Greenfield sites in the future.

3. Distribution of Growth

3.1 JW explained the Core Strategy sets out the proportion to be received in each tier of the “settlement hierarchy”, as follows: Principal Centre - 35%, Key Service Centres - 39%, Local Service Centres - 20%, and Rural Villages - 6%.

3.2 JW explained the Core Strategy does not allocate specific levels of growth to individual settlements, these would be decided at the “site allocation” stage of the Local Plan when full consideration to infrastructure capacity and viability of sites could be made. The levels of growth allocated to each tier of the settlement hierarchy intends to provide a strong steer on future development pattern yet retain a degree of flexibility for specific site allocations.

3.3 Both DS and MW agreed more detailed target would be beneficial than targets currently established at the broad level. DS/MW explained that without details on site layouts and phasing, it will be difficult to assess whether new development could be served by existing infrastructure provision. JW acknowledged that no assurance could be provided by United Utilities until such details could be made, however, settlement with known capacity issues should be identified.

3.4 Based on the rate of growth provided, MW identified the following settlements with possible capacity issues: Allonby, Brigham, Cockermouth, Dearham, Silloth and Thursby. In particular, limited capacity is considered to be available from the settlements of Brigham and Dearham. Attention will also be made to WwTW at
Workington, due to its large catchment and the level of growth envisioned. MW explained that while the priority will be on improving treatment capacity in these locations, additional capacity won’t be available till 2018 at the earliest. JW explained how phasing of future growth could complement this.

4. Waste Treatment at Cockermouth

4.1 MW explained that the recent appeal decision at the Fitz site has meant the option to expand waste treatment capacity by extending the current WwTW is no longer possible. Instead, two other options could be considered by UU to improve waste treatment capacity in the area.
- The first option could be to provide a “catchment solution”, which involved new works in one or two locations around Cockermouth. The first option would increase waste treatment capacity in Cockermouth and surrounding settlements.
- The second option is to provide a “town solution”, which involve numerous small works around Cockermouth. The second option would increase waste treatment capacity in Cockermouth only.
MW explained the outcome will depend on costing and how feasible each option is.

5. Actions

5.1 JW:
- Email Fitz inspector report to MW/DS

5.2 MW/DS
- Provide indicative assessment of treatment capacity for settlements in Allerdale (PC, KSC & LSC).
Policy S1 - PINS model policy for sustainable development needs to be included. Back this up in the glossary in terms of definition for designated and non-designated assets, significance of setting and setting definition.

Important to include “positive opportunity for improvement” also consider enhancing setting.

NPPF - clear that can refuse on grounds of poor design - needs to be a clear message in policy.

To meet tests of soundness and NPPF

Understand the historic constraints and environment
Develop in most sustainable locations
Prove deliverability - especially at site allocations. May require pre-archaeological survey on a site to understand where this will represent a constraint to development and make the site undeliverable.

Proposals map - expect Conservation Areas, SAM, registered parks and gardens not listed buildings. Could identify areas of archaeological potential.

Need to demonstrate a positive strategy for the historic environment to be embedded throughout the document. This includes heritage at risk. Have to have strategic policies for Historic Environment and Design to give framework for neighbourhood planning.

Don’t use the phrase “acceptable harm” use impact instead.
Does the wording in the policies in natural environment correspond to those in the historic environment?
Need to mention the need to maintain and improve historic assets. (areas at risk)

Use CA appraisals for site allocations. Is historic setting taken into account in the SHLAA assessment?

Historic Strategy components

Starts with vision linked to objectives
Address the issues /areas at risk
Design, location, form of future development
Design briefs
Delivery- contribution of the historic environment to the social and economic strategy
Historic assets in GI, landscape and town centres
Sustainable management of Historic environment- CA appraisals, Article 4’s, Areas of advert control.

Mention in policy intention to have a local list (helps cover non designated assets)
Village design statements?
Potential archaeological sites
Mention settings in policy
Need local design review arrangements with historic rep on it.
Enforcement plan- need to mention matters on heritage repair notices.

Comments on Allerdale’s documents

Cross boundary issues p25- need to mention Hadrian’s Wall as issues shared with Carlisle.

Built Environment should include Built and Historic in title

**Strategic objectives**- need one for World Heritage site
SO5b- protect, enhance and seek positive opportunities to enhance and replace poor design

**Need strategic policy on WHS** could include elements of management plan, landscape, tourism, renewable energy, cross- boundary issues and also monitoring indicators.

**Policy S1**- where it mentions built need to add historic

**Policy S4 add heritage assets**

**Policy S8**- under criteria for development within settlement limits
Criteria i- how to define character of settlement? Is a DM policy required?

**Criteria v- use CA appraisals for this where no appraisal exists need to ask developer for one. Not just buildings but landscapes. Do we need a DM on appraisals?**

**Area based policies**

Found the maps difficult to read need to be placed in the Allerdale context. The coast wasn’t on all of them

Workington and Cockermouth needs more on historic heritage especially Cockermouth
Maryport need to add WHS in text and on the map

Affordable housing- EH has its own guidance on affordable housing and conversion of rural buildings which may be useful

Policy HO4- do we need to consider whether there may be possible undesignated heritage assets that need to be mentioned so that they are not caught up in renewal schemes.

Policy HO5- under form and character could also mention conservation areas. Could look at designating local character areas, middle ground between Conservation Areas and run of the mill areas. May need to look to how we assess form and character

Town Centres- do we have any historic markets that need to be mentioned?

Tourism- If there was a strategic policy on WHS the tourism potential could be mentioned there.

Derwent Forest- there needs to be greater emphasis on historic assets. As the site has remained undisturbed there are fewer examples of these military sites. Further investigation in to the historic value of the site is a possibility.

EC8- need to add in relation to WHS “its buffer zone and setting” as part of the assessment and “impact on it outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity” bullet point 3 of the policy should refer to historic environment as well.

Policy BE1- end of first para- replace “strongly resisted” with “refused” (in line with NPPF)

Could cross reference to EH’s building context checklist

Policy BE3- some rural buildings could have value as non-designated heritage assets (add this into criteria)

Whether this policy was too restrictive and didn’t embrace the re-use of modern redundant buildings for business use- only undesirable for re-use if not fit for purpose

BE6 – need to cross check with the separate paper from EH on how to comply with NPPF (in comments folder- paper copy only)

There are a number of policy approaches that could be adopted. Can either separate out the different assets Listed buildings, Conservation Areas, registered parks and gardens or simply refer to designated and non
designated heritage assets. However need to mention management in both approaches such as CA appraisals

EH liked the reference to maintenance in the policy.

NE1- street trees - add reference “where appropriate”
NE2- take out reference to WHS as not appropriate for landscape.

**Development Management policies**

**DM1 Demolition**- include assessment of historic significance

**DMHO4**- could link to a separate policy on buildings of local character (could use same criteria on local listings)

**DMEC7**- needs historic environment reference

**DMEC9**- supports the future of historic centres

Cross reference the historic environment assets with the assessment of the town centre boundaries

Suggest that to help buildings to be looked at as a whole and avoid upper floor neglect could combine policies on primary, secondary frontages along with upper floor uses in to one policy.

**DMEC20 caravans**- should include historic asset reference.

Safeguarding road schemes (historic asset reference?)

**DMBE1**- last bullet point- could revise wording to include “informed by local context” and “in areas of significant historic environment”

**DMBE2**- include impact on setting of historic assets. Garden space can be important in terms of form and space

**DMBE5**- bullet ii- include after settlement “heritage assets”

**DMBE9**- shop fronts- adopt a sequential approach considering repair and maintenance as the first option rather than go for replacement straight away.

**DMBE12**- Telecomm- include impact on heritage assets

Include a separate DM policy on locally important heritage assets
Design and access statements- could include criteria for assessments required if no CA appraisal exists and will be required to be undertaken by the developer.

DMBE24- could put a footnote to reference EH’s guide to converting traditional buildings

Public realm policy- need to ensure historic levels and materials are safeguarded and enhanced.

DMBE31- bullet ii- not just visible remains. Delete “of visible remains” Need to ensure the setting of SAM’s are mentioned and protected.

DMBE33- if having a strategic policy on WHS is there a need for a DM policy. Look at Carlisle and Northumberland’s policy

Does our tree policy cover trees in Conservation Areas?

Examples of policies

Core Strategy- Tower Hamlets and Bath
DM policies- Peterborough and Poole

Assets of local importance- Waltham Forest and Horsham
Duty to co-operate meeting

Allerdale Borough Council and Carlisle City Council

Julie Ward 01/10/12
Jillian Haile
Purpose of meeting

The Localism Act 2011 Section 110 sets out a ‘duty to co-operate’. This applies to all local planning authorities, national park authorities and county councils in England – and to a number of other public bodies. The duty:

- relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a county council
- requires that councils set out planning policies to address such issues
- requires that councils and public bodies ‘engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis’ to develop strategic policies
- requires councils to consider joint approaches to plan making.

Paragraph 156 of the NPPF sets out the strategic issues where co-operation might be appropriate.

Common strategic issues identified

- Hadrian’s Wall WHS – crosses Northumberland, Carlisle District, Allerdale and Copeland. Potential for common policy with text agreed by Judith Nelson (English Heritage); Action – send Carlisle draft policy to Julie Ward and liaise with Northumberland, including check status of Northumberland plan;
- Solway Coast AONB – partnership working already in place through AONB unit. However, potential to have common policy, (this also applies to North Pennines AONB);
- strategic housing sites – discussion around whether each district could meet its housing need. Whilst this unlikely to be an issue, we discussed Wigton as a KSC in the north of Allerdale, and issues arising from this. An issue that was identified was capacity of secondary school in Wigton, and any large housing allocations to west of Carlisle may generate children who choose to go to Wigton School rather than secondary schools in Carlisle (quality and standard issue – together with parental choice); Action – set up meeting with Andy Smart (Education Authority), Michael Barry (CuCC), and County Highways;
• Carlisle is a sub regional centre for retail – discussion around hinterland for retail and potential impacts on Wigton. Wigton considered to meet specific local needs through small independent shops. **Action** – send draft retail study to Julie Ward;

• Northumberland Foundation Health Trust to take over Cumbria Foundation Health Trust next May. One type of operation in one hospital. Implications for travel patterns. **Action** – arrange contact and research any Health Authority draft plans;

• University - The University of Cumbria has facilities within the Energus building at Lillyhall, in Workington, West Cumbria, offering a flexible learning space for all University of Cumbria students. When University responded to Carlisle Issues and Options, they referred to a draft masterplan, and the need to tie in with our Local Plan. **Action** – arrange university contact;

• Travellers – Allerdale and Carlisle both agreed that updated evidence is required as the county wide 2008 GTAA is becoming out of date. The preferred course of action would be a county wide approach again, although the support for this is unknown. **Action** – speak to Michael Barry at CuCC to check progress/support. If timescales not compatible, go for joint Carlisle/Allerdale study, and renegotiate quote from Salford;

• Thurstonfield/Kirkbampton – straddle boundary of districts. Issues may not be strategic, but may be local issues with waste water treatment work capacity;

• renewables – Allerdale considers that high percentage of wind turbines have been permitted and in operation within district. By comparison, Carlisle has seen little wind turbine development, possibly as our windiest areas are constrained by RAF Spadeadam requirements, and Eskdalemuir seismic testing station. Also AONB constraints;

• energy coast, Grid PPA – this area needs further discussion. **Action** – Jilly to discuss with Chris Hardman;

• potential for Duty to Cooperate to be referenced in spatial portrait and map.
Correspondence received concerning Pre-submission draft May 2013
Dear Mrs Ward

DUTY TO COOPERATE

Following our meeting today, and previous meetings on 1st October 2012, and 14th June 2012, I am writing to you in support of the approach taken so far between the authorities towards the ‘duty to cooperate’ set out in the Localism Act 2011.

Cumbrian authorities have a particularly well established culture of joint working. Specific examples of this are jointly commissioned studies, the most recent being the 2013 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment, and the Cumbria Renewable Energy Capacity and Deployment Study 2011. In addition the Solway Coast AONB is jointly managed by an AONB Partnership between Allerdale, Carlisle, Natural England, the Environment Agency and various other community representatives.

When working with Allerdale Borough Council on the duty to cooperate, we have sought to identify common strategic issues, and explore whether specific planning policies were needed to address these issues, as follows:

- Hadrian’s Wall WHS – crosses Northumberland, Carlisle District, Allerdale and Copeland. Potential for common policy with text agreed by Judith Nelson (English Heritage); outcome – joint policy agreed, Policy S28;
- Solway Coast AONB – partnership working already in place through AONB unit. However, potential to have common policy, (this also applies to North Pennines AONB); outcome – joint policy agreed, Policy S34;
• strategic housing sites – discussion around whether each district could meet its housing need. Whilst this is unlikely to be an issue, we discussed Wigton as a KSC in the north of Allerdale, and issues arising from this. An issue that was identified was capacity of secondary school in Wigton, and any large housing allocations to west of Carlisle may generate children who choose to go to Wigton School rather than secondary schools in Carlisle (quality and standard issue – together with parental choice); outcome – agreed that Carlisle is likely to allocate sufficient sites through its forthcoming Preferred Options Local Plan to meet its own needs. Carlisle is unlikely to allocate sites in the first five years of its plan period as it can demonstrate a five year supply + 20%;

• Carlisle is a sub regional centre for retail – discussion around hinterland for retail and potential impacts on Wigton. Wigton considered to meet specific local needs through small independent shops; outcome – agreed that Wigton caters for a strong local market through independent and local retailers, and this is unlikely to be compromised by the strategy in the Carlisle Local Plan;

• Northumberland Foundation Health Trust to take over Cumbria Foundation Health Trust next May. One type of operation in one hospital. Implications for travel patterns; outcome – this was proposed to start in May 2013 and as yet there is no further information on the implications of this merger;

• University - The University of Cumbria has facilities within the Energus building at Lillyhall, in Workington, West Cumbria, offering a flexible learning space for all University of Cumbria students. When University responded to Carlisle Issues and Options, they referred to a draft masterplan, and the need to tie in with our Local Plan.

• Travellers – Allerdale and Carlisle both agreed that updated evidence is required as the county wide 2008 GTAA is becoming out of date; outcome - County wide study currently being undertaken and at first draft stage;

• Thurstonfield/Kirkbampton – straddle boundary of districts. Issues may not be strategic, but may be local issues with waste water treatment work capacity;

• renewables – Allerdale considers that high percentage of wind turbines have been permitted and in operation within district. By comparison, Carlisle has seen little wind turbine development, possibly as our windiest areas are constrained by RAF Spadeadam requirements, and Eskdalemuir seismic testing station. Also AONB constraints;

• potential for Duty to Cooperate to be referenced in spatial portrait and map; outcome - key diagram to show cross boundary strategic green
infrastructure (Solway Coast AONB); heritage (Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Site); transport corridors (road and rail).

Yours sincerely

J Hale  
Principal Policy Officer
Dear Julie,

RESPONSE TO TOPIC PAPERS ACCOMPANYING THE ALLERDALE LOCAL PLAN (PART 1) PRE SUBMISSION DRAFT MAY 2013

We have reviewed the following Topic Papers:
1. Spatial Strategy
2. Housing Growth, and
3. Wind Turbine Separation Distance

Generally we have not identified any obvious implications for the Lake District National Park resulting from the ‘scope’ and ‘approach’ set out in the Topic Papers. We do not consider there to be any strategic cross-boundary issues at this stage which need further investigation by the two authorities.

We do recognise that any growth in Cockermouth beyond this new plan’s period will require us to work together closely to explore how to most appropriately accommodate development, but this is not of concern at this time as through the Local Plan you are able to accommodate the identified necessary growth without significant implications for the Lake District National Park.

With regards to the Wind Turbine Separation Distance Topic Paper, one matter of detail I would like to draw attention to is regarding the effects on protected landscapes, referred to in Appendix 2 Para. 206 - the Solway Coast AONB an Hadrian’s Wall WHS are cited but the Lake District National Park is not; for completeness I believe this should be included.

I hope this is useful. Please let me know if you require any more information or clarification.

Kind regards

Chris

Chris Warren
Head of Partnership and Spatial Strategy
Lake District National Park Authority

Direct: 01539 792681
Email: chris.warren@lakedistrict.gov.uk

Contact Centre: 01539 724555

This email contains information intended for the addressee only. It may be confidential and may be the subject of legal and/or professional privilege..
Any dissemination, distribution, copyright or use of this communication without prior permission of the addressee is strictly prohibited. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Lake District National Park Authority. Although this email and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defects which might affect any computer or IT system into which they are received, no responsibility is accepted by the Lake District National Park Authority for any loss or damage arising in any way from the receipt or use thereof. Computer systems of this Authority may be monitored and communications carried out on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.
12th July 2013
Julie Ward
Principal Planning Officer
Allerdale Borough Council
Planning Services
Allerdale House
Workington CA14 3YJ
Dear Julie

RE: Allerdale Local Plan (Part 1) Pre-Submission Draft Consultation – Response from Copeland BC

Thank you for your letter dated 3rd May 2013 inviting comments on the above document. As discussed and agreed in our meeting on 18th June I am writing our response in the form of a letter, but hope that you will also be able to easily extract the information for your representations database.

I intend only to comment on those policies that cover the wider West Cumbria area and/or would impact directly on Copeland. Other, more detailed, areas of policy are for Allerdale to determine and we would generally be supportive, but provide no specific comment here.

General Comments
The Copeland and Allerdale Local Plans have been produce on a similar timescale and, because many of the issues relate to West Cumbria, have been designed to be complementary and shared a common evidence base where appropriate. Examples of this shared evidence base include:

- The West Cumbria Employment Land and Premises Study
- The West Cumbria Retail Capacity Study
- Shared methodology for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)

- Background papers to support the West Cumbria Economic Blueprint, including:
  - Projections Paper (Housing and Employment)
  - West Cumbria Retail and Employment Land Study Updates
  - Viability Assessment of Housing Sites
  - Nuclear paper

Both Local Plans are also written in such a way that they support delivery of the aspirations outlined in the West Cumbria Economic Blueprint by ensuring an appropriate mix and spread of development across west Cumbria.

Specific Comments
Vision
The Vision appears to be a reasonable reflection of Allerdale’s aspirations for the future. It is broadly consistent with the Vision in the Copeland Core Strategy. Our only area of concern is on page 15, where we would question Workington’s position as “West Cumbria’s principal residential, educational, leisure, cultural and commercial centre.” This is a change from the Preferred Options draft which stated
that Workington “will have retained and enhanced its role as Allerdale’s principal residential...”, which reflected the significant and complementary role that Whitehaven also plays in this part of west Cumbria.

Objectives
The Objectives are broadly consistent with those in the Copeland Core Strategy. As with the Preferred Options we would still seek clarification regarding Objective SO3c and the specific roles of Lillyhall and Westlakes Science and Technology Park when discussing nuclear research, which are still not clear to us.

Policy S3
The proposed level of growth in Policy S3 (304 dwellings per annum) would appear to be an appropriate figure to support growth within Allerdale. This is because:

- It supports and complements the growth figure in the Copeland Core Strategy (230-300 per annum), and will enable the likely future demand for housing across west Cumbria (that is projected to support the Economic Blueprint) to be met in a flexible and sustainable manner by both local authorities
- It is greater than was originally outlined in the Regional Spatial Strategy, making it challenging, but potentially deliverable based upon historic build rates

- Proposing significantly higher build rates could adversely affect sustainable development in west Cumbria and could also result in Allerdale consistently failing to achieve its housing target. It should also be remembered that any target set is not a maximum and there may be occasions when the target is exceeded.

The settlement hierarchy outlined will enable the best use of existing infrastructure (and aid future planning of infrastructure) by focussing the majority development within the main towns (and villages) that provide the best range of services. The scale of development attributed to each settlement also appears appropriate to support sustainable development and regeneration aspirations, and is complementary to that in the Copeland Core Strategy where a similar approach has been taken forward. Anything other than minor revisions to this could result in a skewing of development to less sustainable areas. The proposed distribution of development in Policy S3 will also help support the preference given to brownfield sites, as well as other development principles outlined in Policy S5.

Policies S7, S8 and S9
These policies are all consistent with the approach taken in the Copeland Core Strategy and should mean a complementary approach to housing is adopted in both authority areas.

Policy S13
We are concerned about the inclusion of research and development as a sector that will be encouraged at Lillyhall. There are two references to this within Policy S13 (on page 74) that have been added since the Preferred Options document. It has long been established that research and development in west Cumbria will be focussed at Westlakes Science and Technology Park, with manufacturing businesses that can emerge from this being directed towards Lillyhall.

Paragraph 168 talks about the need to differentiate between the key sites in west Cumbria and states that Lillyhall has a distinct role from Westlakes Science and
Technology Park, but this is contradicted by the inclusion of research and development as a new function being proposed at Lillyhall. Therefore Copeland Borough Council would object to Lillyhall being promoted as a centre for research and development in west Cumbria. As suggested at the Preferred Options stage a short topic paper may help to clarify the respective roles of the strategic employment sites in Allerdale and Copeland.

Policy S20
We note the inclusion of a policy relating to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs). The clauses within the policy seem logical, however it should be recognised that where the NSIP relates to a new nuclear power station at Moorside most of the impacts, requirements and associated/ancillary developments will take place in Copeland.

Policy S21
The approach towards developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) outlined in Policy S21 mirrors that of the Copeland Core Strategy. This is welcomed because it is important that such matters are considered strategically at a larger than district level. Close working by the two authorities when considering any CIL charging and/or production of a Supplementary Planning Document would probably be beneficial when taking this matter forward.

Typographical Comments/Errors
There are a few occasions when Westlakes Science and Technology Park has not been given its full title. It may seem pedantic but for clarity, and to avoid confusion, please can you use the term Westlakes Science and Technology Park in the following paragraphs:
- 167 (page 75)
- 168 (page 75)
- 181 (page 81)

(together with any further references I may have missed)
Also, paragraph 167 (page 74) should also say ‘Moorside’, not Moorfield.
I hope you find these comments helpful and if you would like to discuss the contents of this letter in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Yours sincerely
Chris Hoban
Senior Planning Policy Officer
DUTY TO COOPERATE

Meeting note: 29 August 2013.

Venue: Eden District Council offices.

Present: Julie Ward (Allerdale Borough Council), Paul Fellows and Samantha Bradley (Eden District Council)

Purpose of meeting.

The Localism Act 2011 Section 110 sets out a ‘Duty to Cooperate’. This applies to all Local Planning Authorities, National Park Authorities and County Councils in England, and to the following bodies: (relevant to this discussion) Environment Agency, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, Natural England, Civil Aviation Authority, Homes and Communities Agency, Primary Care Trust, Office of the Rail Regulator, Highways Agency, Highways Authority.

The duty:

• relates to sustainable development or the use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two LPA areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a County Council;
• requires that LPAs set out planning policies to address such matters;
• requires that LPAs and public bodies ‘engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis’ to develop strategic policies.

Paragraph 178 of the NPPF states that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priorities set out in paragraph 156, as follows:

• homes and jobs needed in the area;
• the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
• the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk, and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy, (including heat);
• the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities;
• climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.

Common strategic issues identified for Allerdale and Eden – (policy and infrastructure)
1. Gypsies and Travellers – New Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment currently in production which is county-wide and so will establish any cross boundary issues.

2. Strategic Housing Allocations – Both districts have the same issues regarding the distributional split of housing- i.e. high proportions of development in rural areas over previous years now means high targets in Key Service Centres (Allerdale has 6, Eden has 4). However, for both districts, it is the areas away from the main and most sustainable centres that are most desirable to developers (e.g. Cockermouth over Workington in Allerdale). How each district will meet its housing needs was discussed and both districts indicated that they’re considering including a windfall element to meet housing targets.

The area along the boundary of where the two districts meet has a sparse population residing within only a few settlements, and a relatively low housing need. It is not envisaged that either district would be required to accommodate the housing need of the other.

The potential impact of the Lake District National Park (which overlaps both districts) on the dispersal of housing need and the increased demand for housing within the districts was discussed. It was pointed out that, in Allerdale, the National Park have been willing to alleviate the housing need of the district by, amongst other things, including Allerdale parishes as eligible for locally restricted housing in Caldbeck. Both districts are confident that they can meet their housing need, and therefore there will be no requirement to meet the housing need of one district in the other.

4. Retail- Given the very separate catchment areas of the main towns within each district, it is not considered that there’s any cross boundary issues to retail development.

5. Commercial- Given the very separate catchment areas of the main towns within each district, it is not considered that there’s any cross boundary issues to commercial development.

5. Travel and transport routes – The main strategic road link to Allerdale is the A66, which runs through the Eden district and specifically through south Penrith. Significant development in Allerdale may impact upon traffic and pollution levels in Eden due to associated increased traffic on the A66.

6. Wind turbines – Allerdale has received a high volume of applications for wind turbines in recent years- refusals are now being upheld at appeal given the cumulative impacts of such. This isn’t an issue for the area where the boundary of the two districts is, because of stricter controls within and surrounding the Lake District national park.
However, there's a possibility that developers may begin to exploit Eden as it becomes more difficult to develop in Allerdale (and other neighbouring authorities). The County wide Cumulative Impact of Vertical Structures study will provide more information on the potential impact and how best to plan for such.

8. Infrastructure – Allerdale has carried out some infrastructure deficit planning work and do not envisage any critical elements that will be detrimental to the strategy, nor any cross boundary issues. When Eden carry out similar work it was agreed they would highlight any cross boundary issues. A mutual issue discussed was the financial requirements of the County Council for infrastructure, and the impact of such on the viability of development.

Future actions.

Further meeting when either district progresses Local Plan further.